66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 9:00 having arrived, the House will be in order and the Members will be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and pagers. And rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center here in Springfield."
- Pastor Crawford: "May we pray. Most gracious and most kind God the author and the finisher of our faith, You are the giver and sustainer of our lives. We pray that You would bestow Your most precious blessings up on this august body. May You bless its leader. May You bless all of its members and may You bless them to be of a different spirit. May You bless them to be of Your spirit. May You bless them to walk in a spirit of truth, may they walk in a spirit of strength, and may they walk in a spirit of integrity. This we ask in Your Son's name, amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Arroyo, will you lead us in the Pledge."
- Arroyo-et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Hannig: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie. Representative Currie, do we have any excused absences?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Fritchey, Graham, Patterson and Yarbrough are excused today."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Schmitz, Bassi and Coulson are excused today."

"Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 109 Speaker Hannig: Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Clerk, do we have any Committee Reports? So, we are going to start on page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. And for the most part, just go down the list. There are some Bills we know that are... have Amendments and we'll hold them. But I think these Bills have generally been read a second time, so that thought would be if you're prepared, we would move them to Third and just call the Bill. So, that's ...that's the plan. Representative Eddy, you have Senate Bill 184. Out of the record. Representative Osterman on Senate Bill 243. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Golar on Senate Bill 307. Out of the record. Representative Eddy on Senate Bill 417. Senate Bill 417. It's on the Order of Second Reading. Out of the record. Representative Lyons on Senate Bill 434. Do you wish us to read that Bill? 434. Senate Bill 434. Do you wish us to read this? Out of the record. Coladipietro. Representative Coladipietro on Senate Bill 478. Out of the record. Representative Mendoza, you have Senate Bill 677. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 677 has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

offered by Representative Mendoza, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There's an Amendment to this Bill that Representative Lindner will address."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment already passed the House. It's the protocol for mental health courts which was worked on by the Conference of Chief Judges all over the state. It doesn't say you have to have a mental health court, but if you do it's a protocol so that they will all be similar."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further… any further consideration? Then all in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

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

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 677, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 677 allows for a 30 percent fee for collection cost for uncollected fines, fees, cost, restitution or bond forfeiture. This is a legislative proposal that requests an Amendment to the law authorizing the state's attorney to hire collection agencies. Makes the collection fee consistent for all counties. Collection agencies typically operate on a 30 percent basis. So the

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

legislative proposal that we're proposing today is in line with industry standard and practices. Furthermore, it creates the incentive for defaulting defendants to pay. It takes the burden of collection costs off of the taxpayers while giving the State's Attorneys Offices the ability to recoup the costs for collecting unpaid fines, fees, et cetera. The Bill overwhelmingly passed the Senate unopposed then today. I would ask for an 'aye' vote as well."

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

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

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

Mulligan: "What's the genesis of this Bill?"

Mendoza: "The Bill was brought to me by the State's Attorneys Office of DuPage County and is also supported by the Cook County State's Attorneys Offices. They've had issues collecting on their debts and thought that this would be a better way to be able to do so. Allows them a little bit more leeway in collection of those debts and goes ahead and applies a percentage fee rather than a... indeterminate fee which is very difficult to assess on a case-by-case basis."

Mulligan: "What's left in this Bill? Is Mental Health Court

Treatment Act any part of this anymore?"

Mendoza: "Representative, I don't ... I don't know the answer to that question."

Mulligan: "Pardon... you know how to... you don't know how to answer it?

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Mendoza: "I said, I don't know the answer to that question.

What did you ask me?"

Mulligan: "I said, on our analysis it shows that there was Floor Amendment 1 that creates the mental health c..."

Mendoza: "Oh, that's Representative Lindner's Bill that she..."

Mulligan: "All right. And is... is it on there?"

Mendoza: "Yeah, that's... It is. She just... she just put it on."

Mulligan: "Okay. I just... Ya know..."

Mendoza: "It's early in the morning. Yet. No worries."

Mulligan: "It's early in the morning and I'm not watching that.

Okay. And is there anything in any of... when you put fees in like this... We're having a problem in Cook County with cutting the state's attorney and the sheriff's office and everything, is there anything that says any of these fees that are collected cannot be taken in any other way but to be spent for that particular office?"

Mendoza: "No, there is nothing in there that would like raid their fees or take the money away from... any purpose other than what those agencies need it for. So, this is definitely a Bill that I think will help them. Right now, they are losing money from people who aren't paying their debts and this will just allow them a better opportunity to collect."

Mulligan: "All right. So, it goes right to their coffers."

Mendoza: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Mendoza: "Just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- 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? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared Representative Dugan, you have Senate Bill 620 and I'm advised that the Amendment is on the floor. No. Okay. Out of the record. Representative Krause on Senate Bill 689. Out of the record. Representative Verschoore, on page 12 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 778. Do you to read that Bill? Out of the record. Representative Brosnahan on Senate Bill 826. Out of the record. Representative Sullivan on Senate Bill 1014. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Shall we move this to Third? Representative, shall we move this it Third and call it? Okay. Third Reading. And Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the exact same Bill that we passed out of the House. Unfortunately, because of time constraints, it

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

was held in Senate Rules and they sent it back identical to how we passed it out on Senate Bill 1014. This is a Bill that establishes three (3) pilot programs to combat gang violence. The pilot programs will be in Lake County, Cook County and down in Vermilion County. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. And in response, Representative Sacia."

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

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

Sacia: "Representative Sullivan, it says here that this will be created from... the exact words are 'from moneys available'.

When did the Illinois State Police have any money available?"

Sullivan: "We're hoping that they will. This... normally, I would not run legislation like this or subject to appropriations like this, but the Governor's Office has asked us to include this. They hope to have line items available for this. We also say moneys available' because we don't specify a dollar amount; we specify percentages of monies available in case there is any federal grants and such."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "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 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Three-fifths Supermajority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

- Colvin: "Mr. Speaker, visiting Springfield today is a class of students from Overton School in Chicago. Please give them a Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Jefferson, you have Senate Bill 1290. Do you wish us to read that? Out of the record. Representative Nekritz on Senate Bill 1305. Out of the record. Representative Washington on Senate Bill 1318.

  Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Second... Senate Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Hannig: "Shall we move it to Third, Representative and call the Bill? Okay. Third Reading. And Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. Senate Bill 1318 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code providing that disability license plates and parking decals and devices are not, are not transferable from person to person and provides specific penalties for violation. It is a violation to park in the space reserved for a person with disabilities if the authorized holder of a disability

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

license plate or parking decal or device does not enter or exit the vehicle at the time the special parking privileges are being used. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. And I am open for any questions from the floor."

"Is there any discussion? Then the question Speaker Hannig: 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 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Graham on Senate Bill 1397. The Amendment's in Rules, so we will take it out of the Representative Mendoza on Senate Bill 1409. record. Representative Mendoza. Okay. Out of the record. Okav. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 597."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 597, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia"

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 593 (sic-597) creates a National Guard Veterans' Exposure to Hazardous Materials Act, which detects (sic-designates) the Adjutant General to assist Illinois National Guard members who have been exposed to depleted uranium while actively... activated to seek federal treatment services. Also, creates a task force. In committee, the reason for the Amendment, is that

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Representative Osmond asked me why there were only one (1) Minority Leader appointment and one (1) Minority Leader in the Senate appointment, so we changed that. So I think we have full agreement on the Republican side to go forth with the Bill. I'll take any questions. Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 597, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "I would just recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Saviano, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1366. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1366, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 have been approved for

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

consideration. Floor Amendment #4 is sponsored by Representative Holbrook."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment 4 was made at the request... it becomes the Bill. It incorporates House Amendments 1 and 3 and makes many requests by people like Cargill and Caterpillar that make huge purchases over fifteen hundred (1500) KW exempt from this Bill since they are their own agent. We... they asked to be exempted and we did that. If you remember in House Amendment #1 we also did the same for the University of Illinois and universities that are under the same situation. I'd ask to adopt on this Bill... this Amendment."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook on the Amendment."

Holbrook: "In addition, we made changes that the ICC had requested to include criminal background checks on the honesty and fair dealing of the people. And set up as the ICC had requested an expiration of April 30 on each of the renewal orders on these licensures. These were all done at their request and I am not aware of any opposition to either of those that are all incorporated in Amendment #4."

Speaker Hannig: "And on the Amendment, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a quick question?"

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

Rose: "Tom, our analysis indicates that this incorporates previous language and one of the previous Amendments dealt with exemptions for universities. Our analysis

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

specifically indicates University of Illinois, but I represent Eastern Illinois University. I want to make sure that it is all universities and not just limited to the University of Illinois. That... and I..."

Holbrook: "My analysis says... yes, my analysis says. it initiates for the University of Illinois and other the state universities supply their own powers and buildings and campuses. That's my analysis. I could dig it out of the language. If you would like, I will pull it out of the record."

Rose: "Tell you what, I know we're going to go on and have more debate on this. Maybe you got… I'll ask our staff person to check and we'll get the answer."

Holbrook: "Okay. I'd be happy to. And if not, I'll... when it hits Third, I will hold it."

Rose: "Okay."

Holbrook: "And we'll get our staff to make sure that wording is still there just as you requested."

Rose: Thanks, Tom."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Holbrook."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you. House Amendment #5 makes many, many concessions to the agents, brokers and consultants. It no longer requires an audited financial statement, only a verified one, which is a simple statement of sign-off. It

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

does require that they not represent themselves as independent or unaffiliated if they are not independent or unaffiliated and it makes them disclose their fees. We've dropped out a lot of the programs on their contracts that they have out of this for them. We've made numerous changes for them in this Amendment. And I would take any questions. I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

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

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

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "If we could hold this for a minute, meet Representative Rose's concerns. Representative Rose, are you happy with the language? You're okay with it now? He represents he is okay. I'd like to request an 'aye' vote. This is a good consumer Bill that makes the agents, brokers, and consultants be licensed through the ICC make criminal background checks. It has made major reductions for the agents and brokers on part of what they may feel are some burdens and regulations on reporting and I am more than willing to work with them in the future on this issue in a trailer Bill if needed. But it's something that's needed in this environment of agents and brokers and consultants and the new world we're in, in this unregulated market."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "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 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"

Phelps: "A point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Behind me in the gallery I would like for all of you to help me welcome to Springfield our newly elected mayor for the City of Harrisburg, Mayor Valerie Rose Mitchell, her daughter, Crystal and son, Carl. Welcome to Springfield. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hernandez, you have Senate Bill 1446. Out of the record. Representative Gordon, you have Senate Bill 1509. Do you wish us to read that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1509, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1509, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 1509 clears up a.m. clears up an inconsistency in the

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Registration Code. It provides that when a sex offender is... is registered and has been convicted of his offense but then commits another nonsex offense and goes back to the Department of Corrections, that the tolling... that the period of registration does not continue. It stops when he goes back in... being incarcerated and then starts again after he's released from the Department of Corrections on the nonsex offense. It is so that when they are sentenced to ten (10) years of registration that ten (10) actual years of registration are served. It's a matter of safety for the community and also to make sure that our registration laws are consistent throughout the statues, whether it has to do with this or some inconsistencies that we cleared up last year regarding the SVP and SDP laws. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Lindner."

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

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

Lindner: "Representative, will the person, though, in fact, still be on the sex offender registration?"

Gordon: "What... what'll happen is when they go back into the Department of Corrections, we'll know where they are. So, they'll be listed as an inmate in the Department of Corrections. Because on the... according to the laws of registration, they register with the municipality where they live and that police department or county sheriff's office's is responsible for them. So, if they're not registered with any county sheriff, then they're not going to be on the sex offender list. They'll be... said where

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- they are based upon being an inmate in the Department of Corrections."
- Lindner: "So, when... if they are out and they are getting services, like counseling or something like that, then those services will be terminated also or would they get those same services in the Department of Corrections?"
- Gordon: "It depends on where... it depends on unquestionably on the offense that they commit. I mean, whether they commit... if they are going back in on a Class IV felony versus a Class X murder or an armed robbery, it all depends on the facility that they are sent to by Corrections and the new offense. We can't control that."
- Lindner: "All right. Then... but when they get out, they... will have to register again wherever they live and then will they... be able to get the services again?"
- Gordon: "If the services are available in the area and also based upon the recommendations of mandatory supervised relief and the expansion that you have been very, very good about supporting and the ones that you brought forth in front of our committee, the ones that are out there, absolutely."
- Lindner: "Okay. But the main point is that we want these people to be on the sex offender registration for the time that they are supposed to be when they are out. And so, we are not going to count that time when they are in prison."
- Gordon: "Exactly. Because right now, as the law stands, they could be sentenced to twelve (12) years, go back in and never serve any registration time at all when they are out of custody."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Lindner: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Your 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 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. On Senate Bill 1366 I would like the record to reflect that I would preferred to have been voted 'no'."

Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect your intentions.

Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1424."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1424, the Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1424, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1425 (sic-1424) will amend the Private Detective, Private Alarm, Private Security and Locksmith Act. This is agreed language with the Department of Professional Regulation and Registration. And I ask for

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

passage of Senate Bill 1424. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes' and 30 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 36 of the Calendar, under Motions in Writing, we're going to take all the Motions to Table, just the Motions to Table together, on one Roll Call. includes Representative Eddy on House Bill Representative Jakobsson on House Bill 313, Representative Rose on House Bill 1118, Representative Eddy on House Bill 1652, Representative May on House Bill 2163, Representative Rose on House Bill 3608, Representative Rose on House Bill 3616, Representative Froehlich on House Resolution 117, House Resolution 124 by Representative Chapa LaVia, Representative Riley on Senate Bill 270 and Representative Riley on Senate Bill 433. And Representative Black has a Motion to Table Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2949. All in favor of the Motions say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And the Bills, Amendments, and Resolutions are tabled. We will move to Senate Bills-Third Reading on page 6 of the Calendar. Representative Feigenholtz, you have Senate Bill 68. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 68, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 68 is similar to a Bill that the House passed out and got to the Senate a little late. It addresses the issue of gap payments. When a child who was adopted or is in foster care loses a guardian to death, what the Bill does is essentially have the money follow that child until that child is readopted. The second portion of the Bill is a Bill that I am working on or have been working on with the Illinois... the Chicago Bar Association that addresses the issue of an adoption that is already... that has just yet to be finalized and the intent is to enter a full judgment of adoption not just for the purpose of a name change but to actually finalize that adoption. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 have voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin on Senate Bill 124. Do you wish us to read this? Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on Senate Bill 266. Out of the record. Representative Mautino on Senate Bill

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- 484. Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino on 484. Shall we read this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 484, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was trying to get my computer up and running here. Senate Bill 484 is a rewrite in the Insurance Code which just clarifies the notice requirement. For the past few years there have been some conflicting opinions about what the statute says. There's no substantive change within it. It just says, basically, if you are going to non-renew a policy, you have to do it within the sixty (60) days. You have to give that prior notice. If there is going to be a material change where there is going to be a premium increase or a deductible change, you have to give them also the notice within that sixty (60) days. If you go beyond that point then the policy would have to be extended. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This Bill requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Holbrook, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz on

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Senate Bill 526. Representative Feigenholtz, 526, do you wish us to read this Bill? Do you wish us to return it to Third Reading or I mean to Second? Why don't we return it to Second Reading? So, Mr. Clerk, return the Bill to Second Reading. And are there any Amendments?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted.

  Floor Amendment #3 remains in committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Well, Representative, we should probably wait for your Amendment to come out of Rules. Okay? Is that what your intent... Do you wish to call the Bill? So, Mr. Clerk, again, what is the status of the Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted.

  Floor Amendment #3 remains in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, if you wish for Amendment 3 to be on the Bill, we have to wait or we can call the Bill as it is. That's the choices today. Okay. So we'll wait and take it out of the record. So, out of the record. Representative Feigenholtz on 528. Do you wish us to read that? Okay. Representative Brosnahan on Senate Bill 546. Out of the record. Representative Saviano on Senate Bill 573. Out of the record. Representative Franks on Senate Bill 662. Out of the record. Representative Coulson on Senate Bill 671. Out of the record. Representative Winters. Out of the record. Representative Winters. Out of the record. Representative Crespo on Senate Bill 796. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 796, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crespo."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 796 amends the Illinois Income Tax Act. It creates a tax check-off for the Lung Cancer Research Fund and authorizes the Illinois Department of Public Health to provide grants for lung cancer research. This Bill passed out of the House, as House Bill 2472, went to the Senate. It didn't make it on time, so they sent it back as Senate Bill 796. And I ask for your 'aye' votes, once again."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. And Representative Crespo on Senate Bill 833. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 833, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 833 basically impacts the Board of Trustees for the Fox River Water Reclamation District and the Northern Moraine Wastewater Reclamation District, as well. Basically, what it does for the Fox River District it pretty much provides that no more than 3 of the 5 members belong to the same Party. And for the Northern Moraine, it increases its membership from 3 to 5. I also want to take the

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

opportunity to thank Representative Mark Beaubien for his help on this matter. He is my new friend, right now."

- Speaker Hannig: "This Bill requires 71 votes. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Durkin and Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes' and 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps on Senate Bill 834. Representative Phelps, 834. Do you wish us to read this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 834, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 834 is the Bill that came before us for the Associated Firefighters of Illinois. This is the same Bill as House Bill 988. So, I think you all know the Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "... requires 60 votes. Does anyone stand in response? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All is 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... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes' and 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Myers, for what reason do you rise?"
- Myers: "Mr. Speaker, my switch did not work and had it worked,

  I would have voted 'no'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect. And Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that on the 31st of May, last evening, on House Bill... or, excuse me, on Senate Bill 715, I inadvertently had hit the 'yes' button and I had intended to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 715."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect your intentions, Representative Black. Representative Nekritz on Senate Bill 873. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 873, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 873 is almost identical to House Bill 148 that went over to the Senate and didn't come back. It allows disabled citizens in the State of Illinois access to Medicare supplemental insurance. The Bill has been changed; however, and it's now... it's... I believe, there is no opposition to it at all now. It allows those disabled citizens who are on Medicare to purchase the Medicare supplement policies at an actuarially accurately determined rate. Before we had said it had to be at the lowest rate offered for Medicare supplement insurance. This allows that insurance companies

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

to review the disabled person's medical history and charge an actuarially accurate rate. I ask for your support."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on Short Debate. And in response, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

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

Franks: "Representative, you indicated that the Bill has changed. Was there any Amendments or was it just because it's the… a Senate Bill that it has the change?"

