47th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The House will come to order. Members should be at their desks. Members and guests in the gallery are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, to turn off their cell phones, pagers, Blackberrys and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led today in prayer by Reverend Michael Wiley, who is the pastor of the Divine Church in Woodstock, Illinois. Reverend Wiley is the guest of Representative Jack Franks."
- Reverend Wiley: "Let's pray. Our God, we pause before You today. We give You thanks for those that have come before us that have sought Your guidance to make this... this country a great nation and this a great state. Father, we thank You for those that are on the battlefields, those that are in other countries giving their life, giving their service. We thank You for the Members here that are giving their life and service to You for this great state to make it a better place. We ask for Your guidance on this day, on the decisions that are made and on this great country. In Your Son's name. Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Elaine Nekritz."
- Nekritz 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 Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Colvin and Patterson are excused today."

47th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bost.
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Mathias is excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you. Is Representative Black here today?

  Mr. Clerk, take the record. A hundred and fourteen

  Members being present, there is a quorum. And then we'll

  start on the Order of Third Readings. Representative John

  D'Amico has House Bill 2749. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2749, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative John D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2749 is a Bill from the Cook County Sheriff and it's where the sheriff actually is trying to give up some of his authority. Instead of the sheriff administering the electronic monitoring device, he wants the Chief Judge to determine who is going to wear that. I'll be... answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2749 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Granberg, Hannig, Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Amendment, is hereby declared passed. Having received the Constitutional Majority, is

47th Legislative Day

- hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Rose. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Rose: "Speaker, I appreciate your efficiency, but our computers aren't even up here yet. Could you hold off for another minute or so until our computers boot? Would you mind? Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Well, we'll accommodate you, Representative.

  Representative Rose, are our computers operational on the Republican side?"
- Rose: "They are, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence."
- Speaker Lyons: "Happy to accommodate, Representative. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Stephens: "Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "State your point."
- Stephens: "Representative... Representative Rose, when the little hand's on the ten (10) and the big hand's on the twelve (12)."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you for that clarification, Representative Stephens. On the Order of Third Reading, Representative Eddy, you have House Bill 261. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 261, a Bill for an Act concerning schools. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that I've been to most of your desks discussing regarding the bid process for school districts. Several years ago we had raised the bid limit

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

for most government agencies, municipalities, county governments, to twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000). In 1990 the… or '91, the bid limit was set for schools at ten thousand dollars (\$10,000). Has not been raised and this Bill would raise that bid limit to twenty-five thousand (25,000). In addition, there's a component of the Bill that requires school boards to bid for electricity if the… if the bid is over twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000). And I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have regarding the Bill, and once again, appreciate your support. This is something I've talked to most of you about and appreciate your input if you have any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Paul Froehlich."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Froehlich: "Representative, the... the part about raising the minimum bid to twenty-five thousand (25,000) is fine with me. My question though is the part about energy contracts. Under your Bill, would the school district... all right, would you be creating what in effect would be a big new exemption to the bidding requirement when it came to energy contracts? In that school districts, if they gave the contract to a consortium, would not have to bid what could be a multimillion dollar contract?"

Eddy: "Well, the language in the Bill states that if a district joins a utility consortium then that consortium must either award the electricity contracts over twenty-five thousand (25,000) to the lowest responsible bidder and of course,

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

you get to consider, you know, delivery, quality, service ability and all the other things you normally would. But it actually then, after the advertisement procure electricity takes place, they would have to go through a process. At this time, Representative, as you know, the schools that join those consortiums, and there is no bid process. So this actually holds them more responsible than they are at this time."

- Froehlich: "Well, are you saying that under current law there's no requirement that school districts do any kind of competitive process when awarding energy contracts?"
- Eddy: "Well, I think at this time there is some question as to whether or not that's a requirement, and in fact, there are court cases pending on that issue and... and my... my concern here is to make it clear in the law what the intent is and that the intent is that they absolutely bid over twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) even if they go through a consortium."
- Froehlich: "But if they go through a consortium the school district itself doesn't do any kind of RFP process. Isn't that correct under your Bill?"
- Eddy: "That's true. That's transferred and that responsibility is transferred to the consortium that they join."
- Froehlich: "Yes. Now, is there anything in your Bill that would prevent the consortium after the consortium did its bidding from tacking on whatever fees that it deems appropriate?"
- Eddy: "Well, Representative, this... this does not deal with anything except the bid process and ensuring in that

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

process that there is some type of inclusion of a RFP or bid process for utilities. And I want to add, at this point as you know, that's not clearly stated in law, so this is an attempt to clearly state that that's a requirement."

Froehlich: "Well, I wish... I wish what your Bill would clearly state is that... that... comp... competitive bidding process is required, especially for multimillion dollar contracts. It seems to me what you're doing instead is creating a huge new exemption to the requirement for competitive bidding at least by the school district. You're transferring the bidding to this energy consortium which can... is free to tack on whatever fees they may choose and which may mean the school district and the taxpayers they represent are not getting the best price that they could as if the school district itself did the RFP or other competitive process."

Eddy: "Representative, as you know, in many parts of the state there is not going to be a competitive bid for electricity. Many districts have one source of utility for electricity and that's all they're going to have. This is an effort not to let as... I think your words 'try to create', I think your exact words 'try to create some kind of bypass.' That's... that's absolutely not true. The intent of this legislation is not to create that bypass. That's... that's absolutely false. Right now, today, the situation exists that school districts just do nothing except choose an electric provider. This I think tightens that up as opposed to, you know, your characterization of this as the intent being to...

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

to avoid it. That's just not... I don't agree with your analysis, that's all."

Froehlich: "Well, where there is competition and certainly up in the Chicago area anyway I'm familiar with, there is competition for these big institutional energy users. Where there is competition, your Bill would allow a school district, would it not, to not itself, do any kind of RFP process for a multi-million dollar contract?"

Eddy: "Right now, if the school district is... under this Bill, has twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) or more in electric bid to... for service for electricity, they would have to either (a) bid it themselves, or if they joined a consortium that consortium would be required to go through a competitive process. Now, it does not, I don't think, go to the extent that you'd like to go and I recognize that. However, I would also say it's better than what we do at this point."

Froehlich: "Is there any opposition..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Froehlich, your time has expired. It you could finish... if you want another minute to finish your question, we'll..."

Froehlich: "Yeah, just..."

Speaker Lyons: "...wrap it up."

Froehlich: "Do you know of any opposition to your Bill? Any organized group?"

Eddy: "Representative, I've not heard from any groups that are opposed to this at this time."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

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

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, how many years have you spent in education?"

Eddy: "Twenty-six (26)."

Black: "You are, I assume, a classroom teacher?"

Eddy: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "A building principal?"

Eddy: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "And a superintendent?"

Eddy: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Would you do anything that would harm the integrity of any school in this state while seeking an energy contract?"

Eddy: "Absolutely not."

Black: "Is it not true that the largest consortium currently in the State of Illinois seeking to pool their resources to maybe buy electricity from a supplier at a lower price, I believe the largest consortium currently in the State of Illinois are school districts, are they not?"

Eddy: "The Illinois Energy Consortium is a group of school districts that seek to reduce the cost of purchasing electricity by forming that consortium."

Black: "Would you think it would be possible for the Hutsonville or Danville School District to go out on their own and find a alternative supplier for electricity? Just their own district?"

Eddy: "Absolutely no way would there be competition for electricity without that consortium."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Black: "All right. Is there any competition, anybody knocking on your door in Hutsonville to sell you electricity at below the current rate?"

Eddy: "Absolutely not. And in fact, the only way we have secured below current rate is by joining that consortium. If that consortium was not available to most rural districts, they would be paying far more for electricity."

"That's... that's kind of what I thought when I read your Bill and I appreciate your answers, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This Bill makes eminent good sense, and the largest consortium in the State of Illinois are comprised of educational institutions that are trying to seek alternative suppliers for electricity, and... and we've done this for years in education with natural gas. I've never heard one complaint. I've never heard of any opposition. It... it is what you would expect a school board and school officials to do when they are paying near record prices for electricity. That is a tremendous amount of money that could be better used elsewhere in the school district. I commend the Sponsor for what he's doing. He has all the safeguards necessary in the Bill and unless we can reach some agreement on electricity costs competition, without such a Bill, you're putting school districts at risk and you're also giving school districts the opportunity to perhaps do things that you wouldn't want them to do. His Bill is carefully drafted, well thought out, and is supported by almost... well, not almost, I've not heard anyone in the business or education community that

47th Legislative Day

- has expressed any concern whatsoever with Representative Eddy's Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative Eddy, this Bill adds some latitude and some adjustments for inflation, but it actually doesn't change things whatsoever for a school board if they want to operate exactly as they had before this Bill was put into play."
- Mitchell, J.: "Absolutely."
- Mitchell, J.: "So this simply gives you some latitude and decision making power that you didn't have due to the fact that inflation and everything else has changed the landscape to the point where it literally pretty well restricts the school board's hands and in the situation where you might possibly be able to save the school district some money."
- Eddy: "Absolutely. In 1991 when the bid limit went into place, there were many, many items that schools were able to purchase without going through the process and the cost of the bid. And all we're doing is what we've done for other government bodies. We're raising it so that they can spend more money in schools on children and less on the process that's very cumbersome."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Mitchell, J.: "So the bump even in food cost has made quite a difference in... in how much money's leftover just simply to educate kids and put into the classroom?"
- Eddy: "Absolutely. And I... I'm... I'm totally in favor of competitive bidding. I know it's an important part of the process and this is no... there's no intent here to avoid it in any way. There's just a simple Bill that allows governments to operate more efficiently and carry out the duties, in this case in education, that... that they're supposed to carry out."
- Mitchell, J.: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you take a look at the proponents of this Bill and the opponents you'll see that there are absolutely no opponents to the legislation, but the proponents are the Illinois Association of School Business Officials, the School Management Alliance, LEDA, LEND and SCOPE, all those particular groups are groups that oversee the actions of school boards and certainly, they would not want to sign on something that they thought would harm schools. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. Certainly will help schools in the management of the few dollars that we give them. And I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy to close."

Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this particular piece of legislation, I think for those of you who are looking for a way to put more money in the classrooms and save school districts from some of the costs involved for bidding items that, you know,

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

fifteen (15) years ago didn't have to be bid. This is a way to put money in the classrooms without costing the State of Illinois any money. I think it adds a very important component on bidding of utility electric... electricity that needed to be addressed. It may not be, you know, to the liking of every single person, but I think it's a good Bill. It's a great way to put some money in the classroom. And I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 261 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Coulson, Representative Kosel. Renee. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 87 Members voting 'yes', 28 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Cross, you have House Bill 146. We'll come back to you in a minute. Representative Feigenholtz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for an announcement. I would like to inform the Body that today we're celebrating a very special birthday. Our Majority Leader is turning another year. Let's give her a big congratulations."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "We will be bringing cake to the floor. You can inform Mr. Mapes of that."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Representative Froehlich, you have House Bill 827. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 827, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Paul Froehlich."

Froehlich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill does not raise any fees. The Amendment adopted yesterday assures that there's not... does not raise any fees at all. What we're doing is keeping the 911 Emergency System funded. We're adding an audit and extending the sunset of the Wireless Emergency Telephone System Act to 2013. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeking recognition, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Don Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Moffitt: "House Bill 827, I think should... everyone should feel comfortable voting for this. We had another meeting... we were very close to an agreed Bill last week with wireless carriers and all of our emergency personnel, that's fire, police, et cetera. Had another meeting in my office this morning and I want to commend everyone for negotiating in good faith, that's our wireless providers and our emergency responders. We're very encouraged that we probably will have an agreed Bill with language to put on it over in the Senate. We've also ... Senator Haine is going to pick this in the Senate and the Chair of Bill up Telecommunications Committee, Representative Brosnahan, I want to commend him for all the cooperation he's given us. But what our intent eventually is, of course, to provide

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

adequate revenue to our local 911 centers. So, very close to an agreed Bill. I thank Representative Froehlich for carrying this now and we're going to have some more meetings. But we're pretty close to an agreed Bill, but it will take some additional language. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, I... a point of clarification,
Representative. So once it gets over to the Senate, they
say your negotiations... it's going to come back here and
we're going to look at it again. Cause, you know..."

Froehlich: "That's... that's our expectations. Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "Okay. 'Cause I think it's a good piece of legislation and I think with some of that negotiation with us... really, at the end of the day, we're trying to have a universal system instead of all these hodgepodge systems all across the state, and so we can really contain cost and be that much more efficient all across these different counties, the eight (8) counties that are missing, so no one will be sort of left out of the emergency response system. And the police can respond in a very fluid way and a very effective way. So I just wanted to make sure that we're all on the same page and I'd like to be in one of those meetings, especially when it comes back from the Senate, if that's okay."

Froehlich: "Okay. There are still eight (8) counties that have not adopted, though, this emergency system. It's up to the

47th Legislative Day

- counties, so they're not excluded they just haven't opted in yet. I just want to make sure I... there's... we don't mislead you about that."
- Dunkin: "Okay. And thanks for that clarification. I was under the impression that this legislation was to bring everyone into the fold because of those particular eight (8) counties. So, what happens, Representative, if the counties don't opt in and there's an excessive amount of money?
  - Are we still going to charge an additional one twenty-five (1.25) or one fifty (1.50) on our cell phone bills?"
- Froehlich: "Now, I believe the charge is... is seventy-five cents (\$.75) not one fifty (1.50). We're not raising it. That... the Amendment removed that... that increase."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So you are removing the seventy-five cent (\$.75)... the seventy-five cent (\$.75) ... to one fifty (\$1.50)? That's been stricken out of the Amendment?"
- Froehlich: "The charge stays the same. No change."
- Dunkin: "Okay. And again, the question is, what happens if there is, even with the current amount, that if there's an excessive amount of money with this surcharge, what happens to those dollars?"
- Froehlich: "I don't think that that issue has come up yet.

  There hasn't… it hasn't been such a big source of revenue that there's been any extra funding."
- Dunkin: "I'm saying, what happens if there is extra funding?"
- Froehlich: "That'll be part of the negotiations, hopefully in the final agreement, that could resolve that particular question."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Dunkin: "Okay. Again, so at this point there'll be no additional surcharge, that's been stricken out."

Froehlich: "Right."

Dunkin: "And the eight (8) counties that I was under the impression that this Bill was trying to include, they only have an option."

Froehlich: "It's still a local decision, yes."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you. And I look forward to working with you, Representative, both you and Representative Moffitt."

Froehlich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

Black: "How many Amendments would you... find out how many Amendments are on the Bill?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "There are two Amendments. An amendment was adopted in committee and Floor Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor."

Black: "All right. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, does Floor Amendment #2 become the Bill?"

Froehlich: "Let me... let me take a guick look here."

Black: "I've got 5 minutes, you don't have to hurry."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Froehlich: "No. It... it retains all the language in the Amendment 1 but deletes the provision about increasing the fee."
- Black: "All right. And of the seventy-five cent (\$.75) fee who gets what? How's the money distributed?"
- Froehlich: "About forty cents (\$.40) goes to... forty-eight cents (\$.48) goes to the local 911 boards currently."
- Black: "Are there any attempts to increase the amount of money going to the 911 board?"

Froehlich: "Yes."

Black: "What would that increase..."

Froehlich: "That's part of the negotiations that have not been concluded yet."

Black: "What will that... what do you think that will be?"

Froehlich: "Well, we'd like to... we hope it'll be raised, the amount that goes into that fund. That's the goal to raise it to maybe seventy cents (\$.70)."

Black: "Okay. The Chicago charge for cellular is a dollar and a quarter (\$1.25). Have you changed the Chicago charge at all?"

Froehlich: "No, we don't."

Black: "So Chicago charges a dollar twenty-five (\$1.25) and the rest of the… the other one hundred and one (101) counties charge seventy-five cents (\$.75), right?"

Froehlich: "Yeah, of the… except for the eight (8) that haven't opted in."

Black: "And I believe a referendum has failed in each one of those counties on several occasions. How much money is currently sitting in the cellular 911 account?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Froehlich: "We will check that for you, try to get you that number here. I don't have it at my fingertips."
- Black: "I think its thirty-five million dollars (\$35,000,000). Why hasn't that been distributed?"
- Froehlich: "That's a carrier fund and we are trying to get that released back to the local 911 funds. That's part of the negotiations, Representative."
- Black: "How much money has the Governor swept out of the E911 fund?"
- Froehlich: "I don't know, although I do understand there has been money swept from it."
- Black: "Ten... ten million dollars (\$10,000,000). Ten million dollars (\$10,000,000)."
- Froehlich: "Yes. And we... we are putting a no sweep provision here into that fund."
- Black: "I carried this Bill several years ago and worked many years to get it passed, and we had a sunset clause in there because all of this was to have been done by this time. What happened? Why isn't it?"

Froehlich: "Why isn't..."

- Black: "Why... why didn't the original sunset clause kick in?

  All of the parties to the negotiation years ago said that this would be completed by the end of this year."
- Froehlich: "The... the... well, I think the original sunset's '08.

  And we're extending..."

Black: "Oh no, that's the end of this year."

Froehlich: "Yeah. Well, April 1 of 2008."

Black: "Mmm mmm."

47th Legislative Day

- Froehlich: "And there'd been ongoing requests for money as new technology has come on board since this was originally enacted."
- Black: "And yet we still have PSAPs that don't have the ability to locate a call from a cell phone. Are they spending the money on other technologies rather than what this Bill was designed to do? This Bill was designed to locate a cellular phone in a matter of seconds within ten (10) feet. And I know that all the PSAPs want more money, but what are they spending the money on?"
- Froehlich: "Well, we... this Bill requires your Auditor General to conduct an audit as soon as possible to find out exactly if the funds have been spent where they're supposed to be."
- Black: "Well, that's... that's a good idea. I'm glad that's in there. To the Bill. I'm not comfortable voting for any Bill given the state of relations between the current Illinois House and the current Illinois Senate, that this Bill will come back in any negotiated form or that the Bill will come back, period. I've got a hunch this Bill will be assigned to the Senate Rules Committee and probably, although I have great respect for the Senate Sponsor, and if anybody can do it, he can but I'm... I'm not ready to cast a vote and trust what the Illinois Senate..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, your time has expired, but you can have another minute to conclude your remarks."
- Black: "That's fine. I just am not... I'm not comfortable with sending a Bill to the Senate given the state of relations between the House and the Senate at this time, thinking that it's going to come back in a form that most of us

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

wanted to see. And because of that, I intend to vote
'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Brosnahan: "I stand in strong support of House Bill 827. know Representative Moffitt has worked very hard on this legislation. He's worked very closely with the Illinois Sheriffs' Association. As a result of his last Amendment, I know that there's no fee increase, there's no increase in the 911 surcharge on this Bill anymore. And I know Representative Moffitt, I've worked some on this Bill as well and I know he worked very, very, very closely with some of the people that had concerns. He put that audit provision in there which is a big improvement. Ιt increases the accountability, so I think some of the Members concerns will be taken care of by that audit provision. I also know Representative Moffitt indicated to me that this Bill will be returning to the House and I will work with him on this and we have made a decision not to move this Bill unless we both agree with the contents that the Senate puts in there. So again, for all those reasons, I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

The wireless system has been working well. Refinements

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

were necessary to make it work better. It sunsets shortly. This is the right thing to do to move this process forward. If not, this whole system may collapse and it's very true that the 911 system in our state is now an integral part of keeping our state safe, keeping our citizens safe, and the wireless system particularly, as we drive up and down the highways of Illinois is critical. So, let's not hold this Bill up over details. Let's send it to the Senate, get it worked out and get it signed by the Governor. I would urge 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in Mulligan: support of this Bill for the simple reason that the last day of Veto Session in November, I was driving home on 55, came through a huge accident in the dark, came over the top of a hill and spun out across the road. Luckily there was nobody next to me but I hit the guardrail and I was sitting there and I was really very frightened of what had happened and how the cars were coming over and going to slide into me while I was sitting there. And since I was going the wrong way I needed help to turn around and get back on the So I dialed 911 and they forwarded me to the State Police who immediately came on the line and told me they had so many accidents they would get to me when they could, but to make sure that I gave him my location which I was lucky to be able to do. But to have someone answer when you're sitting there on the wrong si... going the wrong way with cars coming over a top of a hill ready to slide into

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

you too because the roads were so bad and having come through a twenty-five (25) car accident just behind that. And to have someone pick up that 911 on the road in the middle of nowhere on 55, was really very good for anybody that was out there that has ever been in that situation, I think they realize that this is a small amount to pay to have excellent service across the state for people that may be in a similar situation. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Froehlich to close."

Froehlich: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 827 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Mitchell, Watson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 Members voting 'yes, 3 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"

Molaro: "Actually, for two (2) announcements. First of all, I heard what Representative Feigenholtz said, but I want Mr. Mapes to know that even if I'm served I will not eat it on the House Floor. I just won't do it. Second thing is, I do owe have those who care, I do have the winner of the Kentucky Derby and I am going to be leasing it from my desk, but I do charge a nominal fee for that information or percentage of the winnings. And we can work that out at my desk and I'll be here all afternoon until adjournment. Thank you very much."

47th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative, for that very important announcement. Representative Jefferson, you have Senate Bill 1395. The Chair rec... Well, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1395."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1395, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is simply a Bill to establish a port authority in Rockford. It takes no abilities from anyone. We've got a letter here from UTU that's in support of this legislation. This legislation is going to eventually affect a lot of people in the northern part of the state. At some point, there might be interest from Representative Frank's district, Representative Wait's district. A lot of other Representatives along the way. So, it's just a piece of legislation that has to bring Rockford farther into the 21st century. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1395 pass?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed saying... Representative Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Rose: "I'd like... Mr. Speaker I'm really not... I have an error while loading analysis on the machine. I'm not... I'm not kidding. It's... I don't know... the machine is not working. LIS is coming over, but it's an error just occurred."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose, we'll have one of the technicians..."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Lyons: "I think... I'm just going to..."

Speaker Lyons: "...check your computer. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Speaker. While they're working on that, I'm going to use my seatmate's computer here. We're good."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Okay. The question is, 'Should... Shall Senate Bill 1395 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Sullivan... take the record. On this Bill, there are 66 Members voting 'yes', 49 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Representative Cross has House Bill 146. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 146, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Leader Tom Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that's been around awhile. Representative Coulson had this Bill a couple of years ago and there has been some opposition to it, I'm aware of it. It passed out of the education this Session several weeks ago and there were several observations made in committee with respect to it and I want to thank Representative Coulson and Representative Eddy, especially Representative Eddy who has attempted and I think successfully to address some the concerns of the Education community. This Bill... and he spent a lot of time on it and I want... Roger, thank you for that. This Bill

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

deals with... it's called the Care of Students with Diabetes Act and it deals with how children with diabetes in our school systems are treated. And I have to say, and all of you know, I think, that our daughter has Type 1 diabetes and we have been exceptionally blessed that our school system has handled this situation exceptionally well, and so this it not something driven by any bad situation we've had with our daughter. We've been... I can't tell you how fortunate we've been in our school district. We have a school nurse in our schools and it's worked. There are other school districts that don't have nurses and I've... had talked to a number of parents that have had to quit work who go to the school three (3) or four (4) times a day to test their children with... for ... with their ... for their diabetes and you give insulin. So this is an attempt to address that very issue. There are actually federal rules with respect to that that in many ways dictate that but school districts that don't comply with those federal rules, parents aren't always willing to file lawsuits or have the means to file lawsuits. So, to get to the Bill. It is a Bill that standardizes protocol and treatment for children with diabetes. It attempts to codify into State Law what the Federal Government does through the ADA and other means of federal protection. It requires that a parent with... for their child, submits a medical management plan by the parent or quardian that outlines the services needed by the student. It needs to be... accompany that plan by a statement from the student's physician. requirement in this Bill is that a school district, through

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

the principal, in the event there is no nurse, that the principal would designate or delegate training for diabetes to an aide and it would specifically up to the principal who that aide is. This was a bone of contention that... that has been taken care of I believe through the strong efforts of Representative Eddy, and we had talked about using volunteers and that's no longer the case. This would also... Bill would allow students individually independently monitor and administer insulin and it also provides a provision here for civil immunity for schools Sixteen (16) other states have and their employees. adopted a Bill similar to this and I would appreciate a support from you. A number of you are cosponsors, I appreciate that. And I'll be glad to attempt to answer any questions. I also acknowledge that we're not going to get everybody on board on this Bill. Senator Harmon is the Sponsor in the Senate and there may be ways to even improve it over there and Senator Harmon and I are both open to that. So, with that I'd be glad to answer any questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Leader, I'm planning on supporting the Bill, I just have some questions that my superintendents have asked me and I need to know kind of where we're at."

Cross: "Sure."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Bost: "Does this require a nurse specifically or does this then turn it over to somebody else?"

Cross: "Right."

Bost: "And what makes that does liability then fall on the school nurse, because they have trained it or trained someone to take care? If they don't issue the proper amount of insulin or..."

Cross: "Mike, it's a good question. There's one, there's a civil immunity provision in this Bill, and second, and you raised the very question that Roger addressed in his work on this in the solving it. If there's no nurse, usually when there are nurses the situation is better but the reality is, not all school districts have nurses. So the principal then says, and this happens in other cases not just kids with diabetes, 'I'm going to specifically assign an aide to address this situation in my particular district.' And the ... it will be up to the principal who that aide is, and along with training of that aide. It may be a technical aide, it may be a teacher, it... I guess it could be a coach, it could be anyone that the principal deems appropriate. At one point we had said that volunteers would be utilized and that didn't seem to be in place by school personnel and the thought was, let the principal decide who's the best. And so there would... there has been and again, I stress, there's immunity in here, civil immunity for the school."

Bost: "And... and I think... I think that's a concern that was originally from the person I was talking to from this particular school district. I can't imagine having to deal

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

with what you and your wife have to, you know, know as far as the proper issuing and blood test and all of that. And that's not an easy thing to teach to someone..."

Cross: "It's not."

Bost: "...and they're... that's where we scared... we were afraid..."

Cross: "Right."

Bost: "...that the school nurse hands it off to somebody else."

Cross: "If there's a school nurse, then there's no problem.

It's the school district without the nurse and I think there are a number of districts without nurses. And again, I think that's what we tried to address in this... in the Amendment we adopted yesterday that would allow the situation where the nurse doesn't exist. And you're right at the... the crux of one of the problems, Mike."

Bost: "Thank you. And I... you know, I appreciate the hard work that both you and Roger Eddy and everybody involved are putting on....

Cross: "Representative Coulson, as well."

Bost: "...to try to make it a Bill that really achieves what it is that you're trying... trying to do. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Leader Cross, just for legislative intent, in regards to the provisions in House Bill 146 as amended, that pertain to the diabetes medical management plan and the language that states that the services and accommodations that are

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

specified in the diabetes medical management plan shall be reasonable and reflect the current standards of diabetes care. Is it your intent that the reasonable language represent an agreement between the parent and the principal and the school district on any request made by the parent that goes beyond the medical specifications outlined in the physician's statement?"

Cross: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to commend Representative Cross on working hard to... to solve... or help solve a problem that... that were really polar opposite sides on. And for school districts, we deal with all kinds of issues related to medical problems with children and in my district we have kids with epilepsy, and in my district we have kids with asthma, severe asthma, and in all those cases we have... we have training, we have a plan in place to take care of the concerns and really this does nothing more than allow districts some immunity in a situation that they have to take care of anyway. If we have a student with Type 1 diabetes come into our school districts, we should have a medical management... a care plan for that... the diabetes. should be signed off by a physician. This does that. really appreciate the fact that Representative Cross worked on the volunteer portion of this. It's very difficult to find volunteers in some of our rural schools, almost impossible in some cases and it's hard to compel someone to volunteer. This allows districts the flexibility of a volunteer, a personal aide, or even using the county health

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

department or private health services to ensure that the medical component of a diabetes care plan is carried out in a school district. This is good for children in our schools, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote and then remember, school districts already have a duty and responsibility. This clarifies it and it also provides direction and requires training. It does things that are very, very good for schools, and again, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair. Have we adopted Amendment #2 or was it only Amendment #3 that has been adopted?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk. Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor
Amendment #3 was adopted on the floor."

Franks: "So, we're only dealing with House Amendment... Floor Amendment 3 and not Floor Amendment 2, correct?"

Speaker Lyons: "Correct."

Franks: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I've got some… a lot of calls and e-mails from my educators who were worried that the teachers were going to be required to become school nurses. This won't require that will it?"

Cross: "No."

Franks: "Okay. Then we're talking..."

47th Legislative Day

- Cross: "And... and Representative, let me... 'cause that... people ask about that. There was a provision that talked about designating volunteers and I think that created some concern about school personnel, and I understand that. This is where Roger Eddy came in and Beth helped to come up with a designation by the... by the principal in each... in the respective schools, so that whole... the whole idea of volunteers is off, it's gone, it's taken out and I'm hopeful that will alleviate some of those concerns and fears."
- Franks: "Are there any parameters when the principal designates a diabetes care aide that that person have any medical background?"
- Cross: "There's... there's nothing that has... that would mandate a medical background, but the training designated in there is... that's an extensive amount of training on the care for somebody with diabetes. That... the harsh reality is you're just not getting... always get somebody in the school district that's got the medical training."
- Franks: "So, I'm wondering, are we going to have to send... let's say the principal designates his assistant, and that assistant doesn't have any medical training or background. Would that assistant then need to be trained and sent to a, I don't know, some type of program for some time to be trained?"
- Cross: "There's... You could do an in-service type training. I guess it could be whatever training you think is best for the particular situation and what training is needed by the particular person who ends up being a designee. So it

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

could be done locally, it could be done somewhere outside the school or it could be an in-service program, but... whatever it's going to... whatever it takes."

Franks: "Is there any provision that..."

Cross: "A certified diabetes educator would do the training, Jack."

Franks: "Okay. What happens if the person doesn't want to get designated?"

Cross: "He can... you can always opt out."

Franks: "He can opt out?"

Cross: "There's a provision in there."

Franks: "Okay. And I appreciate the fact that you're going to work with Senator Harmon on this. And I understand what you're trying to do. I think it's a great idea. Obviously, you're open to suggestions if you hear 'em on the other side."

Cross: "There's no question. And this isn't... look, this isn't... has not been easy and I... Suezanne Elder who came to me about this who's up in the gallery, her daughter Sophie was diagnosed awhile back, she has spent an incredible amount of time on this issue and I know she's worked with Roger, she's worked with Laura Minzer on our staff and she realizes... well, she's open to continuing to work as am I. As you know, Don Harmon will do the same thing and is a bright, capable Senator, so we'll keep working. And if they're good ideas, we're open to them."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Leitch: "Just a quick question. I am aware of many quite...

quite young kids who have this affliction who have their

own devices that they wear and administer this themselves.

They're taught in the home..."

Cross: "To the pump."

Leitch: "...they're taught in the home to administer it themselves. Is there anything in this Bill that would preclude that child having been taught by a parent or others to do it, or does this require someone in the school to..."

Cross: "No, they would be allowed to continue to self-administer."

Leitch: "So there's no requirement preventing that."

Cross: "Not at all. It's a good question."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Cross: "Thank you, David."

Speaker Lyons: The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Gordon: "Leader Cross, is there any other medical condition where a specialized program is in schools, such as epilepsy or asthma or anything like that?"

Cross: "Asthma and epilepsy, I believe, that I know of and any...
and issues dealing with that... kids with allergic reactions.
So I guess those three (3) areas that I... I'm being told,
Representative."

Gordon: "So the answer's yes? And they're the same."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Cross: "Yes. Yes."

Gordon: "Okay."

Cross: "Thank you."

Gordon: "So they have the same type of program and specialized training and all the other things that are the same thing that you're going to asked to be required for children with diabetes?"

Cross: "This... this is to be honest about it, a little more involved, a little more detailed than those three (3) that I mentioned. But those three (3) have been addressed, not to the extent that this has."

Gordon: "Okay. And is there... and is it just because they haven't been addressed or is that why it's not as detailed or extensive as your Bill?"

Cross: "It may be a lit... this may, my response to it, others may have differences. This is just a little more complicated or more detailed than perhaps using an inhaler. The checking of your blood sugar, the... either administering a shot or looking at a pump for the amount of insulin to administer just is a little more complicated than perhaps using an inhaler."

Gordon: "Thank you."

Cross: "All right."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Cross to close.

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I want to say thanks to a number of you that have been involved in this, as I said, Roger Eddy and Beth Coulson and I know you've gotten a lot of input from people, all of you have. This has not been... it's not a easy issue and I... there's some concerns from

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

school districts and nurses and I appreciate that. I think we've come up with a good product and as I said, I remain committed to and open to making it even better. As I also said earlier, Suzanne Elder, who's up in the balcony, has spent an incredible amount of time on this and I appreciate her effort on behalf of her daughter and our daughter and every other child with diabetes in this state, she's done an incredible job. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. I think it's the right thing and I think it will help make the lives of kids with diabetes in schools and even those in schools that don't have diabetes, the administrators the teachers, nurses, et cetera. It put them in a better position, so thank you. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 146 pass?'
  All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
  Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
  Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 91 Members voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
  Representative Dunkin, you have House Bill 1351. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  House Bill... well, Amendment 1 with House Bill 1351 simply

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

allows the Department of Aging to establish a three- (3-) year demonstration program consisted of a volunteer... a volunteer based telephone reassurance in emergency home response activities. The State Police would not be affected or impacted by this here. It'll be about a three- (3-) year program and it'll be an optional opt in. So, I would encourage and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Coulson: "Representative, does this have anything to do with the Emergency Home Response System for seniors that the Department of Aging is currently using in their community care program?"

Dunkin: "It does not directly have an impact. We want to model a program similar to where with... but without a major cost impact or implication."

Coulson: "So, could you describe exactly what your program is to do? I'm not on the Aging Committee anymore so I didn't get to hear that or I think the Body may want to know that."

Dunkin: "Well, what we want to do is, put the Department of Aging in position to try to come up with a demonstration project, so I can't answer that specifically because they... it's going to be a work in progress. It'll be a three-(3-) year demonstration project. It may have very similar tenets to the emergency home response system, it may not or it may have a very limited tenets of it that could fit some

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- of the needs of a new project. But again, at this point, it won't cost any money and we're lookin' at conducting it within the sphere of what they're doing already with the Department on Aging."
- Coulson: "So, I guess my question then becomes, why do we need the legislation if the department can already do this?"
- Dunkin: "Well, I'm not saying that they can already do it.