Nekritz: "It was the Senate Bill that included the change."

Franks: "And could you tell me what the change... again, is? You said it was a minor one?"

Nekritz: "It actually makes it... it removed the opposition of the insurance companies. Previously, the Bill required that the insurance companies offer the Medicare supplement to a disabled individual at the lowest rate that they offer it... these policies in the state. This allows them to do an actuarial review of that person's medical history and determine the rate based on that. It still has to be within the range of rates offered for other Medicare supplements. So, it's still cheaper for a disabled person to get it under this then it would be under... if we had... it we did not have this law."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Lady's Bill. Actually, I had this legislation last year and as we had drafted it the largest opponent to the

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Bill became the AARP people because what it did in effect was raise the rates of the premium insurance for all of the seniors to reflect the higher cost of the individuals who are not 65 at that time. And so, that's why it wasn't called last year. The Representatives worked with those groups and provide an actuarial basis and from that it will not cause a higher impact on everyone's rates but will allow those with disabilities to purchase supplemental insurance and it's a very good Bill. And it's much better than the form I had it in last year."

- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All is favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, Representative Ford, you have Senate Bill Senate Bill... 929. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 929, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Before we start on this, Representative Molaro, for what reason do you rise?"
- Molaro: "Well, I was just asking and maybe it's for the Body and even myself. Out of the last six (6) Bills some needed 71 and some needed 60. Can you just explain why it's 60, why it's 71, so we have clarity on that?"

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "Representative, if there is an immediate effective date, they'll require 71 votes. If there is no immediate effective date, they require 60 votes."
- Molaro: "And by no immediate effect date, is there any effective date in there whatsoever or...?"
- Speaker Hannig: "That means that the Bill is silent. And then the underlying statutes, the existing statues determine when the Bills become effective, not the Bill itself."
- Molaro: "I don't know what you mean by existing statutes?"
- Speaker Hannig: "So, it's real simple, Representative. Either the Bill says an effective date, effective immediately, effective June 3 or it's silent. If it's silent, it's 60 votes. If it's states a date certain, then it takes 71."
- Molaro: "And last question. If it's silent and it only gets 60 votes, right. And we say it's passed and it's a law that becomes law, I guess, when would it then become effective? I mean, when would it become the law of the State of Illinois? Since we are declaring it passed, if the Governor signs it, when does it become law, if it's silent?"
- Speaker Hannig: "So, it becomes... there's an underlying statute that regulates this, Representative. And I don't pretend to know it..."

Molaro: "Okay."

Speaker Hannig: "... but it basically says that when it becomes law. For our purposes it either has an effective date or it doesn't."

Molaro: "Thank you."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "So, now. Sorry. Representative Ford, proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 929 is a reenactment of House Bill 980, nothing has changed about this Bill. It's just been incorporated into Senate Bill 929. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin on Senate Bill 996. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 996, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have here for your consideration Senate Bill 996, which states that a resident judge elected from a subcircuit after January 1 of 2008, must maintain residency as a registered voter in the subcircuit to run for retention from the circuit at large thereafter. This Bill and in particular the Amendment to the Bill that I just read, deals with the issue of judges, particularly in my county, Cook County, who run for judge in particular subcircuits from different communities around the state; indeed, around the county and once elected, picking up

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

residency and moving to different areas of the county beyond from which those communities from which they ran. When we first presented this Bill here in the House, it did not... the language here is a little different from the Bill that passed out of the Senate initially, with respect to some opposition and concerns from a number of downstate judges, whom I met with and the Amendment that I just read as a result of those conversations which removes them from some of the concerns that they had. In a lot of the downstate areas, judges run from a particular county but they sit on benches from counties all around... neighboring counties all around their home county. As a result, they were concerned about individuals who vote for them in different counties where they serve but people may not have an opportunity to vote for them. Well, this Amendment removes them from this language and it has since removed the opposition to this Bill. I've worked with Cook County Commissioner Larry Suffredin, who is very involved in the Chicago Bar Association, who helped craft that Amendment... this agreement, which also removed the opposition of the Chicago Bar Association who are very instrumental in the rating of judges, judicial candidates. Additionally, this would not affect any judge who has been elected prior to January 1, 2008. So it literally grandfathers all of those sitting judges across the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions about the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We are going to put this on Standard Debate. And Representative Molaro, you're recognized for 5 minutes."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Molaro: "Thank you. It will be real quick. Just to make clear, I think it's a good Bill to keep people... to keep the judges there; however, let's talk about the people who are already judges. You know the old theory about changing the rules. So, in other words, the judge has left the subcircuit, now he is going to run for retention in two (2) years, right. Let's say he is going to run. He gets to run countywide, is that correct?"

Colvin: "That's correct. Yes."

Molaro: "All right now, fast forward six (6) years from that time. Since he was elected prior to this Bill, he will always run for retention countywide?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Molaro: "That's all I want to know. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Mathias: "Just a follow-up question to Representative Molaro's question. For any new judge after July 1 of 2008, elected after that date. I'm sorry, January 1 of 2008, will they... must they run... reside in their... in their..."

Colvin: "In the subcircuit from which they ran."

Mathias: "...for sub... for retention."

Colvin: "Correct."

Mathias: "And what about where... would they be running for retention only in the subcircuit or countywide?"

Colvin: "No, and that's the question that Molaro asked..."

Mathias: "Oh."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Colvin: "...to clarify that issue. No, they would still be running circuit wide, like every judge does currently in every election. Not just the circuit, but they would run countywide. So, in Cook County a judge who is elected in subcircuit, under this legislation, would be required to maintain residence from which the residence they are a registered voter but in... come 2014 the first time they run for retention they would run countywide."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos."