  This Bill was brought to me by senior citizens... if I'm not mistaken, if I can recall, it's been a little bit. AARP, obviously they're one of the proponents of it and we're trying to make sure that we have an airtight system in communities that want to opt in to such a program. But the only way... one way that we can do this is by a demonstration project that won't cost the state any additional money."
- Coulson: "So, Representative, if it doesn't cost any money, who's going to be doing this?"
- Dunkin: "Well, we already... we have a Department on Aging at the local... some of our cities at the local level and we have one at the state level. So, they'll be looking to collaborate and seeing how, you know, what best practice they can put forth."
- Coulson: "Okay. So it's a pilot program. Where would this pilot program be started? Do you have... or is this just going to be put in the Aging's Department and allowing them to decide that?"
- Dunkin: "You're correct. We're going to work with... I'll work with them, you can work with us and we can just identify a particular area that... where we feel that we could get a good sample, a good demonstration with such a program."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Coulson: "Okay. So, I guess the last question I have is, your intent is for there to be some type of a telephone wellness check system piloted in the State of Illinois? Is that... that's what our analysis says."

"Okay. Well, yes. The short answer is yes, but you Dunkin: know, again, it's for older adults who want to volunteer in demonstration program and the Depart... allowing the department to establish and maintain collaboration with local area agencies on aging. can be in Quincy, Illinois, it can be in Belleville, it can be in Chicago, can be in Peoria or can be in Winnetka, Lake Forest or Lake Bluff. And all it simply does is, you know, it's a demonstration project to evaluate the use of older adults or senior citizens to perform telephone reassurance activities, an outreach on an emergency home response system. And the program will operate for about three (3) So, it's something that I think the department years. should be doing, and I... it's something that senior citizens who are out here across our state whose family members may have a concern with... or may want to have their parents opt into. And again, it will not cost the state any more money."

Coulson: "Okay. So, Representative, I think that the original underlying Bill was to have the State Police do this but you've really changed that with the Amendment so that the Department of Aging who has some expertise in this area may already have some programs like this would be doing that. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Coulson: "Okay, Okay."

Dunkin: "As a former employee of the City's Department on Aging, I think this is a great program and it really should give some families some additional reassurances that, hey, if they want their parents or their grandparents to participate in such a program, this is one positive program that all of us will have an option for. And hopefully, maybe if it's a successful program..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Coulson, your time has run out.

If you could conclude your remarks in the next minute, we'd appreciate it."

Coulson: "And to the Bill. I think this a... a... obviously something that we need to continue working on and I'm glad that it's going to be through the Department of Aging where some of these types of systems have been worked on. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This Bill is a good piece of legislation that simply allows senior citizens or older adults here in our great state to volunteer to participate in a telephone response system that allows them to get a... a check up phone call and see how they're doing on a consistent basis. I think having a program like this right here in various parts of our state just to check up on grandmother, to check up on our parents. It's something that the Department on Aging is very capable of doing and it's a program that we should be just wrapping our arms around and I'm very happy to be a

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Sponsor of it. And I would encourage a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1351 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, would you like to vote for your Bill? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 1 person voting no', 2 people 'present'. This Bill, having voting received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative David Leitch, you have House Bill 1823. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill addresses a concern... some problems that occurred predominately in southern Illinois and requires that the salaries of county officials not be reduced between the time of their election and the time they can take office. I don't know of any opposition to the Bill and I would ask for its support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1823 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May, Representative Ryg, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, take

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- the record. On this Bill, there are 81 Members voting 'yes', 31 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz, you have House Bill 3446. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3446, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Sara Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3446 is an initiative that was brought to me by the Department of Public Health that addresses access to critical information that the department uses in collecting data for the cancer registry. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3446 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bassi, Representative Scully. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, you have House Bill 587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 587, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook... Representative from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill authorizes the expansion of existing student election judge... the student election program to include Illinois college and university students. That's all the Bill does. Be glad to answer questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is 'Should House Bill 587 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. 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 Bill, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, you have House Bill 1360. Is Representative Ford on the floor? Representative Franks, you have House Bill 247. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 247, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. The simple premise of this Bill is that the DUI deaths need to drop. In 2005, 42 percent... 42.6 percent of fatal motor vehicles crashes in Illinois involved alcohol. As bad as that sounds, the figure actually is down from 2004, from forty-four and a half percent of the fatal crashes involved alcohol. One way to cut down on the number of alcohol-related fatal crashes is to crack down on repeat offenders and that's what this Bill does. The percentage of fatal vehicle crashes related to

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

alcohol is far too high. Between 1997 and 2001, nineteen hundred and eighty-five (1985) child passengers died in alcohol-related crashes. Over this five- (5-) year period more than two-thirds of these children were riding with a drinking driver, someone they trusted to keep them safe. Children riding with an alcohol-impaired driver are not only at risk from erratic dangerous driving, they're also more than 40 percent less likely to be properly restrained in either a seatbelt or a car seat. In part, this is why 24 percent of the children who die each year, die as a result of an alcohol related crash. This Bill would make it a Class IV felony to be convicted twice of driving while under the influence if that person was transporting a passenger under the age of sixteen (16) in both instances. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Reboletti: "Representative Franks, I know you and I have talked about this before. I believe the state of law is such that this is already a Class IV felony eligible and that actually this would be more difficult to prove up. And I know we've talked about it. If you would work with the Senate Sponsor and make this a Class III..."

Franks: "Exactly."

Reboletti: "...it would make more sense."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Franks: "Exactly. That's what we plan on doing. I appreciate your input. You've made it a much better... it'll make it a much better Bill."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Will the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Lyons: "Indicates he will."

Bost: "Representative, and I understand what we're trying to do and why in certain case, but is there a certain genesis... was there a particular case where this has occurred and all of a sudden this is moved forward?"

Franks: "It's happening all the time. In my district, in McHenry County, I think we had sixteen (16) fatal crashes last year involving children. And it's just an epidemic. And it's... and we're seeing repeat offenders and we have to... I think increase the penalties..."

Bost: "Parents with a drinking problem go out and drive with their children in the car, is that..."

Franks: "I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?"

Bost: "Well, I'm thinking, okay, you got a mother or a father that already had a DUI, now all of a sudden they go out and drive and they got the..."

Franks: "Yeah, I'm thinking of what a nightmare situation. Could you imagine if your... I've got two (2) kids who are in fifth and sixth grade. I couldn't imagine if one of my sons went over and spent the night at a friend's house and then, you know, and... or was going to be there all night and the father had drove him back at 11:00 impaired. Now, how

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

is a ten-(10-)year-old going to tell, you know, the father of his friend, 'hey, I'm not gettin' in your car because you're drunk', and how is the kid going to know. And it's just... it's terrifying to me as a parent and I know it is to you as well. And that's one way I think to try to crack down on these people."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks to close."

Franks: "I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The questions is, 'Should House Bill 247 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Representative Lindner, you have House Bill 224. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 224, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 224 is an initiative of six (6) counties: Kendall, Boone, DeKalb, Grundy, Lake and Will. They are all in the high growth area and have not been able to keep up their infrastructure with the growth. This Bill allows these citizens to vote to see whether they want to impose a gas tax on themselves."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Speaker Lyons: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, 'Should House Bill 224 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Boland, McGuire. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 70 Members voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, you have House Bill 1360. Out of the record. Representative Fritchey. Representative Fritchey, you have House Bill 773. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: House Bill 773, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, 773 has been the final product of a lot of negotiations between the affected parties. It retools some of the language revolving prevailing wage aspects. In reporting prevailing wage aspects, it cover prevailing wage jobs into TIF zones and Enterprise Zones. I'd be happy to answer any questions, otherwise I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Anyone seeking discussion? Representative Rosemary Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I actually put on my light because I thought the Bills were rolling kind of fast out of here and so... although, I feel badly because

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Representative Fritchey is a good colleague and friend, but I'd like to ask him exactly what his Bill does?"

Fritchey: "Well, Representative, the Bill does a couple of things. It... it defines, which isn't defined anywhere, who exactly is a contractor or subcontractor. It requires notice for a public body, if it is a prevailing wage job, that that public body provide notice to the contractor that pub... or that prevailing wage is required on that job. Provides a mechanism for complaints and for liability in case the prevailing wage is not applied... complied with. And it additionally, as I said, extends prevailing wage into TIF zones and Enterprise Zones, which really makes sense as are... as these are publicly funded projects."

Mulligan: "So why are the Illinois Mechanic and Specialty Contractors Association a proponent and yet you have the Association of General Contractors, Illinois Municipal League, NFIB, the State Chamber, the Illinois Road and Transportation Builders, Rural County Government League and Department of Labor all against it?"

Fritchey: "My understanding is absent the Department of Labor, and I want to be careful so as not to misspeak, but with respect to the other trades, my understanding is that none of the trades remain in opposition as a result of the work that had been done and the Amendments that had been put on to the Bill."

Mulligan: "So, what is the actual genesis of this?"

Fritchey: "The genesis of this came from an attempt to have a equal application and a proper application of the

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

prevailing wage and a mechanism for filing of complaints when prevailing wage is not complied with."

Mulligan: "So if the Illinois..."

Fritchey: "It's really ...it's..."

Mulligan: "...Municipal League is against it, what does this do to local municipalities?"

Fritchey: "It... it does nothing to the local municipalities, what it does though, is extend the prevailing wage jobs into TIF zones... TIF zones and Enterprise Zones which really isn't that much of an expansion from... when you think of the underlying concept that publicly funded jobs are to be covered anyway. This simply says that... it... you know, the fact that it... the project is in a TIF... in a TIF zone or a Enterprise Zone should not make that project any different than a different funded project. It's... it's really not that controversial of an in expansion."

Mulligan: "So, if the janitor in city hall changes a light bulb he has to be paid prevailing wage?"

Fritchey: "This would not be... that would not be impacted by this. This is not defining or changing the scope of existing prevailing wage jobs. Really, know, I think the part, if you want to focus on anything is, you know, it sets up a mechanism for liability and complaints if prevailing wage is not complied with."

Mulligan: "All right. So, if a contractor has... employs the same employee and you have a job in two (2) days, one is a TIF... in a TIF district and one isn't, do they just have to pay that employee the prevailing wage for the whole day or just in and out of the TIF district?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Fritchey: "Solely... solely for the... solely for the job that would be can... that would be listed as a prevailing wage job. If a job is not covered by prevailing wage, then obviously, that contractor's not entitled to prevailing wage."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Dave Winters."

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

Winters: "John, as I understand this, if the project in a TIF district, there may be... a TIF district as I understand it, municipality collects taxes and then can use those to do public infrastructure such as curbs and gutters, or sewer, road improvements, access, things like that to make an area of the community more developable. Once the TIF district is lined out, though, there's a fiscal boundary and a developer comes in and buys some land and says I want to put up a hotel here. To my knowledge, that hotel may have no public money involved whatsoever in the construction of it, other than the underlying support, the infrastructure that the city built that may be indirectly supporting that hotel. Is that a fair presentation of the way a TIF district can operate?"

Fritchey: "Yes, I guess with the addition that it is that underlying infrastructure work that enables other development to occur within that TIF district."

Winters: "Well, it may... it may or may not. The development may have happened and we don't really know whether or not that

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

particular development would have happened without the public infrastructure upgrades. If you have a particularly attractive area that is being redeveloped... it's an older community that's being upgraded, if you will... a private developer can come in whether or not there is a TIF district there, just because it's in a TIF district and he is not receiving any public money. There is no public money whatsoever engaged in that hotel project this would require, though, the laborers on that project to be paid prevailing wage. Is that correct?"

Fritchey: "That... that is correct because it would... TIF district would be subject to prevailing wage provisions at that time."

Winters: "Well, I think this... and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. This is an enormous expansion to the prevailing wages. We have always considered prevailing wages to be those projects that are done with public money. A forest preserve district that's building a picnic shelter or a park district or a city that's building a road, we insist that those wages be the prevailing wages paid to union contractors and employees, but it's always been public money tied to it. We require school districts, if it's public money and which it usually is, I haven't seen too many grants where people just give a millions dollars (\$1,000,000) to the school to build a school with private money, public money equals prevailing wage. In this case, we are attempting to expand this to private industry, a capitalist who is out to try to make a project work and the prevailing wage will often make it completely infeasible

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

for that development to go forward. So while the city is trying to upgrade itself, taking an older community that may be past its economic prime, reinventing and reinvesting money in there, in the public infrastructure, and then upgrading that neighborhood, the effect of putting prevailing wage on as many of the projects that we're trying to attract will be driven away. Prevailing wage rates are considerably higher than you find in the private industry. This Bill will have the exact opposite effect on our TIF district of what we initially set the TIF districts It will stop economic development. cases, projects will not make sense to the banker, to the person that's putting his money into this project, project will not happen. We'll have TIF districts sitting there without investment, we'll have put in the public infrastructure and then because we've driven up the cost of labor on the projects, it doesn't make any sense anymore to do it. We've spent the public money and then the project's not going to go forward, it'll sit there empty. Speaker, in the event that this Bill does get the requisite number, I would like to ask for a verification. Mr. Speaker, a verification if it gets the proper number?"

Speaker Lyons: "Verification will be so implemented."

Winters: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank... thank you. And to the Gentleman from Winnebago, let me clar... let me clarify though. Representative Winters. I... I just want... I want to clarify so you and I are on the same page. I understand

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

that you may have other concerns. Part of your concern may have been driven by a lack of a complete answer that I unintentionally gave you. It deals with those projects that are financed in whole or in part with loans or other funds made available pursuant to the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. So the funding is not... if the... if the funding is not sourced from that Act, it would not be covered here. And I think... I think that alleviates a lot of... a lot what... a lot of what your concerns were."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, Representative, I... I was otherwise occupied while you were explaining the Bill. Might you, in a succinct Cliff Notes version form, tell me what the Bill does?"

Fritchey: "Well... well... what we are attempting to do is a couple of simple things and that is to define who a contractor or subcontractor would be. To say that if a contractor or subcontractor is doing work that is financed in a whole or in part by public funds, that that work would be covered by the Prevailing Wage Act as it is today. The exception that had previously existed that if it was a partially public funded project within a TIF zone or an Enterprise Zone, that such a projects would not be prevailing wage, now it would be. It also provides that the local unit of government is responsible for notifying a contractor that prevailing wage applies to that job, and provides a mechanism whereby if the contractor does not comply with prevailing wage because they were not notified, that there is a chain of liability that flows from that."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Lang: "And so your goal with... which is the same goal in virtually all prevailing wage Bills we have around here, is not necessarily to expand it, but to properly define it. Would that be correct?"

Fritchey: "Cor... correct. And you know, it would be easy for somebody to try to attempt to characterize any prevailing wage Bill as an expansion of prevailing wage. I appreciate your comment because that's... exactly this is not an expansion as much as it is a clarification of when prevailing wage applies, when it doesn't apply, how to make sure we know the difference and how to have a set of recourse available to us if a prevailing wage job was not properly enforced."

Lang: "So... I've had a couple of prevailing wage Bills and what I find out and maybe you can verify this... confirm this in your... for me. I've always thought that all we're doing with these Bills, we all... we all believe there should be prevailing wage paid on public works projects, and these Bills are all about the process of making sure no one falls through the cracks, that there are no loopholes and that we make sure that prevailing wage is paid on all government jobs. Is that pretty much what you're trying to do here?"

Fritchey: "That's precisely what we're trying to do here and I think we've actually done a good job and when I say we, I'm taking credit that I don't deserve. The individuals that have worked on this legislation made extensive efforts to sit down with the affected trades, to sit down with the interested parties, to sit down with the Department of Labor. There were negotiations, there were renegotiations,

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

there were Amendments made to the Bill. There were discussions and there were commitments made. This... should this Bill go to the Senate and other issues were to be brought to light that they would continue to try to work this through. This is not an attempt to force a Bill through for the sake of forcing a Bill through. This was a sincere attempt to try to craft a properly constructed piece of legislation to achieve its intended goal."

Lang: "So those who are opposed to this Bill, the interest groups that have been opposed to this Bill, is their opposition simply because they generally oppose all these prevailing wage Bills, or do... do they have any point of view that we should be addressing?"

Fritchey: "I... I think that the nature of this process being what it is certain issues come up and whenever those issues arise there are de facto proponents, de facto opponents regardless of the substance of the legislation. I'm not going to say that there may not be philosophical differences that exist. I think that those differences are ...greatly outweigh... or the conceptualized differences greatly outweigh what's actually in the Bill."

Lang: "So do any of them have any specific substantive problem with the way you drafted your legislation or is it just simply opposition to these definitions of prevailing wage that you wanna put into the law?"

Fritchey: "Well... I'm... yeah, I'm always reluctant to speak on behalf of a third party. The Department of Labor, I think, is concerned because this may create more work for the Department of Labor from a monitoring standpoint. But

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

to the extent that we are creating more work in order to make sure that the laws are properly and fairly applied, I think that is a legitimate objective."