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

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

"Representative Colvin, I've had questions about these types of Bills that have appeared before. As you know, I know something about judges and really my question is, what is, in your estimation, the public policy behind this? And let me tell you why I am asking that question. We run from a district as Legislators. Aldermen run from a ward as aldermen. They are expected to represent, on some level, the interests of the people from where they are elected. But judges are there to uphold the law. They don't represent a specific constituency, in fact, they shouldn't represent a constituency. I would maintain that if you are elected from the North Shore, which is part of my district, you shouldn't become a judge and represent the interests of people in the North Shore, you should be just as open and open-minded about representing the interests of the people on the west side of Chicago, south of Chicago, the entire county. So, I do think of judges as different than

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Legislators, in terms of why they are there and what they are... what their mission is once they get on the bench. So, I'm trying to understand the countervailing public policy behind a law like this."

"Representative... Representative, I appreciate the Colvin: question. And in all due respect, I think you're changing clearly what... how this... what is in this Bill, in terms of representation. That is not a part of this issue at all. This deals with residency, in terms of, in my belief and in practices that I've seen and probably you have too and I am certain your husband is aware of a lot of the tricks and games and the pretense under which people run for a judge. Everything from name changes, to address changes, all for the purpose of getting elected to judge. This Bill has absolutely nothing to do with representation of particular section of the county in which you are elected. I would argue that a judge elected on the bench who runs, who will run for retention countywide, representing the law of the land, the laws that we pass, is not subverted in any way in this legislation. This deals with, I think, a lot of the tricks and the gamesmanship that go on with respect to electing judges, particularly in the subcircuits that we The intent, the original intent, Representative Younge and Representative Paul Williams who worked on the original language of the subcircuits, is that we would have a diversity on the bench, not just of race and sex, but of geography. That we would elect judges from across the Prior to the subcircuits in Cook County, selection of judges were very highly politicized. I know

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

that and I know your husband knows that. This... the subcircuit language was put in so that we could begin to break that up a little bit. This Bill, I guess, this Bill extends that point even further so that we have some requirements, that individuals who come from particular areas of Cook County in particular, my county, come from particular area, that we are electing judges who represent a wide geography of the land. It has nothing to do how they interpret the law and for whom they interpret the law. I think Representative Ford asked a very insightful question, in committee, when he talked about a judge who would be elected from his district on the west side of Chicago and face the case where maybe a young man who lived right down the street from him. Well, I think the honest answer to that, like any judge, if it was someone who came before your husband, is that he would recuse himself from hearing the case for obvious biases. I think those incidences happen in the courts already. So, I don't think in any way the intent of this Bill speaks to the original intent of the subcircuits. And that's what we are trying to accomplish here, clearly, openly, and honestly."

Hamos: "Well, I am satisfied with that answer. I think that I was looking for some policy justification for doing this. I still worry as to whether this would pass constitutional muster impacting on, I don't know, the right to travel."

Colvin: "And in all truthfulness..."

Hamos: "I think that has to be tested probably later on."

Colvin: "In all truthfulness, I think that issue was..."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Representative, your time has expired. Could you bring your remarks to a close? Did you wish, Representative Colvin, why don't you finish answering the question, Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "That issue was discussed and debated in committee and quite frankly, some of the lawyers who testified from the state... a lawyer who testified from the State Board of Elections as well as Larry Suffredin admitted that maybe it would not stand muster. But the real issue is, would it be challenged, and under what circumstances would it be challenged. Perhaps in some specific instance where some judge or someone running for retention felt that this was unjust would maybe challenge it. But I think in terms of what we're trying to accomplish, going back to the original subcircuit Bill, many folks thought that that perhaps would be challenged constitutionally, as well. It wasn't, but in terms of what we are trying to accomplish here, I think it speaks to the spirit of the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So we had one (1) in support and three (3) in response or opposition. We're going to move this to Extended Debate which would provide for an additional two (2) speakers on each side, since it seems like a number of Members would like to debate the Bill. So, Representative Bost, you're next for 5 minutes. Do you know which side you'd like to be on?"

Bost: "I'd like to ask questions if I could, Representative... or Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Certain... certainly, proceed."

Bost: "Representative, now... now the Amendment that you put on..."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Colvin: "Yes."

Bost: "...that does take out all counties or all the southern end of the state where we had the problems that existed with the judges there, where we have the multicounty circuits."

Colvin: "Correct. In fact, I would like to thank the Downstate Judges Association that graciously came into my office and voiced their concerns. And we worked with them, showed them this language at which they agreed to and removed their opposition."

Bost: "Yeah. And I just wanted to rise and thank you for doing that. When that was first brought up it was a concern to all of us as downstaters that have multicounties and do rise in support of your legislation."

Colvin: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure what side I'm on. I just have some questions that I wanted to ask. I think I agree with you. I noticed on our analysis that the Attorney General has issued an opinion last December stating that the General Assembly cannot legislate this?"

Colvin: "We can't legislate and I am not a lawyer here. What this Bill does it... what we are legislating here is part of the Election Code, which the General Assembly has a full right to do so, in terms of judges running circuit wide and those items, in the way the Bill was originally drafted was some concerns to that respect. But what we are attempting to let... what we are legislating here, the General Assembly has every right and intention to do so, under the Election Code."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Mulligan: "Okay. So, no matter where a judge lives once he currently, once you come from a certain subcircuit where you initially were elected, say you served for twenty-odd years and you may have moved, when you retire the vacancy still goes back to the subcircuit you were elected from?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "But in the meantime, they may not have lived there. So, I don't think it's an issue of do you reflect the people that you represent. I think it was more of an issue, originally, when they set up the subcircuits to kind of divide up geographically because it had gotten political as to who was elected and then in some instances who was appointed and it was kind of to divide it up amongst everyone so there were judges and opportunities from a variety of areas, at least in our area, that was Cook County."

Colvin: "That's exactly correct. In fact your argument, I think, speaks to the very point of what we are trying to do here. A judge who may be elected from my subcircuit from the southside of Chicago, the first subcircuit of Cook County, could get elected and then move to Lake Forest. Quit the bench, but wouldn't run from Lake Forest, would run again from the first subcircuit."

Mulligan: "Or you could move if you knew someone was going to retire shortly and you wanted to be the one that got that position just as..."

Colvin: "Can move into my district and then move back into a house..."