Lang: "And so the list of opponents I have here aside from the Department of Labor, the Associated Builders, the Municipal League and the City of Chicago. Why would the Municipal League be opposed?"

Fritchey: "I think the Municipal League is concerned whenever something has the potential of increasing the cost of a public works project, even though a public works project is to be covered by prevailing wage. There has been a niche that was carved out either through oversight or omission for public work projects in TIF zones or Enterprise Zones. I think if you look at the underlying intent of prevailing wage, they were clearly intended to be covered. They had not been covered. This ensures that projects..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang, your time has expired.

We'll give you another minute for John to conclude his remarks."

Lang: "If I could just speak to the Bill briefly, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the Sponsor for his answers. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill.

I think many of you know I've had Bills on prevailing wage on this floor and the strong will of the Illinois General Assembly over a number of years has been to support prevailing wage. The Gentleman does not have a Bill that expands prevailing wage, he does not have a Bill that makes more people responsible for more things, he does not have a Bill in my view that's going to cost anybody anything

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

except perhaps a little paper work. What he has is a hole in the law that he's trying to close by simply putting some definition into the law. Periodically, due to anecdotal information things that happen out there in the world and these jobs in their interaction with contractors, their interaction with municipalities, we find little problems. Representative Fritchey has found some problems in the law and he's not trying to expand anything, he's just simply trying to define the law. Those of you that wish to refer to this as some sort of expansion of prevailing wage, I think you'd be well advised to actually read the Bill, which sometimes some of us do and many times most of us If you read the Bill, you'll see that Mr. Fritchey's not trying to do anything that expands anything or hurts anybody, he just wants to make sure that the people who are supposed to be covered by this are covered and the people who are not supposed to be covered by prevailing wage are not. The Gentleman's got a good Bill, it deserves support. I urge your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was on Short Debate, we put it on Standard Debate. There've been two people speak in favor of it, Representative Lang and Representative Fritchey; I have two (2) people speak in response, Representative Mulligan and Representative Winters. So, we'll have one more person in response, one more person or support. Representative Gordon, are you in response or in support? Okay. You'll be the last speaker in support."

Gordon: "In support. Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Lyons: "He indicates he will."

Gordon: "Representative Fritchey, first of all I commend you on this very important Bill, but secondly I just wanted to ask you, does this... what was the reason that these changes needed to be made? I mean, who... where did it come from? Who was not clear on who you had to pay the prevailing wage to?"

Fritchey: "I think the concern was that there was an absence of language as to not only who had the responsibility of paying prevailing wage, but who had the responsibility in the event the prevailing wage was not paid because the contactor was not apprised of the fact that it was a prevailing wage job through no fault of their own. sets up a clear delineation as far as who is responsible for notifying and it says that the public body or other entity involved shall let that contractor know with written notice that prevailing wage is required on that job. the contractor then does not comply, the liability would rightfully rest with that contractor; however, if the public body fails to notify the contractor that it is a prevailing wage job, and then the contractor is gone after for failing to comply, the contractor would then be able to go back to the public body and say, 'Listen, I did what I was told to do' and to the extent that a subcontractor suffered damages, namely the differential between the paid wage and the prevailing wage, the public body would then be understandably on the hook for that differential in as much they omitted to inform the contractor that it was a prevailing wage job."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Gordon: "So, not only does it go after people who potentially were avoiding doing this, looking for loopholes, but it also helps out contractors and saves them from certain liabilities. Is that right?"
- Fritchey: "That's absolutely correct. This is about equity, this is not pro labor, pro business, pro public body, anything along those lines. It simply, I think, would take some commonsense measures of liability and responsibility and insert them into the Prevailing Wage Act."
- Gordon: "Now, also Representative, I notice... I don't know if you know, but I happened to pass a Bill earlier this year also dealing with the prevailing wage that carries some of the same language that is in your legislation. Was there the language about proximity to actual construction location? Whose suggestion did that come?"
- Fritchey: "That language is no longer in the Bill. As I... as I said..."
- Gordon: "Oh, okay."
- Fritchey: "This Bill looks substantially different than it looks today and the proponents of the Bill and myself listened to the concerns, found those concerns that were deemed to be valid and addressed them either through modifications or redactions of the legislation."
- Gordon: "And was there a specific opponent that had a problem with that language?"
- Fritchey: "I... I think a fair and honest statement to that is that there were a number of interested parties that had concerns about that language. And as I had stated to the Gentleman from Skokie, this was an issue of trying to craft

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

the best piece of legislation that we could and when we listened to those objections we determined that they made sense and accordingly that language was removed from the Bill."

- Gordon: "And Representative, does this law apply all over the state from Cook County to suburbs, downstate? It applies equally to everyone, is that right?"
- Fritchey: "Again, it is a modification of the Prevailing Wage Act which applies statewide."
- Gordon: "And this is just, like you said, it's not antibusiness, it's not pro labor, it's something that's going to clarify for everyone, is that correct?"
- Fritchey: "That is correct and I'm glad you brought that up and for people that are... are still paying attention to the debate, yeah, I would hope that they focus on that fact. Where all too often, people see a Bill go up on the board and they have a knee-jerk reaction that, well, this is something that they are for or against, without necessarily looking at what the legislation actually does. confident that people on both sides of the aisle, upon reading what the legislation actually does, will say, you know what, this is not dramatic, this is not overly expansive, this is not unreasonable, it is not heavyhanded, it is not leveraged in favor of one side or the is actually putting language into Ιt legislation that should have been in the legislation all along and simply clarifies the law and actually provides safeguards for all interested parties."

Gordon: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Gordon: "Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this Bill is about It's about fairness to workers, to their fairness. families and Representative Fritchey has done outstanding job to make sure that this levels the playing field and it's also pro-business and pro-contractor. is a Bill that is going to help every single person in the State of Illinois that provides clarification to the law which is very, very difficult to do sometimes in this Body, and is going to help every single person who deals with labor law and the rules that we have in the State of Illinois. If you are for prevailing wage, if you are for working families and if you're also for business, then this is the Bill to vote for. This Bill deserves a 'yes' vote. It will make sure that the people of the State of Illinois know that this Body stands with them on... when they go to work every day and when they are trying their best to take care of their families. I would urge a 'yes' vote. Overwhelming support should be shown by this Body. you."

Speaker Lyons: "We've had three (3) speakers in favor of the Bill, two (2) against, so we have room for one person who stands in response to the Bill. Representative Osterman, are you speaking in response?"

Osterman: "Mr. Speaker, just a point on the legislation. This legislation came before the Labor Committee numerous times and Representative Fritchey was fairly articulate each time he presented the Bill in committee but a point to the process that we are undertaking. This legislation is going

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

to go to the Senate, concerns that were brought up in committee can be addressed in the Senate and it's my intention and knowing the Sponsor of this Bill that he will work with the people that have legitimate concerns on that. So just a point to the Sponsor that... always he will be open-minded about this, but this is something that we should look at and take into consideration. And just wanted to make that point."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Jefferson. We've had speakers. Leave your light out. Thank you. Representative Fritchey to close."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. As I said, know, there's really no need to overstate this legislation because the legislation is not that earth-shattering. I would implore you to... as you listen, understand what this Bill does. This Bill is not a large expansion of prevailing wage. It is a clarification and a scheme for having equity in determining when prevailing jobs... prevailing wage jobs apply, what to... what mechanism should be handled when those jobs are not properly deemed as prevailing wage, where liability should rest. It puts equity into the system. It's fair to all sides that are involved. And I request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been verification requested on this Bill by Representative Winters; therefore, we are asking all Members to please vote their own switch. The question is, 'Should House Bill 773 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 66 Members voting 'yes', 49 Members voting 'no'. And there's been a request for verification by Representative David Winters. Mr. Clerk, read those voting in the affirmative. Staff, please go to the back of the chamber. Members, please be in your chairs. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "The following Members voting in the affirmative are: Acevedo, Arroyo, Beiser, Berrios, Boland, John Bradley, Rich Bradley, Brosnahan, Burke, Chapa LaVia, Collins, Crespo, Currie, D'Amico, Monique Davis, Will Davis, Dugan, Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Flider, Flowers, Ford, Franks, Fritchey, Golar, Gordon, Graham, Granberg, Hamos, Hannig, Harris, Hernandez, Hoffman, Holbrook, Howard, Jakobsson, Jefferies, Jefferson, Joyce, Lang, Joe Lyons, Mautino, May, McAuliffe, McCarthy, McGuire, Mendoza, Miller, Molaro, Nekritz, Osterman, Phelps, Reitz, Riley, Rita, Ryg, Saviano, Scully, Smith, Soto, Turner, Verschoore, Washington, Yarbrough, Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Mr. Hoffman's not in his chair?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Hoffman's in the chamber."

Winters: "I was going to ask for Ja... Representative Franks but
I see he's sitting on the Republican side of the aisle.
Representative Flowers."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps. Representative Flowers just walking in the chambers."

Winters: "Okay. Granberg."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Granberg. Is Representative Representative Granberg in the chamber? Remove Representative Granberg from the roll."

Winters: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Lyons: "Is Representative Turner in the chamber?

Remove Representative Art Turner. Representative Acevedo asked for leave. Dave, he just walked out."

Winters: "Yes. Representative Golar."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Golar's in her chair."

Winters: "Yeah, she's in her chair. I believe that's it.

Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "On this question, there are 64 Members voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Point of personal privilege to Representative Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to take this opportunity to apologize to the Body. Before I passed Senate Bill 1395, I inadvertently picked up the wrong folder and gave the wrong analysis. As Representative Black often says, that all you have in this Body sometimes is your integrity, your honesty. It was by no means any sleight of hand to get the Bill passed. Matter of fact, I had called for... to dump the Roll Call and do a recount, but the Bill was so important to Rockford that it's already gone to the Senate for concurrence. So, I just want to let the Body know that it was no sleight of hand. It was something that happened. I apologize for it, but I just picked up the wrong folder, gave the wrong analysis on Senate Bill 1395. But I just want to let you know that it

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

was no sleight of hand and that hopefully, it won't happen in the future. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Meyer, you have House Bill 3632. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3632, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Meyer: House Bill 3632 requires that the Department of Human Services establish an innovative technology-based state program for young adults with disabilities. of the program is to assist young disabled adults in pursuing higher education, securing employment, building social relationships, and participating in a community. On a pilot basis the department shall operate a technologybased day program for eight (8) young adults beginning July 1, 2008. It would require the department to report to the General Assembly concerning the operations of the pilot program and allow for expansion of the pilot program after July 1 of 2009. If the program is extended after July 1 of 2009, the department will work with the Superintendent of Education to provide further resources in secondary schools to help young adults with disabilities obtain skills in higher education and employment. after July 1 of 2010, the department will establish a residential solo pilot program that emphasizes technology for independent living. The department will report to the General Assembly after April 15 of 2011 on the status of

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

the solo pilot, and after July 1 of 2011 the solo program may be expanded to other sites statewide. These programs are subject to appropriation. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those that receive assistance from the state who are developmentally disabled are basically cut off after they're eighteen (18). And we need to understand that these people need a continued assistance to help them gain gainful employment in the state and become active members of our society. And this... this Bill attempts to start the discussion in terms of direction that we should be going with this."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Meyer, are you finished or...
Okay. Anyone seeking recognition on House Bill 3632?
Seeing not, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3632 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Pritchard. Representative Schmitz.
Representative Schmitz, you want to be recorded? Mr.
Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Gordon, you have House Bill 2071. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative Careen Gordon."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 2071 requires that the utilities do not decrease the staffing levels for certain job classifications and leave the levels the same as they were on January 1 of 2007. It also... if the... the utilities had clear and convincing evidence that the staffing levels needed to be decreased that they would have to petition the ICC to do that. It also deals with collective bargaining agreements and it doesn't go around what those agreements state, but clarifies how this can be used to make sure that the utilities provide reliable and safe service to the people throughout the State of Illinois. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Jim Meyer."

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

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Meyer: "Representative, in committee there was testimony given.

Well, what... what are the... what is your concern with the staffing levels? I don't understand that."

Gordon: "Well, we have to make sure that the service provided by the utilities remain... remains reliable, remains safe. There've been specific instances I know in my district that I had talked about where people in housing projects, specifically senior housing project, is continuously losing power and ComEd is having to be called out. They're not always there, they're not always able to do that. They say that they, you know, they don't have enough people. They've laid off significants... significant amounts of

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

people over the past few years and when people, you know, older people have oxygen machines and everything in their home, there has to be a level of reliability. That's been my personal experience in my district with the lower staffing levels that have been there."

Meyer: "Well, when the types of problems that you've described occur, is there some other... what is the relief for the consumer in... in complaining about the lack of service in those cases?"

Gordon: "The relief of the consumer? They have to call and wait. There hasn't… they have to only deal with that company because there's no other choice for them to make."

Meyer: "Is there currently any mechanism that they can file these complaints with the ICC or with another governmental body on their behalf?"

Gordon: "Well, they... I mean, they can always complain, but most people don't even know about the process with the Commerce Commission or even what it does, Representative."

Meyer: "You indicate that the staffing levels cannot be cut where they... below where they are as of January 1, 2007."

Gordon: "Yes."

Meyer: "Why did you pick that date?"

Gordon: "That's the day that you know as well as I do that the expiration of the rate freeze went through."

Meyer: "Do you believe that at that point that they... given the fact that you've had complaints with the staffing, is it at adequate levels then?"

Gordon: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Meyer: "I said, given that you have had complaints indicated to your office, which is the reason for your legislation I would understand, do you feel that the staffing levels as of January 1, 2007, should be... should be enough to give full service?"
- Gordon: "I... I don't believe that staffing levels are good right now, and so I definitely would not want them to go below where they are. And January 1, 2007 is the date... it's a valid date as we go through the process of dealing with our electric utilities and the problems. Do I think they have enough staff? No, I don't. So, I definitely don't want them to reduce it."
- Meyer: "Why doesn't your legislation then propose additional staffing?"
- Gordon: "Well, Representative, I don't know exactly how to propose that companies, even public utilities that are regulated by the ICC, be forced to hire more staff unless we can go through the process to show reliability or lack of safety. Dealing with the ICC which is not always the easiest thing to do. I... I really would love to address that problem and I'd love to have you help me do it, but I'm just not quite sure the avenue to take with that, Representative."
- Meyer: "Well, one could also argue that if you don't have the data available to determine what the proper level should be, then how can you determine that the proper level shouldn't be lower than the levels are... was on January 1st?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Gordon: "Well, Representative, I would think that what the proper levels would be is very, very subjective. What you may think is the proper levels, what I think are the proper levels versus what the utilities think could be three (3) or four (4) or five (5) very, very different things. It also depends on the location in the state of where the problems are, the staffing levels that exist. I have lists, for example, of Ameren's workforce reductions over the past ten (10) years..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time has expired. One more minute to conclude your answer and then we have several..."

Gordon: "I just, you know..."

Speaker Lyons: "...speakers here. So, Representative Gordon, finish your answer."

Gordon: "And also AmerenCILCO'S workforce reductions and a specific area of Exelon reductions 1998 through 2004 and AmerenCIPS with a specific location and their workforce reductions over the past ten (10) years as well."

Meyer: "All right. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill was on Short Debate. We put it on Standard Debate, so one person speak in favor of it, the Sponsor in one, and in response, Representative Meyer. We have numerous people seeking recognition. Representative Sullivan, are you in response or support?"

Sullivan: "In response."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed, Representative."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've been debating electric utilities for many, many, many months now. I'm one that who has voted for the rate freeze and believe that the utilities can do better, but this Bill goes a little too far. This Bill, if you really look at it, goes against the type of society that we want to have, a capitalist society where we believe that people should go through the process to reduce costs and so forth. Under this Bill, you cannot reduce your workforce in every single job category that there is. So, going down the path, why would you ever want to invest in technology when you know that it will still cost you more money 'cause you can't reduce workforce. It's been said in committee that the reason we're doing this is because the pub... the utilities have a monopoly, that they supply the power, they supply the phones, they supply whatever. Well, then why don't we require everybody that provides police force to keep certain staffing levels so we have a safe society? Where does this end? So that's what I think you should really look into, not that, you know, they might be reducing workforces but where does this stop? If we pass this Bill now where you require a private company to have a certain staffing level, well, why don't we go to any company and say, we think it's in our best society as a ... our best interests as a society to have proper staffing Ladies and Gentlemen, time... it's time to stop levels. going down this path. We realize the utilities need to be taken to task for certain things, but this is not one of them. I encourage a 'no' vote."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dugan...

Dugan. You speak in response or in support? In support.

Representative Dugan."

"Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I would just like to Dugan: commend the speaker (sic-Sponsor) on this particular piece of legislation and in response to some of the questions that were asked and the concerns that were given. I don't know how many of you live in the... in... in... and I can only speak on the ComEd territory. But as far as the issue of staffing, right now, mandatory overtime of the electrical workers in the Commonwealth Edison territory has been going on for quite a few years and that is because they are short staffed. Businesses that come into my district that are looking for new services from Commonwealth Edison, are now being told that it will be a minimum wait of at least six (6) months. And the reason that ComEd gives that response is because of the fact that they have contractors and unfortunately, the contractors aren't available right now, so people have to wait. This is a issue of not only the workers being mandated to work overtime because a utility company does not want to bring back some of the staff that they let go back in 1997 when we had the rate freeze was put into effect. It's also affecting economic development in communities who businesses and developers are being told that they have to wait at least six (6) months to even get service and that is because of staffing issues with a public utility company that is supposed to be providing safe, reliable service that they continue to tell us they want to do, yet they will not do it by bringing back and

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

keeping staff that they need to keep. So, I agree with those that said, do they even have enough? No, I don't believe they do. But I certainly know with the issue that we have in the ComEd territory that they cannot in any way be allowed to even take less staff to try to do a job that they're not able to get to now on a timely and reliable fashion. So I ask for an 'aye' vote to at least protect the reliability that we have in place right now. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: We've had two (2) speakers in support, two (2) speakers in response. I'll take one more in response, one more in support. Representative Black. In response or in support?"

Black: "In response, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you."

Black: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, does your Bill impact municipally-owned electric utilities?"

Gordon: "It impacts the public utilities that are regulated by the ICC."

Black: "All right. So, then I assume it would not then impact Springfield water, gas, and electric?"

Gordon: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part,

Representative."

Black: "Would it impact the utility here in Springfield that is municipally owned?"

Gordon: "No, it would not."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Black: "All right. Would it... would it impact... there are a number of small public utilities that serve rural areas in the state. One is in Mt. Carmel that has about five thousand (5,000) customers. But evidently... since they're regulated by the Commerce Commission, it evidently would impact them, correct?"

Gordon: "No, it doesn't regulate any co-ops, Representative."

Black: "It is not a co-op. All right."

Gordon: "It's a public utility regulated by the ICC."

Black: "Yeah. Mt. Carmel public utility which is regulated by the ICC and has five thousand (5,000) customers. So they have to follow this, too?"

Gordon: "Yes."

Black: "Now, that's very interesting. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Lately, it has become, I guess, very popular on this floor to only look at a moral issue. And... and we've lost somewhere the ability or the willingness or whatever to look at a broader picture. I... I don't know of ... if you want to mandate employment levels, why don't we mandate employee levels, at the Department of Corrections? Those people are so understaffed that it's critical and that's public safety. Why don't we mandate employment levels at the Illinois State Police? On any given shift in District 10, I don't think I'd have three (3) state troopers on duty that can get into Vermilion County. You could go on and Why don't we mandate employment levels at Department of Public Health? No, we're only going to do this for electric utilities that are regulated by the ICC. I would suggest that the ICC should be the body you take

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

this complaint to. What... what will we do... the water company in my hometown switched to computer... computerized readers some time ago and you simply drive by with a computer receiver and that's how you read the water meter. The electric utility in my district is installing automated reader devices which would work the same way. Does this mean that every meter reader must be kept on the payroll? Once this is complete, they no longer need the people that I grew up with walking from yard to yard to read meters. A computer will do all of that. But if this Bill becomes law then all of those meter readers must remain on the payroll. They may or may not be qualified for other jobs without specific training. I don't think they can climb a high voltage pole and work on restoring or run power lines. This Bill goes far beyond what is our area of concern. If you're going to do this then you open the door to mandate, you know... General Motors has cut thirty-five thousand (35,000) jobs in the last two (2) years. don't we mandate employment level at General Motors? Well, I know why we don't do that. Everybody's trying to keep General Motors from going bankrupt. So, here we debating on what private investor-owned companies have to do with their employee headcount but we can't do anything or won't do anything or have not been able to do anything to give customers relief from higher rates. Now, all these costs will be passed on to the ratepayer. They'll go to the Commerce Commission and say our labor costs no longer have been declining, now we have higher labor costs. goes into the rate base. This is... this legislation has

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

some very dangerous precedent and I can think of some areas where if you really want to mandate employment levels maybe we ought to look at the Department of Corrections. But the ratepayer will pay for this Bill, nobody else."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Gordon to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I always enjoy standing on the House Floor and presenting legislation to this Body. I enjoy answering the questions and I enjoy hearing the arguments for and against laws that we want to make in this state, but what I've noticed is that you can bring up any issue that goes completely and totally beyond what the piece of legislation actually does and what it actually says. So, when you always bring up that... that this is going to force levels of employees in different agencies, I would be happy to have a mandated level of employees at the Department of Corrections and I would welcome the speaker before me to work on that legislation. I know how important it is to keep those employees safe in our correctional facilities. But what this Bill deals with, and only deals with, are the electric utilities, public... publicly-owned companies in this state that deal with the Commerce Commission. Now, we brought up new technology. If there's new technology that is going to save money for the consumer and is going to make better service and safer service, then there is an avenue to petition the Commerce Commission in this piece of legislation. The problem that was brought up has already been solved. It's been looked at and we said, you know what, there could be reasons to reduce staffing levels, but

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

by clear and convincing evidence a known and proven legal standard, is what the utility would have to go to the ICC to show. I was asked where does it end? It ends right here and it ends right now. Our utilities have not shown their reliability, have not shown their safety and for the past ten (10) years they have make astronomical profits off of the consumer. This is a very, very narrow issue. so you ask how do we know that they're going to reduce staffing levels if we don't pass this? Ameren has already threatened to do that if a rate freeze continues. can't be any more of a clear message, then I don't know what is. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is for the consumers. This is for the workers. This will make sure that the people in senior citizen housing, the people in minority housing, in public housing who don't always get the first bite at the apple, who don't always seem to have the level of importance where their wealthier... where the wealthier citizens do, this will make sure that they get the service that they need and they deserve. Is there a way for the companies to prove otherwise? Absolutely. Otherwise it would be a very, very bad law and it would keep them from doing business in this state. That's not what we're after. This Bill is about safety, it's about reliability, and it's about making sure that public utilities owned by the public serve the consumer to the levels that they are required to serve by the State of Illinois. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and I thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2071 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Ryg. Take the record. On this Bill, there are 67 Members voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 3496?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3496 is on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3496, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Dan Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's my privilege on a point of personal privilege to introduce to the Body again, it's been the tradition for the last few years on the day that we acknowledge those police officers who… Hello."

Speaker Lyons: "Yes, Representative Burke, sorry we were..."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "...discussion up here anticipating our entertainment here. Staff, please, on the floor to the back of the chamber. Leave the front of the chamber open for our police officers who will be here to offer their once a year special presentation. Representative Burke, anything further?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Burke: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the day that we acknowledge those officers who have fallen in the line of duty, on the Police Memorial Day, it is my pleasure to introduce to the Body the internationally renowned, Emerald Society, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hannig is in the Chair.

Representative Acevedo, for what reason do you rise?"

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know they just left the Acevedo: floor, but on behalf of the General Assembly we want to thank the Emerald Society for their performance today. As we all know, today's the police memorial and I know this is a special day for myself and Senator Munoz because the last Chicago police officer killed in the line of was Officer Donnie approximately five (5) years ago, Marquez who was a very good friends of ours. Also, we worked in the same unit, you know, Unit 543. But even though he was killed in the line of duty, there are other police officers, women and men, who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to protecting their community and unfortunately, they're not considered in the line of duty, they're considered in the pro... performance of duty, which stops their families from receiving certain benefits, federal and local. And I think that's wrong because certain police officers, whether they're driving to a scene for emergency and they're killed in an automobile accident, whether they're doing surveillances and run over by a train, which happened to a police officer in the 10th District, I think they're doing a duty. I think they're doing their duty protecting the citizens of the City of

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Chicago. And I think that's something we as Legislators should look into and ask not only the Chicago Police Department but all law enforcement agencies in the State of Illinois that every time an officer is protecting their citizens of their certain municipalities that they should be considered in the line of duty and be given the same opportunities and then same benefits just as an individual who's killed in the line of duty. At this time, I'd like to offer a moment of silence for all those brave men and women who's paid an ultimate sacrifice. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "On the Order of House Bills-third Reading, Representative Hamos, you have House Bill 611. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 611, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill applies to mail-in voter registration. When we passed the law back in 1996 that created this kind of system, when motor voter first came about, at that time we opted to require that first-time registrants by mail had to cast that first-time vote in person. So, if they sent in their voter registration form by mail, they had to show up at the polling place on election day, no absentee voting. That was in 1996, Ladies and Gentlemen, but what has happened since is that in 2002 the Federal Law changed. And under the federal Help America Vote Act, now election authorities obtain the identification information at the time that it's

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

sent in by mail. The person has to put their social sec... their driver's license number on there. There has to be an attempt to get a match and the identity of that voter is determined. What this Bill does is it eliminates the old law that says you have to vote by... in person the first time because in this case we know... now know that the identification... the identity of that voter is determined up-front. And I'll be happy to take any questions."

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

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Durkin: "Representative, who determines up front that the… that this person is in existence? And how do they verify that there is an actual person?"

Hamos: "Well, the... they have to supply a driver's license number and there's now the ability, didn't used to be the case ten (10) years ago, but there is now the ability to actually do a match with the Secretary of State's Office. The Secretary of State, we know, when you go in to get your driver's license does seek identifying information. So that identity is determined at the Secretary of State's Office and then it's picked up by the election authorities. There's two (2) levels of government that are involved in checking your identity."

Durkin: "But this is not done in person, if someone just submits that information to the Secretary of State's Office, correct?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Hamos: "Well yes, because when you go in to get your driver's license..."

Durkin: "All right."

Hamos: "...you have to come in person with, I believe, two (2) pieces of identification to get your driver's license.

This picks it up to a match. And that is now available.

It didn't used to be."

Durkin: "Well, you don't anticipate or do you think that there would be any room for fraud or someone would perhaps manipulate the documentation since we are now waiving the personal appearance for somebody to register? I mean, are we opening this up to greater manipulation within the..."

Hamos: "Well..."

Durkin: "...wards and also in different parts of the state?"

Hamos: "Well, again, I think that what we're trying to say here, Representative, is that this kind of procedure would only take place if you supply the driver's license information and if there's a match. If they can't produce a match, that voter file is tagged. You still have to come in person on that day with your identification. Our Bill, in fact, says that the election authority will send you a notice to that effect. Not able to produce a match. If... and secondly, if they send out a voter's card that says, oh, yeah, we got the match and that card comes back to the election authority as undeliverable, again that voter file is tagged as no match. So there is protection built into this. The point is, that because of a new Federal Law we do that kind of check up-front instead of after the fact."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Durkin: "So you can register to vote by mail and also you can concurrently vote at the same time? Are you... is that... my staff has indicated that that is something which you can do under this legislation."
- Hamos: "No, you still need to register... you still need to register, I believe, thirty (30) days in advance."
- Durkin: "All right. I mean... I guess the issue... I mean, the question I really have is, where's the problem? What's..."
- Hamos: "Well, the problem is that we are... especially as to elderly and disabled people who do vote absentee, and we now allow them to vote absentee, and college students who are out of town and would like to vote, this doesn't allow for them to... our current procedure does not allow them to do that. Under this Bill, we've checked their identity, we know who they are, this would allow them to vote absentee."
- Durkin: "Well, I appreciate your efforts on this, but I... to the Bill. I would disagree that I think that this is going to help the process. I think, you know, we need to have greater checks and balances within out system, particularly on people who are registering to vote and also the people who are planning on voting, and I think that this does not accomplish that goal. And Mr. Speaker, if this does reach majority, I would ask for a Roll Call. Verification."
- Speaker Hannig: "You'll be recognized for that purpose at the appropriate time, Representative. Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Hamos, you're recognized to close."
- Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the only thing I neglected to say that I would like to point out is that

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Illinois is one of only seven (7) states remaining in the country that has this kind of onerous procedure that requires two (2) checks for a first-time registrant. This is to try to… we're trying to make… make our process easier where people can actually be encouraged to vote. That is the American democratic tradition. That's all this Bill does."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May, McAuliffe, Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Okay. So there's been a request for a verification. I'd ask the staff to retire to the rear of the chamber. Clear the aisles. And Members, please be in your seats. Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting in the affirmative."

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

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Durkin, do you have any questions of those voting in the affirmative?"

Durkin: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino. The Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Mautino. Mautino. Representative Mautino's at the rear of the chamber."

Durkin: "All right. Representative Bradley."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bradley's over on..."

Durkin: "All right. Representative Beiser."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Beiser."

Durkin: "Oh, I didn't recognize him in the back."

Speaker Hannig: "He's in the... in the row."

Durkin: "All right. Representative... let's see. Connie Howard."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Connie Howard. Is the Lady in the chamber?"

Durkin: "Clock's ticking."

Speaker Hannig: "Is the Lady in the chamber."

Durkin: "All right."

Speaker Hannig: "She's at the... over by the press box."

Durkin: "Okay. Representative Colvin."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin, I believe, is excused.

Is that not correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Durkin: "My mistake. Representative Phelps, who I see back there. I withdraw that."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay."

Durkin: "How about Representative Collins. Annazette Collins."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Collins. She's in the rear of the chamber."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Durkin: "Representative Granberg."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Granberg. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"

Durkin: "Representative..."

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Granberg is voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Durkin: "Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ken Dunkin. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? We've got you, Representative Howard. Is Representative Dunkin in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded?"

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Dunkin is voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Hannig: "Remove him."

Durkin: "Representative Jay Hoffman."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hoffman is in his seat, as always."

Durkin: "That's why I got… you know, I went to bifocals about a year ago, Representative Hannig. I'll be the last person I think would be called dilatory, but I will… I appreciate your patience. And I'll… I'll… I'm done."

Speaker Hannig: "On this... on this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2758."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2758, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

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

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2758 amends the offense of reckless homicide and aggravated assault to increase the penalties when a person harmed is a traffic control aide. This came to light and due to the fact that in the past six (6) weeks (2) two traffic control aides were killed by drivers who blatantly disregard for their traffic control aide orders. It stiffened the penalties for these offenses against traffic control aides and it adds traffic control aides to the offenses of involuntary manslaughter and aggravated assault. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Fritchey: "Representative, I'm asking this 'cause I haven't had a chance to read Bill, but I'm just looking at a part of the analysis and I see it increases the penalties when the person harmed is a traffic control officer, but then it says, 'or if the offender is willfully disobeying the lawful order or direction of such an officer.' And I guess my concern is then if you have a driver that is going to make a left turn and the traffic control officer appears to tell that driver to hold off and the driver doesn't and make the turn... and makes the turn anyway, what's the penalty that's being increased there? I obviously, they're

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

not being charged with aggravated assault. Obviously, they're not being charged with reckless homicide."

Acevedo: "Now, Representative, I believe it's only in the case when an individual is killed, that the traffic aide is killed, not when they're disobeying an order."

Fritchey: "Well, I'm... now I'm asking... I'm looking at the Bill and it just says, let's see, 'if you're operating a vehicle while willfully failing or refusing to comply with any lawful or direction... lawful order or direction of authorized police officer or traffic control aide. penalty is a Class II felony for which if a person is subject to a term imprisonment and shall be sentenced to a prison term of not less than three (3) years and not more than fourteen (14) years.' And my concern is this, and I'm well aware of the story of the woman that got hit at the intersection... that must have been what, maybe a week ago or And obviously, you know, the idea here is to send a very stiff message that you have to be mindful of these people as well drivers should be. But my concern with that provision, if I'm reading this right, well... let me... and I apologize to do this, Representative, as I'm reading this while I'm trying to question you. I just want to make sure that we are not going to turn somebody into a Class 2 felon simply for willfully disobeying a traffic order."

Acevedo: "And Representative, by all means, this is something exactly what I don't want to do. But if you can read it and you read the analysis..."

Fritchey: "Rep... Representative let me..."

Acevedo: "...this is reckless homicide."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Fritchey: "...let me... let me cut you off and I apo... I read the rest of the section upon which it's predicated on, and that's only if the willful disregard is part of an act which led to a reckless homicide."

Acevedo: "Right."

Fritchey: "Excellent Bill. Thank you for hearing me out. I appreciate it."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Durkin: "I just got one question. I understand what a traffic aide is, we see them downtown at the intersections. Would this include a volunteer crossing guard in our neighborhoods? Would this... would they be included within this definition of a traffic aide?"

Acevedo: "I... I don't believe so, Representative."

Durkin: "Do you think maybe it's something you want to think about, and this is going to pass out of the chamber but I..."

Acevedo: "And it might be something that I can add on in the Senate, but I just wanted to talk to the city people who brought this to me."

Durkin: "'Cause we don't have we have... traffic aides out in the suburbs where I live and we have..."

Acevedo: "Right, and I understand that."

Durkin: "...he's a volunteer crossing guard, so I would appreciate it if you consider that and bring it up with the Senate..."

Acevedo: "I'd be more than happy to work with you, Representative."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Durkin: "...and add that on to your Bill. Thank you."

Acevedo: "And we... maybe we can add it on in the Senate."

Durkin: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

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

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

Mulligan: "Representative, does a judge or state's attorney have any discretion on what the charge will be? I'm thinking perhaps and I... and I... saw on the news, particularly the last woman that was killed, was truly sad and I know where you're coming from. But what if it's a senior citizen who is waiting and is confused and goes through and hits somebody, which we know unfortunately that happens? What discretion does a state's attorney or judge have, because we continue to pass laws that say a mandatory sentence for X, Y, and Z and then there's no discretion. And in some instances that mandatory sentence does not really fit the situation. So what would happen in that case?"