Mulligan: "Right."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Colvin: "...that they never sell in Lake Forest and become a judge and sit on the bench. That's correct."

Mulligan: "Plus, elected judges in our area sometimes do other things. They... they help counsel when we have peer juries or they help counsel... they come out and speak at events on drug courts and things that they just... I can see where you are going with this and I understand. The only thing I... my understanding was that no matter where you moved or whatever happened, when you retired or you moved on that subcircuit position was still elected from where you were elected. So, you still get that, but I can see where you would think it was fair. Just because you know somebody is retiring three years from now, you move into your area take up one of the slots that you think one of the people in your area should be running for then they move back. That would be very unfair, so I could see why you are doing And it seems also from our analysis that the this. Illinois Constitution kind of backs you up. So, you are just trying to put this in law in another spot?"

Colvin: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that last point... that last part?"

Mulligan: "It seemed to me that the Illinois Constitution... from our analysis the Illinois Constitution backs up where you're going on this."

Colvin: "It does. And again... yeah."

Mulligan: "So, you could make the argument that they have to do this anyway, you're just trying to put in Illinois law?"

Colvin: "I didn't... I didn't hear you there, hon."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Mulligan: "I said, I think you could make the argument that they have to do this anyway, but you're trying to put it in Illinois law to have it enforced by the Election Board or...?"

Colvin: "That's another way of saying it, indeed, in terms or what we're trying to codify here."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think... the problem that is arisen and clearly it's more of a problem in Cook County is that, in fact, judges are moving out of there subcircuits. And so the Gentleman has a Bill to address a problem that does exist and I think is not address in the Illinois Constitution. And to go back to his discussion of the... of poli... the discussion of the policy behind this, we want our judiciary to reflect the citizenry in terms of its gender makeup, its racial makeup, its ethnic makeup and it's also in its diversity of experience and by having judges that are elected from around the county and who reside in different neighborhoods and have different experiences, they can... they we all they are... we all bring our life experience to our jobs. We do that here and the judiciary does that as well. So, it's important, I think, to have that diversity of experience and to allow judges to move out of those neighborhoods and to maybe even all combine into one (1) neighborhood where they don't have that diversity of experience, is not good public policy. while... so I think that the Gentleman's Bill is really ... the goal of it is... is excellent in assuring that the judiciary

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

maintains that diversity of experience so that we can make sure that when people bring their... their cases before a judge, that they have a chance of having someone who looks like them and thinks like them. I'd urge your 'aye' ...your support."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Wait."

Wait: "Thank you. Mr. ...Representative Colvin, I represent the Winnebago, Boone County area, and as you know, we're going to have subcircuits and they're new to our area. And I apologize if I ask the same questions, maybe somebody else asked because it is very hard to hear back here. First of all, on a sub-circuit, do you have to live in the subcircuit when you're first elected?"

Colvin: "Yes, because you run in a subcircuit and one of the requirements is your residence."

Wait: "Do you just have to live when you file or do you have to be there, like we have to be there eighteen (18) months or before we even file?"

Colvin: "You know... and I know that with new subcircuits that you have, you know, I couldn't be a hundred percent certain either way in answering that question. I'd hate to put something in the record that would be untrue, in terms of whether or not... I mean, it almost sounds like the question you are asking like after a remap, do you have a certain amount of time to run in a particular district and then if you win, do you have to move into it."

Wait: "Right."

Colvin: "I may not be the one to specifically answer that question. Given that this Bill is... needs concurrence in

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

the Senate, it might be a better question to address at that time before it reaches concurrence in the Senate, but... but I couldn't as a... as part of the Election Code, I couldn't tell you about the new subcircuits in Winnebago County. It does say, of course, you have to retain residency. So, I would suspect that at some point that you would have to move into the subcircuit to run. Now, in Cook County, in subcircuit 1 where I live, you couldn't file if you lived in subcircuit 2, I mean, you would just be kicked off the ballot. I assume that the law being consistent that would mean the same thing. As a new subcircuit, though, I couldn't tell you, you would have to be there. I could tell you, you have to be there prior to the election."

Wait: "Okay. And then, is that correct... is that correct, you do have to live there the whole time that you are a subcircuit judge or can you move out and then when you have to come up for election again then you can move back in again?"

Colvin: "No, no, you could do that. That would be against the law. That would be against what we are doing, both the letter and the spirit of the law."

Wait: "So... so, you would have to live in the district continuously and you would have to be there when you're reelected."

Colvin: "Correct."

Wait: "And are these four year terms or six year terms?"

Colvin: "Six year terms."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Wait: "And then do you run for retention, rather than running all over, like you do, and you need 60 percent of the votes then to be retained?"

Colvin: "You need 60 percent of the vote of the entire circuit.

Again, to the question that Bob Molaro asked, to clarify exactly that issue, you run circuit wide, which means would run across Winnebago County, I'm assuming."

Wait: "Okay."

Colvin: "That would be in the entire circuit."

Wait: "Okay. The first time you just run in the subcircuit, but when you run retention you run in the whole circuit that would be Boone and Winnebago County in our district."

Colvin: "Yeah, that exists... that exists prior to this law.

That's correct."

Wait: "Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification."

Colvin: "You're welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "We've had three (3) in favor and five (5) in response. So the rules will provide for two (2) additional speakers in support. Representative Pritchard, would you like to rise in support?"

Pritchard: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Proceed."

Pritchard: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Pritchard: "Representative, in committee we had some discussion around the Supreme Court decision that seemed to cast some shadow over this whole notion of requiring judges to reside in the subcircuit. Could you speak to that issue?"

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

"I think the issue that came up, and not being a lawyer, I think the issue dealing with constitutionality is whether or not we were creating an environment where there was a different standard for different... for judges. with respect to what we are trying to accomplish here, and I think there were two (2) points that were brought up. One (1) is that we were making a change in the Election Code, which the General Assembly has the right to do. issue of constitutionality that arose dealt with whether or not we were creating a different standard with respect to judges being retained. What I think removed the opposition of the judges is that it didn't ... it did not ... it did not change how they ran for retention. In other words, every judge that's elected whether it be from a full circuit or a subcircuit, runs circuit wide. The downstate judges who serve... may sit in one county but may sit on benches in several counties in a circuit were concerned that they would only be running from one (1) county. This Bill... this... in particular, the Amendment does not subvert that at all. Having that there be no subcircuits in a lot of these downstate circuits anyway, this literally removes them from this language. In fact, for a judge elected either before or after January 1, '08, it would create no different standard for a judge who runs in a multicounty circuit."

Pritchard: "Correct. So, it takes effect in what year?"

Colvin: "In January 1, 2008."

Pritchard: "In 2008, so then the retention would be six (6) years later or 2014?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Pritchard: "So, that's when we are really talking about and...
and I thought that it was a rather unique approach in your
Amendment on this and working around the whole question of
residency, in that, this Bill then requires the judge to
hold voter registration within the subcircuit, is that
correct?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very creative way of dealing with a contentious issue that the Attorney General has flagged as well as has the Supreme Court case. And I compliment the Sponsor for working on a resolution."

Speaker Hannig: "So we have one position left and Representative Scully that would be a position in support. Would you like to rise in support?"

Scully: "Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this. I think it's going to make retention very, very difficult for anyone to achieve."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So Representative Colvin to close."

Colvin: "I appreciate the last speaker's position but quite frankly, a judge who runs for retention, come 2014, who would have been elected after January 1 of 2008, would run for retention the same way any judge will. Once that judge is successful in getting on the bench, he will hear cases from triers of fact across the gamut, depending on what bench he sits on. I don't think it will create any different standard from any other judge who runs on retention. This Bill mandates, or continues to mandate, that judges are run for retention in a subcircuit

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

countywide or in a multi-jurisdictional countywide situation, as you have many judges from downstate. It creates no different standard with respect to retention. I would appreciate those individuals who believe that subcircuits, for what they intended to do, is to create diversity in the bench. And I think Elaine Nekritz said it very well, when she talked about diversity, in terms of color, sex, age, and geography. This Bill simply helps us to further codify that diversity. And I would appreciate everyone who believes in what the subcircuits where meant to accomplish, see what we're trying to do here and vote 'yes'. Thank you very much."

Speaker Hannig: "This requires 71 votes. And so the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Munson, Mitchell, Feigenholtz. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'yes' and 32 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Osterman, do you wish to... for us to read 1007? Senate Bill 1007. Okay. Out of the record. Representative... Representative Acevedo, for what reason do you rise?"

Acevedo: "Speaker, on that last vote... I was... my button was pressed as 'no'. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."

Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect. Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on our Roll Call earlier today, we'd like for Representative Durkin also to be excused. And that was not mentioned into the record. And I'd like that..."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. And so, we will put that in the record and have the Clerk lock the switch. Representative Berrios on Senate Bill 1011. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Berrios."
- Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1011 is the same exact Bill that was House Bill 810. It increases the value of a prize in a crane game. You know the one that you put like fifty cents (\$.50) in and the claw goes and picks up the prize. All we are doing is, usually you get a really cheap prize that's usually worth about a buck fifty (\$1.50). So we are changing it so that it will now be more than twenty-five dollars (\$25) of a prize. I'd ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady asks for the passage of Senate Bill 1011. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman, Golar, Brauer, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes' and 43 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Smith,

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- you have Senate Bill 1174. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman on 1265. Out of the record. Representative Hamos on Senate Bill 1296. Out of the record. Representative Mautino. Oh, I am sorry, I didn't see you, Julie. Mr. Clerk, read... read Senate Bill 1296."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brauer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Brauer: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't hit my button quick enough before you took the roll. Please record me as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect. Representative Hamos."
- Hamos: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that has to do with joint and several liabilities. And I thought I would wait 'til today to call it. Oh, just kidding. Take it out of the record."
- Speaker Hannig: "Out of the record. Representative Kosel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Kosel: "A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Hannig: "State your point."
- Kosel: "I would like to announce to the Body, many of you know Kent Gaffney from our staff and Elizabeth his wife, who used to lobby for Governor Edgar. This morning at 8:00 they had a baby boy, 6 pounds 9 ounces. Still to be named."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Mautino on Senate Bill 1400.

  Representative Mautino? Out of the record. Representative

  Munson on Senate Bill 1487. Representative Munson? Okay.

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Representative Munson, I'm advised there is a Floor Amendment. I'm advised there is a Floor Amendment. Did you... I'm advised there is a Floor Amendment that's out. Do you wish us to adopt the Amendment and call the Bill? It's Out of the record. Okay. your call. Representative Colvin on Senate Bill 1511. Out of the record. Representative Poe on Senate Bill 1568. Representative Representative, the Clerk advises me that the Amendments are out. So, do you wish us... so let's move the Bill back to Second. And Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendments 1 and 2, offered by Representative Poe, have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "So, Representative Poe on Amendment #1, what's your pleasure?"
- Poe: "Yeah. We want a vote... a 'yes' vote on 1 and ask for the Mid-Illinois Medical District."
- Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. And now, Mr. Poe on Amendment #2."
- Poe: "Yeah. What that does is that it puts some language in there that makes the Mid-Illinois Medical District a training district so that there'll be provisions for training programs and research in the surrounding areas."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

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

Speaker Hannig: "Do you wish to hold the Bill or advance the Bill, Representative? Okay. Third Reading. And is this in the form that you wish to call it, Representative Poe?"

Poe: "Yes."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1568, a Bill for an Act concerning forest preserve districts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "If only we... and the legislation went through the House that the Springfield Medical District and what we would like to do is make it more of a central Illinois existence and it's going to be called the Mid-Illinois Medical District. It lists about eight (8) counties. The surrounding counties of Sangamon County that would be in this district and the Governor would be able to make two (2) more appointments to the board so that at the end of the day the Governor would have six (6) appointments, the mayor of Springfield four (4) appointments and Sangamon County Board Chairman would have one (1) appointment. And at this time, I know of no opposition and ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Representative Younge."

Younge: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman will yield."

Younge: "What are the eight (8) counties that would be a part of the district?"

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Poe: "Give me just a minute here. Okay. They're Cass County, Christian, Logan, Macoupin, Mason, Menard, Montgomery County, Morgan County and Sangamon County and Scott."