Acevedo: "Representative, I believe it would be up to the judge's discretion. And more importantly, it should be up to the prosecutor, because first of all, I don't believe this legislation is trying to harm senior citizens, not one bit, but... we're looking for the individuals who blatantly have disregard for individuals directing traffic."

Mulligan: "I certainly understand that. I just want to make sure that we cover the outside situations where that's not really the case of what happened."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Acevedo: "And I think it would be up to the discretion of the prosecutor to decide whether, I mean, if an individual was just confused or disoriented compared to an individual who just really doesn't care, he just runs through it."

Mulligan: "They're... they're going to get where they're going no matter what."

Acevedo: "Exactly."

Mulligan: "Yeah, okay, I understand. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then Representative Acevedo is recognized to close."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

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

Bassi: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Bassi: "Whichever Lady left a phone and a blue pen in the bathroom, in the ladies' bathroom, I have it if you're looking for it. Fritchey, it's not yours. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jerry Mitchell, you have House Bill 3361. Out of the record. Representative Hernandez, you have House Bill 1449. Out of the record.

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Representative Hoffman, House Bill 818. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Bill Mitchell on House Bill 308. Out of the record. Okay. Representative Holbrook, how about House Bill 664? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 664, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 664 is a Bill initiated by our Treasurers' Association to try to answer some of the questions being raised at some of the auctions, property tax auctions, for public sale. They've set up a program with computers that gets rid of the problem that they've had in many cases where people claim they've bid at the same time. It sets up a program for counties of under fifty thousand (50,000) and those of more than fifty thousand (50,000) where a registration fee is paid and is refundable in almost every case. It either goes toward the purchase and if you show up and do not... aren't successful bidding you get your money back. The only case where you don't get your money back is if you say you're going to be there and you're not there. I have a piece of legislative intent I'd like to read into the record, and if... as defined, persons, male, female, corporations, company firms, societies, singular or plural numbers, it is the intent of this legislation to allow a person, company or corporation to transfer their registration to person, company, or corporation if they cannot participate in the county annual tax sale. The registrant must notify the tax collector no later than five (5) business days

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

prior to the sale of the substitute person, company, or corporation who will participate in the sale in their registrant's place. An additional deposit is not required for any substitute person. With that said, I know of no formal opposition to the Bill. The tax purchaser, those folks, I don't know of anyone against it. Be glad to take any questions."

- 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? Representatives Schmitz, Kosel, and Feigenholtz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes' and 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jefferson, you have House Bill 3428. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3428, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jefferson. Representative Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the correct Bill, Senate Bill... House Bill 3428 creates an authority for the Rockford area to create a port authority so that we would have the ability to bring in rail for the City of Rockford. And I would appreciate your support."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ramey, you have House Bill 3086. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3086, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ramey."

- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3086 is to... in support of Kane County Farm Bureau. It's a front door... front door Amendment... or front door request for a tax increase to help save farmland. There's a program in Kane County that already exists called the Farmland Protection Program. They receive funds from the riverboats and from federal grants and currently those... that funding is diminishing. So they're requesting this front door referendum for Kane County only. I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then... the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I presume that this is a very good Bill and so what I'm trying to do is just get a little more information about it because it's such a good Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "The Sponsor indicates he'll yield."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Mulligan: "All right. So the Farm Bureau is okay with it."

Ramey: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Everybody's okay with it."

Ramey: "Yes."

Mulligan: "It's a front door referendum..."

Ramey: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...and the money is going to go to a good use to purchase... to save farmland."

Ramey: "Correct."

Mulligan: "Which is one of the primary industries in Illinois."

Ramey: "Absolutely."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Ramey: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then Representative Ramey to close."

Ramey: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Durkin and Fortner, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes' and 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Joyce, on House Bill 511. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 511, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Joyce."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 511 is a... similar provision actually much more narrow than one that was passed out of here in the 94th General Assembly on a vote 108-2. And this would simply cover settlement agreements between public bodies and an entity. And what would have to be FOIA able would be the names of the parties involved and the amount of money the case was settled for. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate and inr... well, we'll put it on Standard Debate. And Representative Rose, you're recognized for five minutes."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Rose: "Thank you. Representative Joyce, what... who's opposed to this Bill?

Joyce: "I believe the Illinois Municipal League and various governmental bodies."

Rose: "Is it possible that in addition to the Municipal League you have the township officials, the AFL-CIO, the IEA, the IFT, Metro counties, School Management Alliance? That's what our analysis shows. Is that accurate?"

Joyce: "Sure. It very... very could well be. Very well could be.

I'm sure it is."

Rose: "Okay. Why... why would they be against the Bill?"

Joyce: "Why do I suppose? I don't know why I suppose. This is... this is a... some sunshine that's going to be spread on the government. We have had many of... many problems with agreements, settlement agreements that have been agreed to

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

by public bodies. This is only for public bodies and then they get sealed by a court and the public doesn't know what they're paying their money to the plaintiffs in a suit. They don't know how much money they're paying and they don't know what they're paying it for. And what this Bill does, it has to name the participants in the settlement agreement and it names the amount of money. Now if they're afraid of that, then maybe they shouldn't be agreeing to a sealed settlement."

Rose: "What kind of settlements would qualify under your Bill?"

Joyce: "Any particular wrongful... go ahead."

Rose: "The question would be like... let's say you've got a situation or a circumstance with a teacher who maybe commits some awful crime and act... say sexual violence against a student which has happened actually in a number of school districts of late that we've seen."

Joyce: "That'd be a criminal act."

Rose: "It'd be a criminal act, yeah, criminal act."

Joyce: "These are civil... civil settlements."

Rose: "I know, but what I'm saying is that the child's family then sues the school district and in court and receives a settlement. My concern isn't necessarily what the ultimate dollar amount is on the settlement, what my concern is whether or not that child's name and perhaps even you know, to some degree the... the circumstances surrounding the conduct are redacted out before that's released to the public. You understand my concern?"

Joyce: "Well, redaction is included, I mean, for Social Security numbers and personal information like that, is all

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

included in this but, and it's actually included in the existed... existing statute. But as far as releasing someone's name and the public body who the settlement agreement is for, and the amount of money, that are... those are the only things that... that are in this. It's not what happened and what happened to the person. None of that is in here. It's not the cause. It's what are... who are the parties involved and how much is the money. How much money is..."

Rose: "Right. That's... I mean, that's what I'm getting at and what I'm worried about is that the child who was the victim in the case may end up being the party who's..."

Joyce: "Yeah, but..."

Rose: "...that information's released and everybody knows what happened."

Joyce: "Well, you currently cannot get that information under FOIA."

Rose: "You cannot?"

Joyce: "You cannot. And... and..."

Rose: "Does this change that?"

Joyce: "No, it does not."

Rose: "So that would be redacted out?"

Joyce: "Correct."

Rose: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Representative Black."

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

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

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Black: "Representative, I can't remember, does this Bill apply to the City of Chicago or were they exempted in the Amendment?"

Joyce: "It applies to the City of Chicago."

Black: "Okay. I wanted to make sure. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Black: "I think one of the great frustrations that many people have with public bodies who use public funds or perhaps through their insurance carrier and they... they reach a settlement with a disgruntled employee or an employee who falls down on the job or slips on a snowy sidewalk or a employee who has filed a lawsuit alleging something, and they often make an out-of-court settlement, and then they say the amount of money is not the public's business. Well, wait a minute. It's a public entity we're talking about here, not private parties, not private business. We're talking about public bodies that ex... public ut... units of governments, if you will, that use public tax dollars to hire attorneys to represent them, hire attorneys to negotiate a settlement. You're telling me that taxpayers don't have a right to know how much money is being spent to defend this government. It could be something as simple as somebody filing a complaint on a violation of the Open Meetings Act. And to get the complaint to go away, the public... unit of government says, well, maybe we made a mistake, but we're not about to admit that in a court of law. I'll tell you what, we'll give you five thousand dollars (\$5,000) if you just drop the... drop

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

the complaint and to see if we can get the attorneys to agree. I... I think when you conduct public business and you use public tax dollars to settle disputes, settle lawsuits, the public has a right to know how much of their money did you spend? And I think they can hold you accountable if you are spending hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars can make things go away in which the public unit of government may in fact have been negligent. And in some cases, my hometown is facing a lawsuit that could result in a substantial payment of money because one of their public buildings had a stairwell that collapsed and a young... young man was killed. So there's a lawsuit already filed. think all this Bill does, and I join the Sponsor in urging an 'aye' vote, is to say if you make a settlement out of tax dollars or tax supportive insurance policies, public has a right to know how much did you settle that for and then they can make up their mind at the next election and hold those officials accountable. Should you have done more to prevent the accident? Did you pay too much? didn't you want to got to court? What... what was ... what are the terms of the settlement? And as the Sponsor has already said, it protects the gruesome details of what the victim may or may not have gone through. commonsense legislation that simply lets the public know how their dollars are being spent when a complaint or a lawsuit ends up being settled. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flider."

Flider: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Flider: "Yes, Representative, I was curious, in our analysis legislation where the analysis states that everything would be exempt... or that everything should be made public except for that which would be exempt under Section 7 of the Act. Can you tell me what Section 7 is?"
- Joyce: "Representative Flider, Section 7 includes all the exemptions to FOIA, if you want me to read them."
- Flider: "No, I'm not asking for that. I was just specifically asking because in the context of this legislation, you know, it relates to settlements and so on. So I guess what I was wondering is, are there some settlements or some... is there something that would not be made public as a result of your legislation here or would all settlements be open?"
- Joyce: "All existing... er... all future public settlements between a public body and a entity would be disclosed. What would be disclosed would be names of the persons involved in the suit and... or the settlement and the amount of money. Things that are exempted are Social Security numbers and... so, that's all we're looking to clarify. Is to make... that's all we're looking to make sure that the public knows who's involved in the settlement agreement and how much money they're being paid out of taxpayer dollars."
- Flider: "Okay. And then our analysis also indicates that it would be made public despite the fact that a judge would declare that it remain sealed."

Joyce: "That's correct. It..."

Flider: "What do we do about that conflict?"

Joyce: "So currently what happens is you will have a situation where a judge seals the settlement agreement according to

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

the parties involved. And then you may have a entity such as a newspaper or a TV station or even an interested party that would go to court and file suit to release that settlement agreement under current existing FOIA... under the current existing FOIA statute. And in 99 percent of those cases that seal would be lifted and has been lifted in the past. And this would eliminate the need for those entities to go through that process, but more importantly it would say, you know what, we're going to, as public bodies, enter into settlement agreements that we know will be exposed to the public, that we know taxpayers are going to find out how much we're spending of their money to settle this case. And we're doing it in a way that we're not ashamed to shine... sign... shine sunlight on it."

- Flider: "I've had a representative of local government indicate that they thought the result of this legislation could result in higher settlements. Have you heard of that argument?"
- Joyce: "Actually, I have heard that argument and if you... I remember in the committee, I think it was Representative Bradley that used some choice words to say that argument is totally false. And I'm not an attorney, he is and I would trust his word on it better than my own."
- Flider: "In fact, I would think in having been a local official myself, I would think that, you know, having the scrutiny of transparency in, you know, people understanding that whatever decision the public body makes that that may actually make one more diligent in assuring a better settlement or a better resolution."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Joyce: "Right."

Flider: "Maybe... maybe the answer is not to settle but, you know, protect the rights of the community or of the local government rather than settle. So..."

Joyce: "And... and I certainly believe that it gives... it is...

there will be... each issue would certainly be given a lot

more thought and wouldn't be a quick rush to settlement."

Flider: "Well, thank you for answering my questions. I... I think fundamentally and from the standpoint of... of our efforts to try and provide more transparency in government and certainly the need for the public to know what government is doing. I think the concept behind your legislation is a good one and I think it will lead to more transparency and open government. And I do think that the public should understand and should know what our local government decisions are and after all, it is their dollars and their money that is being dealt with."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired.

Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Me?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, could you wait until we finish the debate and then we'll go to your point of personal privilege?"

Dunkin: "Well, the school has to go. I have folk from my area."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Go ahead then, Representative."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Dunkin: "That's the only reason. I wouldn't dare do that to one of my good colleagues. But I'd like for the House of Representatives to recognize and please give a warm welcome and round of applause to the Ancona School. The school is from Chicago and my daughter, Sasha Dunkin is a member there. So we could... if they can stand and we can all give them a round of applause and welcome. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Scully. Representative Scully."
- Scully: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. I think this is very good public policy. practicing attorney I do have some experience at the issue of the advantages in many cases of achieving a better settlement in the context of confidentiality, in many cases that is true. But the bottom line is here we're dealing with public dollars. And the benefits to be gained by full disclosure, I think substantially outweigh the risk that, on a case-by-case basis, individual cases might have been settled in a better manner through confidentiality. Regarding the issue of possibly causing higher settlements, I disagree. I think it's... so that it... that certainly is a possibility, I think it is much more likely that full disclosure of those settlement dollars is going to substantially decrease settlement dollars. I think it's very prudent legislation. I think it's good public policy. Any I ask for your support."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan, there's been three (3) in favor and (2) two in response. Would you like to

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

speak in response? That's asking questions or being opposed?"

Mulligan: "Just wanted to ask one or two (2) questions. I think I'm..."

Speaker Hannig: "Yeah, and that would be in response."

Mulligan: "...I'm in favor..."

Speaker Hannig: "So you have 5 minutes."

Mulligan: "Representative, how did you determine what would be released and what wouldn't be released?"

Joyce: "How did I determine... you mean... in the current statute there's certain... certain things that are not released, but how I determined what would be released and would not be released is I sat down with... in this Bill, with all of the opponents that, I think, someone else mentioned before, and said let's come up with something that is workable."

Mulligan: "I'm... I'm interested in the part and I don't know if that's still there that says, 'any changes in practice or procedure a body must make under a settlement an agreement will not be released.' Say a police department..."

Joyce: "The only thing that's in this Bill now is..."

Mulligan: "You think that's out?"

Joyce: "...the parties that are involved and the amount of money in which they settled for."

Mulligan: "All right. But you're not releasing practices or procedures, and my only question on that is, if a police department is charged with sexual harassment or some kind of ethnic profiling, I would think that part of the agreement might say they have to do sensitivity training, they have to do X, Y and Z. And yet under your Bill it

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

wouldn't be released and I'm not quite sure the reasoning behind that. Maybe that's a Bill for another day, but I just couldn't understand..."

Joyce: "Yeah."

Mulligan: "...why that in particular was eliminated."

Joyce: "Well, that very well may be a Bill for another day. It very well is probably something that gets released on... if a... if the public is interested enough for an entity to pursue it such as a newspaper or a individual or even a... some sort of... someone from the news media. But what we think is the most important information is the amount of money..."

Joyce: "...it'll cost the public and who it's going to, so..."

Mulligan: "It'll cost the public. I agree with you on that.
Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "We've now had (3) three in support and three (3) in response and Representative Joyce, you're recognized to close."

Joyce: "I would just..."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is
open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Representative Cultra and Leitch,
do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record.
On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes' and 15 voting
'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House
Bill 3361."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3361, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I've talked to just about everybody on the floor. If I didn't see you, you probably weren't in your seat and were wondering what I was doing running Anyway, this is a Bill that moves five (5) charters into Chicago for the specific purpose of trying to reenroll some of the quarter of a million, sixteen- to twenty-four-year-old dropouts that we have in the State of Illinois. We know, and factually, that it cost about ten to twelve thousand dollars (\$10,000-\$12,000) a year to education these young men and women that are on the streets, probably out of work, and probably headed to a different lifestyle than they really wanted. Eighty-five percent of those young people that are incarcerated do not have a high school diploma. So what we're trying to do is to follow the model of California and see if we can possibly save some of these young lives and give them a second chance. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "We're going to put this on the Order of Standard Debate. And Representative Graham, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in full support of House Bill 3361. It's really important in today's times that we take a look at why we have so many dropouts in our state. In my district these charters would be very helpful to children who have

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

lost their way. I think that we need to do everything possible to provide them with hope and resources that will remove all the barriers that prevented them from being successful students and eventually productive members of society. And if we're really interested in keeping our youth out of jail, keeping them out of harm's way, and maturing them into very responsible adults, I think that this Bill is a great step towards that direction. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Monique Davis."

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of this legislation and I'm very proud to be a cosponsor with Jerry Mitchell. I think many of you know what Monique Davis is opposed to charter schools. Monique Davis is only opposed to those schools that take children from a traditional school and then place them in a charter school. This legislation will merely open up new opportunities for those who have been expelled or those who have lost their right to go to a regular public school. I think the research that has done by the task force, I think the cooperation with many of the other educators across our state has brought this piece of legislation into a superior form. And I certainly urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "So we've had three (3) speak in support. The rule would provide that three (3) could speak in response.

  Representative Fritchey, would you like to speak in response or opposition?"
- Fritchey: "If I have to say I'll speak in response I'll say that, but the reality is I really want to just commend the

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

speaker... the Sponsor of this thing. You know, we get so caught up in Democratic issues, Republican issues, Chicago issues, downstate issues, suburban issues, this is a Bill and a Sponsor that transcends all of that. He realizes, the Bill realizes that there is a cost to every Illinoisan where we have kids that don't finish school, that there's a benefit to every Illinoisan when we have a educated population and when we do the right thing for kids. so refreshing to see somebody reach out. They're not looking to protect their own territory, they're not looking to stake out a partisan position, it's just... it's a very good lesson above and beyond the contents of this Bill that we... our differences here are far outweighed by similarities and our concerns. Representative Mitchell, thank you for doing this on behalf of the kids in Chicago that it'll help, on behalf of the people it'll help throughout the state and for sending a message that we don't have to be as divisive as we often are here. you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ramey and Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, you have House Bill... Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank Representative Fritchey for closing on that Bill for me."

Speaker Hannig: "He did a wonderful job, didn't he. Mr. Clerk, Representative Lang has House Bill House Bill 3762. Do you wish us to read that Bill, Representative? Mr. Clerk... Okay. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Mautino, you have House Bill 1627. Out of the record. Representative May, Karen May, you have House Bill 2285. Do you wish us to read that? Out of the record. Representative McGuire, you have House Bill 3571. Out of the record. Representative MeGuire, House Bill 1447. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1447, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Mendoza: House. House Bill 1447 creates the Trade and Tourism Study Commission Act which establishes a Commission to examine and evaluate the state's programs and expenditures for the promotion of Illinois trade and tourism. The commission would consist of twelve (12) members, four (4) appointed from the Senate with two (2) being each appointed by the President and Minority Leader, four (4) Members from the House with two (2) each appointed by the Speaker Minority Leader, and four (4) representatives of Illinois trade and tourism organizations who'll appointed by the Governor. One of them would represent the International Visitors Center of Chicago and all of the organizations must represent the state's geographic

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

diversity. The commission must study the state's various programs and expenditures for the promotion and support of Illinois trade and tourism at the state, regional, national and international levels, examining their operations and evaluating their effectiveness. I think this is a good idea, especially in terms of informing the General Assembly as to what is going on in these different programs, whether they're effective, whether they should be changed, whether they should be expanded or more importantly, it gives us the information that I think right now is lacking in terms of what we're doing in the State of Illinois. So, simply ask an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

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? Representative Rita, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Acevedo, for what reason do you rise?"

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Acevedo: "Yesterday at our event for the Latino Caucus, a question was asked quite often and they were asking if Cinco de Mayo is the independence of Mexico. Well, the 5th of May is not a Mexican Independence Day but it should be.

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

And Cinco de Mayo is not an American holiday but it should Mexico declared its independence from mother Spain on midnight, the 15th of September, 1810. And it took eleven (11) years before the first Spanish soldiers were told and forced to leave Mexico. So why Cinco de Mayo? And why should Americans savor this day as well? Because four thousand (4,000) Mexican soldiers smashed the French and traitor Mexican soldiers army of eight thousand (8,000) at Puebla, Mexico, a hundred (100) miles east of Mexico City on the morning of May 5, 1862. The French had landed in Mexico along with the Spanish and English troops five (5) months earlier on the pretext of collecting Mexican debts from the newly elected government of democratic President and Indian Benito Juarez. The English and Spanish quickly made deals and left. The French, however, had different ideas. Under Emperor Napoleon III, who detested the United States, the French came to stay. They brought a Hapsburg Prince with them to rule the new Mexican empire. His name was Maximilian. His wife was Carolota. Napoleon's French army had not been defeated in fifty (50) years and it invaded Mexico with the finest modern equipment and with a newly reconstituted Foreign Legion. The French were not afraid of anyone, especially since the United States was embroiled in its own Civil War. The French Army left the port of Vera Cruz to attack Mexico City to the west as the French assumed that the Mexicans would give up their capital and fall to the enemy, as the European countries traditionally did. Under their command of Texas-born General Zaragosa and the calvary under the command of

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Colonel Diaz, later to be Mexico's president and dictator, the Mexicans awaited. Brightly dressed French Dragoons led the enemy columns. The Mexican Army was less stylish. General Zaragosa ordered Colonel Diaz to take his cavalry, the best in the world, out to the French flanks. response, the French did a most stupid thing; they sent their cavalry off to chase Diaz and his men, who proceeded to butcher them. The remaining thunderstorm and through hundreds of head of stampeding cattle stirred up the Indians armed only with machetes. When the battle was over, many French were killed or wounded and the cavalry was being chased by Diaz' superb horsemen miles away. Mexicans had won a great victory that kept Napoleon III from supplying the Confederate rebels for another year, allowing the United States to build the greatest army the world has ever seen. This grand army smashed Confederates at Gettysburg just 14 months after the battle of Puebla, essentially ending the Civil War. Union forces were then rushed to the Texas/Mexican border under General Phil Sheridan, who made sure that the Mexicans got all the weapons and ammunition they needed to expel the French. American soldiers were discharged with their uniforms and rifles if they promised to join the Mexican Army to fight the French. The American Legion of Honor marched in the Victory Parade in Mexico City. It might be an historical stretch to credit the survival of the United States to these brave four thousand (4,000) Mexicans who faced an army twice as large in 1862. But who knows? In gratitude, thousands of Mexicans crossed the border after Pearl Harbor

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

to join the U.S. Armed Forces. And recently, as Iraq, Mexicans flooded American consulates with phone calls, trying to join up and fight for another American war. Mexicans, you see, never forget who their friends are, and neither do Americans. That's why Cinco de Mayo is such a party, a party that celebrates freedom and liberty. They are two ideals which Mexicans and Americans have fought shoulder to shoulder to protect, ever since the 5th of May, 1862. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz, you have House Bill 1871. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1871, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the debate rages in this Body about electric rates and the procurement of power, I think we cannot ignore the role that renewable energy can play in a solution to some of the problems we're facing. House Bill 1871 sets mandatory minimums on the amount of electricity from renewable sources that an electric company must purchase. Twenty-two (22) states already have set similar standards for power procurement. A renewable portfolio standard as the minimum is called or a RPS, provides numerous benefits. Most obvious, of course, is environmental improvements we enjoy from using renewable energy, but there are others. They include new income for farmers who own or lease sites where wind turbines are located and who grow bioenergy mas... biomass energy crops; wind turbines generate new property tax and

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

sales tax revenues. Long-term contracts for wind power where there is no cost for any inputs can protect ratepayers from rates that are based on fossil fuel inputs, and finally, renewable energy helps to diversify our energy mix and adds stability to energy production costs. Happy to answer any questions and I ask for your support."

- Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner, Smith, Schmitz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes' and 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stephens, you have House Bill 495. Representative Stephens. Representative Stephens, do you wish us to read 495? House Bill 495. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 495, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 495 provides that a municipality shall not impose a fine as a result of parking in a handicapped spot or a fraudulent use of a handicapped plate or decal lower than is stipulated by the Illinois Vehicle Code. The initiative... this is an initiative of the mayor's office, the mayor in

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Representative Black's district. The Secretary of State is a probable opponent. Members of the disabled community have told Representative Black that they support the legislation. I move its passage and will try to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Let's put this on Standard Debate. And Representative Franks, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Franks: "I'm reading the analysis here... I wanted to ask you a couple of questions, Representative. Would this Bill apply, for instance, if one was entitled to have a decal hanging from your mirror indicating that you are handicapped and are entitled to have a spot, but for some reason you didn't have it exposed properly or if it had fallen off and it was on the floor and a officer gave you a citation for not displaying the decal, even though it might have been in the car but on the floor, there would be no provision now for that person to have that citation reduced?"

Stephens: "Correct."

Franks: "Why would we want to do that?"

Stephens: "Well, because of... as members of the disabi... disabled community have told me and Representative Black, you know what, it's a... it is a necessary item of responsibility for these people if you are going to have that decal or the hanging from your mirror or in the front of your vehicle, it's your responsibility to have it there. We can't just have people coming in... you know, parking in a disabled

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

place, not having any indication that they have a disabled person in that vehicle and then coming in a day later and saying, 'mayor, you got to fix my ticket.' You just can't do that."

Franks: "It drives me nuts when people park there when they shouldn't be. But for instance, my mom just had her knee replaced last month, and she's got a decal that she hangs from her car..."

Stephens: "Huh, huh."

Franks: "...and I know that when my dad went to pick her up he forgot to take the decal... well, I don't know whether he parked in a handicapped zone, I hope he didn't, but she was certainly entitled to that, and I'm wondering 'cause there's a lot of caregivers. And if... so if I go to pick my mom up and take her out for Sunday brunch, and she can't make it to the door and asks me to park in the handicap because she is but she forgot her decal, I'd get that ticket."

Stephens: "Well, certainly, Representative, if you're... if you're delivering someone to a public facility like a restaurant or other facility, you can drop them off at the front door if you are driving."

Franks: "Right."

Stephens: "And if... you know if you're driving your vehicle or her vehicle without the sticker, you have to park in a nonhandicapped place because remember, when you use that spot then someone who has been responsible enough to keep their decal in the window, then they can... they can use it."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Franks: "And I agree and I should get that ticket, but let's change it the other way. Let's say she goes and she's going to meet me there, and she gets into her car and she forgets her sticker because it was in my car when I picked her up the night before for dinner."

Stephens: "Well, Representative..."

Franks: "Now my mom is entitled to be there but she doesn't have her sticker and now she's going to get a three hundred and fifty dollar (\$350.00) fine."

Stephens: "I'm sure, Representative, if... if... we can always find an exception and maybe we should govern just towards those weird exceptions when everybody is forgetful, loans their vehicle to their son and then uses his car and forgets to bring the decal along. This is just a simple matter of courtesy to those disabled persons who understand that, you know what, this a privilege that I have earned by my disability and I have a responsibility with that privilege to make sure that..."

Franks: "I agree with you."

Stephens: "...the community knows, I deserve to park here."

Franks: "But there's always... there are exceptions. I know I've had people who've gotten tickets for not having a front plate because somebody might have stolen one of their vanity plates. And because it might be something, you know, some sports guy's name. So they bring a picture to the judge and say, 'Hey, judge, I had a front plate but somebody stole it.' Or another example, they get a ticket for not having their insurance card with them, even though they have insurance, but they don't... they can't find... if

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

you've seen my glove box... you wou... I would... you'd never find my insurance card, okay."

Stephens: "Well, Representative, if you get caught without your insurance card you should be properly punished."

Franks: "But if I can prove that I was insured the day that I got a ticket for not producing my insurance card, they're going to throw that ticket out. Much like the fact that if you're driving without a driver's license, you still have a license. If it's not on your person and you can produce it later, they're going to drop that ticket. And I'm wondering why we're going to be so red-lined here and not cut people a break when something could happen as simple as the decal not sticking well enough on the mirror and falling on the floor."

Stephens: "Representative, you're giving an example of a ticket that's going to be dropped."

Franks: "Right."

Stephens: "And that's not what this legislation is about. That ticket, I presume, could still be dropped."

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

So, did you want to bring your remarks to a close? Okay.

Representative Stephens, why don't you finish answering the question and then we'll proceed."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we can't do is lower the monetary fine."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lang. Pardon me, Representative."

Franks: "Can I ask one follow up on that?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black or Lang, did you want to yield your time?"
- Lang: "Let me give Mr. Franks one minute of my time."
- Speaker Hannig: "Let's start the five (5)-minute clock and we'll see how it goes. Representative Franks."
- Franks: "I just... I wanted to follow up with your last answer.

  Would you still be able to drop a ticket if you're able to

  prove that you had the decal but it happened to be on the

  floor because it fell?"
- Stephens: "That's currently allowed. And my understanding, it's currently allowed and this does not change that ability."
- Franks: "So, then... I'm not sure why we need the Bill then, because if you're able to do that now, why do we need this Bill? I'm turning it back over to Mr. Lang because..."
- Stephens: "Evidently, some... and I can respond if Representative Lang doesn't mind. I don't know if our rules allow you, Representative Lang, by the way, to give part of your time but not all of your time and I think you deserve a full 5 minutes and I'd ask the Speaker to reestablish that."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, we'll give Representative Lang...
  you're recognized and we'll give you 5 minutes."
- Lang: "Thank you very much, Sir. I probably won't need five minutes. I want to make sure I understand the Bill. First of all, let me tell you that I think that people that park in these handicapped spaces ought to go to jail that don't deserve to be parking in those spaces. It's appalling and you drive around and you're in a mall and people that are perfectly healthy are parking in these spaces, so I... I

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

share your disgust with these people, but I want to make sure I understand what your Bill does. So your Bill has nothing to do with whether the person has the decal or the sticker, your Bill only has to do with whether they're displaying the decal or the sticker. Is that correct?"

Stephens: "Correct."

Lang: "Well, if the Bill was about whether they had the decal or the sticker I'd be more likely to support it. We have people that don't get the decal or the sticker, they don't apply, they don't fill out the papers, they don't qualify and they're parking in handicapped spaces. But you would penalize these people simply because they weren't displaying the sticker?"

Stephens: "Representative, when someone parks in that handicapped spot without a sticker, if we don't deal with this issue of whether... you know, you'd have to bring your sticker along or we have to... we tell a municipality why you can... you can charge them whatever you want. There's a minimum two hundred and fifty dollar (\$250.00) a minimum. Some cities are charging as much as three hundred and fifty (350). Well, the end... at the end of the day, what we're trying to do is to get people who deserve to be parking in those spots, the right to park in those spots..."

Lang: "Agreed."

Stephens: "...and everyone else, whether you have the right to or not, only if you have that sticker or decal with you, should you park in that spot. If you don't want to bring the sticker with you, if you're not that responsible, don't

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

knock somebody else out by parking your son's car or your car without the decal."

Lang: "Well, so what about the situation someone raised earlier about, well, you have your driver's license but you forgot it? So you get a ticket for not having your license, you go to court and then the judge says, 'Well, do you have a license or don't you?' And the person says, 'Yes, judge, here's my license.' And then they say, 'Fine, goodbye.' So, I... I am... I own it... if this Bill was about tripling the fines for people you don't get the sticker and don't qualify to park, I would support it with you. But this Bill isn't about whether they actually get it or whether they actually qualify, this Bill's about whether they remembered to put the sticker on the car or remembered to put the indicia on the car. And then no defense... basically no defense, you tie the hands of the municipalities so that if a person comes in and says, 'Well, sure I had the sticker, it fell off. Or sure I had the right license plate, it fell off or someone stole it.' The issue should be, do... are they entitled to park in that parking space, not if they're wearing the right color hat. Don't you agree?"

Stephens: "It's one thing to be driving down the highway and forget your license, your driver's license, but if you... but that's no... that's no special privilege above and beyond all other licensed persons. This is about using a handicapped parking spot and then going into the mayor the next... the next day and saying, 'You know what, mayor, I forgot my sticker and I really should have brought it, but I didn't,

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

I'm sorry that no one else could use that space while I was there, even though I didn't have any indication to your officer, your enforcing officer that I shouldn't have been ticketed.' All these... if they just bring their sticker along, then the system doesn't have to stop and give them special treatment."

Lang: "Why don't you just turn this Bill into one where we charge someone who parks in a handicapped space illegally a ten thousand dollar (\$10,000) fine. I would support you in that."

Stephens: "If I could amen..."

Lang: "Isn't that right? Isn't that really..."

Stephens: "If I could amend it on its face and you'll get your support, I amend it on its face."

Lang: "Isn't that what you're really trying to do? You're trying to trying to keep people who don't qualify for parking in handicapped spaces because that irritates you as much as it irritates me. Is that right?"

Stephens: "Yes, it does."

Lang: "All right. So, is this Bill going to get you closer to that point? This Bill doesn't get you anywhere closer to that point. It just simply says if you're absentminded you're going to get fined. It doesn't say anything about whether you're entitled to park in that space. That's it, no comment. You're done, Sir. Is this your first Bill?"

Stephens: "Was that a question? Was that a question?"

Lang: "No. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Lang: "I understand what Representative Stephens is trying to do. Again, I am for hugely increasing fines and penalties on people that do this. These are disgusting, appalling people; they shouldn't have driver's licenses. They should not be allowed to park in my mall, I can tell you that. But this Bill doesn't get where Mr. Stephens wants to go, and therefore, I'm not voting for it."

Speaker Hannig: "So, we've had one in support, two (2) in response and Representative Black, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Representative Stephens carrying this Bill for me. Bill originated in my district. And let me try to explain what it does and it does exactly what the previous speaker said. This came up in my hometown, it's come up three (3) times. I've talked to the disabled community. I've talked to the legal counsel in the Secretary of State's Office. The law says clearly, you must display your handicapped parking placard when parking in a handicapped zone. law makes no exceptions. The law doesn't say, oh, if you had it in your trunk or you put it in your glove compartment or you had it under the seat, it doesn't say It's says you must display the handicapped placard if you park in a handicapped spot. So yes, it does get to the illegal use of parking in a handicapped spot. Now if you had a handicapped license plate, that's fine, but if you use the placard it must be displayed either on your rearview mirror or sitting on your dash. It doesn't say and doesn't allow for any excuses. And let me tell you

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

what the disabled community has said to me. The reason that most people who are parking there don't have their placard is that they have given it somebody else who is not entitled to it. And then they forget it get it back and so they say, well, I have one and I gave it to my sister and I forgot to get it back, but I'll park there anyway. when they get caught, they come up with the excuse that the previous speaker used. Well, I... I forgot it. It was in the I got into this with the disabled Well, as community in my hometown, we discovered that there are several cities who violate the law. The mayor of several cities and the Municipal League thinks this is fine and I think it's a violation of the law and so does the Secretary of State legal counsel. If you bring in the placard, twenty-four (24), thirty-six (36) hours later, the placard is in fact registered to you and you proved that and to your car, then they just tear up the ticket. I didn't know that law provided that once issued a ticket a mayor or a municipal hearing officer... this isn't going to court, you're not getting a hearing before a judge... an individual in the city says, oh, oh, you do have the placard. That's not the issue. The issue is you parked in a handicapped spot and did not display your placard. And half of the time or more, it's because you don't have the placard, you've let somebody else use it. In one egregious case, a daughter parked her car in a handicapped spot, using her mother's placard her mother can no longer drive. Now, the placard is registered to her mother's car which is no longer in service. Her rationale was, well, it's for my

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

mother. The officer said, 'Where is your mother? Is she with you?' No, she's home. Well, then in all due respect to the driver, you're not suppose to park there using a handicap placard issued to your mother and your mother's at What we are trying to do, what I'm trying to do... I had a mayor who said, no, I don't think I have the power to tear up a ticket. But a mayor thirty (30) miles away said, oh, I tear them up all the time. All I'm trying to do is what the previous speaker clearly said. If you violate the law by parking there without your placard on display, you will be fined and you will pay the fine. I don't see what's so revolutionary about that. If you're going to really toughen up... and the disabled people that I talked to in my district said the first thing you need to do is to stop these people from letting other people use their placard and half... or more then half the time that's why they don't have it with them when they park there. The law is simple, I think the law should be obeyed and that's why I introduced the Bill and that's why I hope you'll consider an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "We had two (2) in support and two in response, and Representative Molaro, you're next for 5 minutes."

Molaro: "Thank you. You know I got to say this and this the first time I'll probably say this. Representative Black just said it was... you're picking up the Bill for him. I think you might have just did what Representative Jefferson did and speak about the wrong Bill. Because Representative Black, I read the Bill, and this is the only thing the Bill says, and you as the Sponsor, unfortunately, you're going

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

to have to read this too 'cause here's what it says. the way, Representative Lang, so you don't see I'm doing this. I think he's wrong and I think Representative Franks is wrong. And here's the problem, and Bill, if you could just listen to this. All the Bill says, that if a hearing officer determines that you violated the ordinance then you must charge the three hundred (300) or whatever it is. That's all it says. You can't charge a hundred (100) bucks. But I will warn you that the hearing officer when he's hearing this, if someone comes up and says, 'here's my placard, I forgot it.' He could say, No liability. could still do that. This Bill doesn't stop that. doesn't stop the mayor from tearing up the ticket, doesn't stop the hearing officer from saying no liability, so if you go in front of this hearing officer just like Jack Franks' example and you say, I am... I have the placard, but I failed to display it, they could still say you're not liable. This Bill does not speak to that. You could still tear it up. You could still do whatever you want. All this Bill says is that if you are found liable, then you must pay the three hundred (300) whatever the maximum amount it does. It's only three (3) sentences long. That's all the Bill does. So when Jack Franks get up and says, what about this or what about that, this Bill doesn't speak to it. When Representative Lang starts saying, well, what if you do this, and you have the right... this Bill doesn't speak to it. When you, Representative Black, you're the Sponsor of the Bill gets up and talks about mayors this Bill has nothing to do with it. All this Bill

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

says is if the hearing officer finds you liable he must give the maximum amount. That's all the Bill does. The only thing it stops is a hearing officer from saying, well, instead of three hundred (300) I think it should be one fifty (150). Can't do that anymore under this Bill. If you're found liable, you must pay three hundred (300), but it does not tell the hearing officer when and how he can fine liability and it doesn't tell the mayor or the police department what they could do. At least that's what the Bill says. Now, if you're... if it... the rest of it was for legislative intent, terrific. But that's all the Bill says. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "So Representative Molaro, was that in favor or in opposition? Was you in favor? Okay. So, he's in favor. Representative Black, and let me ask all the Members, please refrain from using other Members' name in debate. It just drags out the debate, and Representative Black, your name was used in debate."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm tired of going through this. I'm tired of a simple Bill trying to fix a simple problem on behalf of the disabled community. We get into arguments that should be heard in the Supreme Court. Take the Bill out of the record. I will never bring it back. The hell with it."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens, you're the Chief Sponsor. For what reason... for what reason do you rise?"
- Stephens: "Well, you... now you drug me into this and we're going to fight it out. All right. Now there was... we've been all over the... am I allowed to close?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Hannig: "So we would... the Rules would provide for one additional speaker..."

Stephens: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Hannig: "...in opposition or in response. So who would like to speak in opposition or response? Representative Reis, would you like to be in opposition or response? No. Representative Stephens. Well, let's see. I guess no one else. So Representative Stephens, you can close."

"Wow, we've had... we've had some fun here and I understand that there might... there is some legitimate question as to whether this is worthy of your support. I would remind you that what the Bill does is in the event of the determination involving a violation of this Section, the hearing officer may not impose a monetary fine that is defined in another Section of the Code less than that And that other another Section of the Code amount. indicates that if you find the person in violation that the minimum fine is two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250.00). If, as the previous Representatives have brought up, examples where a good judgment says, you know what, I don't deserve this ticket. The hearing officer can dismiss the ticket based on the facts. So, if you're going to find them guilty, find them guilty in the statutes have to be upheld. The Section says the minimum fine is two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250.00). Find them innocent, let them Find them quilty, fine them the amount that this Body has established as a minimum fine for such violation. That's all it does. Now, I think that that commonsense explanation of what the Bill does and I think

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- it does make good sense. And I move for the favorable passage of 495."
- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford and Representative Black, do you wish to be recorded? Gentlemen? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1871, I inadvertently hit it... hit my 'no' switch. I did want to be recorded as 'yes' on that Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "It will reflect your intentions.

  Representative Bill Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Mitchell, B.: "I would like the young people in... over the Democratic side of the gallery to stand up, please. I'd like to introduce them to the House of Representatives. This is, I believe, sophomores and juniors at Lincoln Christian College in Lincoln, Illinois, as well as their instructor Sally Litterly who's an instructor but is also the Logan County Clerk. So, I'd also like to give them a... I would like to give them a big Illinois House welcome."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Watson, for what reason do you rise?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Watson: "A point of personal privilege and an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Watson: "I find it interesting that we spent more time debating a handicapped parking Bill than we did on changing the Constitution and Electoral College but be that as it may, I do have an inquiry of the Chair. We've come to the end of another week's work. We've been working on an issue since what, the end of Veto Session? When I go home my constituents are going to say, what's going on with utilities? Yesterday you said we would address this at the appropriate time. Mr. Speaker, do we know when that appropriate time will be?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, when we have a Bill to vote on, we'll call it and we'll pass it."

Watson: "I believe we have several Bills, but we have taken Bills that we have called on Second Reading, Third Reading. We've had Bills that have come up two (2) or three (3) times in front of us. This is the most important issue facing this state right now. Economically. In my district we've had food banks that have seen a 25 percent increase in business because we're not doing our job. Nothing."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, we just call the Bills as the... as they're requested by the Members."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Eddy: "Representative... Mr. Speaker, I have the same question.

And that's not an answer. I don't have an answer to take

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

home to the people in southern Illinois. They see me in coffee shops, they see me in the grocery store, and they say, what are you guys doing with the electricity? What's going on? And I don't have an answer for 'em. All I can tell them is, in Springfield there seemed to be other things that are more important than electric rates and the fact that people there aren't able to buy food and have to... When are we going to address this issue? We had a Committee of the Whole meeting on electricity months ago. And we leave here every week and we go back and we talk to the people that send us here and we try to explain to them that we're working on this issue. Can you tell us... can someone in the know come out here and tell us where we are on this issue? So that we can go home and tell our constituents what's going on."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. A point of personal privilege. Just as my two colleagues from downstate Illinois, I think I want to relate a call I got yesterday from a senior citizen who remembers Harry Truman, and he remembered in 1946-48 Truman ran against that 80th do nothing Congress. He says, he called me up yesterday and he said, 'You guys in Springfield seem to be very similar to the do nothing Congress of 50... 60 years ago.' The people of Illinois, particularly downstate Illinois, they feel disenfranchised. They feel that if they were having their electric rates go up in the City of Chicago as much as the people that I have, that we would have acted months ago. And they call and they say, 'what's happening?' I had a gentleman call a

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

mayor of a community in Tazewell County, called me yesterday. He said, 'small businesses are going out of business, restaurants that have their rates go up 200 percent. And he said, 'what are the suits in Springfield doing?' And it's pretty hard. We pass Bills, we send them to the Senate, the Senate has no action. We read the Senate... the <u>Sun Times</u> today, we might know why there's no action. The people of Illinois want relief. And where is this General Assembly giving people relief? If we're not doing our job, we need to address this problem."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary... or inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "... your inquiry."

Reis: "What is the status of Senate Bill 1592?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1592?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1592 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Reis: "Is there any fiscal notes that are still outstanding?"

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the Bill's on Third Reading.

By rule would have to have met all the requirements."

Reis: "So everything's clear? We can vote on that, right?

Ladies and Gentlemen, 1592 kind of made some headlines a

couple of weeks ago when the debacle in the Senate went on

when a Member was... a Member's Amendment was taken off. The

Bill came over here, it's went through committee. ComEd

has been reattached to that. Is this something we're going

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

- to vote on this afternoon? I know we're not finished going through the Calendar yet, but"
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, the Chair calls Bills that are requested by the Sponsor. We try to do it in an orderly fashion. Some Republican Bills, some Democratic Bills. Some..."
- Reis: "Well, the previous two speaker wanted to know when we're going to take issue on this and... and I guess that we do have that Bill out there we'd like to go home and tell our constituents who are in their third or fourth month now of paying these high electric bills, that we did do something, that we acted on something that's going to affect everybody in the state, not just the Ameren customers. And I hope that we can take this Bill up this afternoon and so we can go home and tell our constituents that we are, in fact, working on their high electric bills."
- Speaker Hannig: "I think, for the record, we have passed Bills to the Senate at least twice, during the Veto Session and this time."
- Reis: "They're tired of us going home saying all you guys do is play volleyball."
- Speaker Hannig: "And so..."
- Reis: "And I know we're going to have a short week next week with dealing with the GRT. It'll be another week before we go home and they want to hear that we're doing something not just playing volleyball with the Senate."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, you would suggest we pass this Bill now?

  Representative Bost."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very concerned because I thought at 2:00 that we were supposed to argue the GRT and at 3:00 we were supposed to argue the Ameren rate freeze. I think there's been some confusion. I think both of them should be argued right away. However, I think there has been some confusion. It's probably because Molaro in the last debate which was a Bill dealing with... dealing with a license plate argument and he mentioned everybody and their neighbor on the House Floor, gave every name. So, I guess, you know, once again we're just going to back to our constituents and realize that we're just playing games up here instead of dealing with what we need to be dealing with."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino, you have House Bill 1627. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1627, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House 1627 will allow for a mailing to be done and there is agreement between the IFT, IEA on this legislation it will allow for once in the… once a year a voluntary membership could be sent out or information about memberships. We added an Amendment which took care of some of the concerns. I believe that the IEA and the Teachers Retirement System have one more issue they wish to work on in the Senate. But basically, that's what the Bill does."

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate, and in response, Representative Molaro."

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

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

Molaro: "Frank, let me ask you a question. Is there any cost to the Pension Fund, Frank?"

Mautino: "No, there's no cost to the Pension Fund on this. As a matter of fact, if one of the groups wants to do the mailing... it's in an area, if one of the groups wants to do the mailing it'll be done at their cost."

Molaro: "All right. Well, thank you. Frank. That's very nice of you to answer my questions."

Mautino: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 988. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 988, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Has
House Amendment 1 been adopted?"

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Amendments?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1, has been approved for consideration, but has not been adopted yet."

Phelps: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "So would you wish to move this back, Representative Phelps and adopt the Amendment?"

Phelps: "I would like to adopt House Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So Mr. Clerk, return this to the Order of Second Reading and are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 988, the Members on the Local Government Committee... remember this was a Bill that some of the fire chiefs around the state were against. I owe a great amount of respect to the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois for the weeks of negotiations that they have sat down with the Chiefs Association, and because of this Amendment, the Chiefs Associations have removed their opposition. All this Amendment does is allows the appointing authority to modify the requirements of the Act through an agreement at the local level and ask for its adoption."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin, on the Amendment."

Durkin: "Representative Phelps, where's the... what's the current position of the Illinois Municipal League on this Amendment... Bill as amended?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Phelps: "I believe, Representative Durkin, they are still in opposition just because of the principal of the… principal value of the Bill."

Durkin: "Let me get this straight now. You're going to say this is going to be sent down for collective bargaining between management and also the... I mean, local governments and management. And as I read, if they reach impasse then this language will apply to that municipality, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Durkin: "Who decides when impasse is... when they're at an impasse?"

Phelps: "And I'm not sure about that, Representative Durkin.

It may be a third party that comes in and does that, but what has happened is, that some of the cities have refused to bargain and that's why the Associated Fire Fighters wanted this Amendment. But the great thing about this Amendment, it gives the municipalities local control of what the qualifications of the firefighter is going to be."

Durkin: "All right. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Dugan."

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

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

Dugan: "Yes, Representative, I just wanted to... just clarify because I know that we've had some questions asked. This doesn't affect any part-time volunteer fire department that many of us have in our districts?"

Phelps: "This Bill has nothing to do with any volunteer fire department in the state. This is only... pertains to

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

collective bargaining full-time fire departments around the state. Correct."

Dugan: "Okay. And there's nothing in this Bill that prohibits a part-time firefighter from working at another part-time department as they do, we know, all over the state?"

Phelps: "This... 988 does... prohibits the use of... does not prohibit the use of volunteer part-time, paid on call, or contractual firefighters."

Dugan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Phelps: "You're welcome."

Dugan: "To the Bill, Speaker. I just want to say and I know there's been quite a bit of confusion on this legislation 'cause I've talked to the fire chiefs throughout the state and I know that they've come to an agreement with the Amendment. But I want to make it very clear, the only thing that this Bill does is locally in every community we have a fire and police commission. And that fire and police commission makes the rules of what a firefighter, a full-time firefighter, needs to have as far as testing and qualifications in order to work in that community as a full-time firefighter. All this Bill does is to address the issue that if a community wants to have a full-time firefighter in that position, that full-time firefighter has to meet the qualifications of their own police and fire commission. So I know there's been a lot of confusion about what this Bill does, but it does not affect part-time firefighters, it does not affect volunteer departments. All it does is say, local communities set their own qualifications for full-time firefighters and we

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

just want to make sure that those full-time qualifications are met when a local municipality puts a firefighter into a full-time position. So I thank you, Representative, for bringing this Bill forward. And I certainly ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Third Reading. Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

McCarthy: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to welcome the class from Infant Jesus of Prague School who's up in the gallery on the Republican side. They're down here learning about our State Government, and we'd like to give them a warm welcome. We have some over here too, I guess. And Representative Scully and Representative Riley join in that welcome with me. So, thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Moffitt, for what reason do you rise? Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 1360?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1360 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Hannig: "Return that to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Cultra, for

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

what reason do you rise? The Gentleman does not seek recognition. Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative. Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, May 03, 2007, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday, May 07, 2007, in Perfunctory Session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 08, 2007, at 12:00 noon; and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 08, 2007, at 12:00 noon."

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 371, offered by Representative Berrios. House Resolution 372, offered by Representative Smith. House Resolution 373, offered by Representative Scully. And House Resolution 374, offered by Representative Rich Brauer."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can see everybody's kind of turning here, and they're getting ready to leave. I just assume that since we went through that process, we're not going to deal with GRT and the Ameren freeze Bill, right?

Just checking. Just wanted to check."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Ryg."

Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of announcement. We'd like to remind everyone that next week is Capitol Capers. There will be a dress rehearsal at 7:30 p.m. at the Crowne Plaza and we will have another rehearsal prior to the show at 5:30 on Tuesday May 8, again at the Crowne Plaza. Please make sure, if at all possible, that you are there. Thank you."

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

Flider: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Purposes of an announcement."

Speaker Madigan: "State your..."

Flider: "Just want to remind the Members of the House Least Cost Power Procurement Committee that we're going to have a committee meeting at 8:30 a.m. on Tuesday, subject matter only on House Bill 4091 and we're going to have electric generators in the state address that legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention very briefly. We're prepared to adjourn and I wish to announce that today I will send a letter to the Clerk extending the deadline on House Bills until next Thursday at the close of business. Again, today I will

47th Legislative Day

5/3/2007

send a letter to the Clerk extending the deadline for all House Bills on the Calendar until the close of business next Thursday. And for Democrats, on Tuesday morning at 10 a.m. there will be a caucus on health care; 10 a.m., Tuesday morning, caucus on health care. Mr. Clerk, do you have anything further? Nothing. There being nothing further, the Chair recognizes Representative Currie who moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 8, at twelve noon. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 8, at twelve noon providing perfunctory time for the Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. The following Resolutions were referred to the House Committee on Rules. House Resolution 375, offered by Representative Mulligan. Introduction of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4094, offered by Representative Fritchey, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 4095, offered by Representative Lindner, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."