Younge: "Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the ques... the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, we are going to return to Senate Bill 1487. And now, we're going to return that to the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. And are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1 was adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Munson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson."
- Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment 2 becomes the Bill. And it creates the Identity Protection Act. It's the same Bill we passed out of here, House Bill 573, earlier this year."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the 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. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act concerning

insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Munson."

Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this Bill creates the Identity Protection Act. We passed it out earlier this year and it is designed to help protect the Social Security numbers of the residents of Illinois when the State or local Government possesses it. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1487. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reboletti and Myers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills—Third Reading, is Senate Bill 461. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 461, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Member of the House. This comes from the Chicago Bar Association. It's a fairly technical Bill. And it is supported by the state bar, Property Lawyers Association, Tax Buyers and the Cook County Sheriff. Essentially, what it does is expand the

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

time period during which people can by notified that their taxes might by sold, which gives people more opportunity to make sure that they aren't. And it makes a lot of technical changes having to do with the service of notice and tax deed proceedings. So it makes it the same as that in the Code of Civil Procedure codifying a holding of the Illinois Supreme Court. It makes it possible for a taxpayer to file a Motion to vacate a tax deed order within thirty (30) days after the order is entered, just like any other court order. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "This is on the Order of Short Debate. And requires 60 votes. And in response, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Yes. Representative, I intend to support the Bill. I am trying... And I would like clarification. I worked on a Bill some years ago. And I think it has been fixed, but maybe you can bring me up to date. One of the concerns I have always had about these sales, and it happened in my district, the notices are sent to the property owner and in this case it was an elderly woman in the early stages of Alzheimers who just simply put those things away. And by the time anyone... by the time her children, who didn't live in state found out about it, it was too late. In fact, her prop... well, they redeemed the property, but it had been sold for back taxes. And I tried to pass a law that said

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

somebody could be... request that they also get a notice of that. Does the notice of the impending sale still only have to go to the registered owner?"

Currie: "Representative, this doesn't change any of the current provisions..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Currie: "...in respect to notice, except to extend by one (1) month the notice that may be given by the sheriff. I would think that could be helpful in the circumstance you described, in that family members might be more likely to pick up on this information..."

Black: "Correct. Okay."

Currie: "...if it's six (6) months rather than five (5) months before the tax sale."

Black: "Well, I... I think the additional month is an excellent idea. And I will ask our staff to look into whether or not the additional notice to a family member or designee has in fact been added to the law. If not, perhaps I can work with you next year to see that there is an extra layer of protection, as more and more of our elderly citizens live alone and often need that kind of assistance. It... this is a good Bill. Anything that extends the deadline is a good Bill. I hope everyone will vote 'aye'."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. Today in the gallery is... we have visiting us is a special education teacher, who I have

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

known since first grade, Jeanette Atlas, my best friend since first grade. And she is here with all of her students from Carpenter School from Representative Soto's district. Let's give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Hannig: "And on Senate Bill 461, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan is recognized."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair?" Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Mulligan: "You stated at the beginning of this Bill that it would take 60 votes and I am not questioning that. But I went to the end of the Bill, the full text just to try and understand where it was. And there's a statement at the end of this Bill that says, 'This Amendatory Act of the 95th General Assembly shall be construed as being declarative of existing law and not as a new enactment.' Is the operative word 'declarative of existing law' and is that why it only takes 60 votes? I am just curious as we move through this overtime Session actually what types of things apply. I haven't noticed that term before although I am sure it has been around."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "I believe it takes 60 votes because it does not have an effective date clause. So it will not go into effect until a year from July."

Mulligan: "Well, I was... that was just an interesting..."

Currie: "It's not because of that language, Representative."

Mulligan: "It's not because of that language."

Currie: "No."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Mulligan: "Okay. I was just wondering what the reason was.

Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Appreciate your 'yes' votes."

- Speaker Hannig: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Just to correct the record. This morning I did not include Representative Dunkin among those who absences were excused today, but his is and he is."
- Speaker Hannig: "So he will be recorded as excused. On page 18 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, is House Bill 811. Representative Berrios. You're recognized on the concurrence."
- Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am just wanting to concur Senate Amendment 1. What we did was actually add the word 'limousines' to House Bill 811 because that is the only group we were really trying to add to the rolling stock exemption. I'd ask for concurrence."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Black: "It's been a while since we have been in this position.

The underlying Bill has an immediate effective date, so what does that do to the vote requirements on a concurrence Motion?"

Speaker Hannig: "Seventy-one (71) votes, Representative."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

"Is there any further discussion? Then the Speaker Hannig: question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 811?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur it Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 811. And this Bill, having received а Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We are just going to start on page 14 on the Order of Concurrences. And where Motions have been adopted or recommended, we're going to go down the list and just start calling the Bills. So, Representative Jefferson, you're recognized on House Bill 4. Representative Jefferson. This requires 71 votes."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the committee.

I just wanted to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3
as it relates to House Bill 4."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner, Jefferson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Osmond, you are recognized on House Bill 32. Representative Osmond on House Bill 32.

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular... I'd would like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and what this was... is, if you recall, this is for the Adeline Jay Geo-Karis Marina Fund. And this was a self-sustaining fund that maintained the marina. And in the Senate it was thought to remove the sweep from the... sweeping ability of the Governor. And that's what this Amendment involves."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote... Excuse me. Representative Flider are you..."
- Flider: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just a question of the Sponsor. I...

  It was my understanding that the sweeping authority no longer exists. That there can be no sweeps."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "It expires at the end of this fiscal year. That's what I was just told."
- Flider: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'.

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wait and Bost do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, you're recognized on House Bill 39."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for concurrence of Senate Bill... and the ... House Bill 39 with the Bill with Amendment 1, which there was discussion on the floor. There was some issues with this. The Senate made some clarification to this. This is the one-party consent for eavesdropping on child pornography cases. I worked with Representative Scully on this matter. What the Senate did was state that there had to be some permission from the State's Attorneys Office to get the consent and then forty-eight (48) hours later, if the investigation was still ongoing, that then you would have to go to a judge to get an eavesdrop signed by that judge. However, the Amendment in the Senate is silent as to the situation with how you get permission from the State's Attorneys Office. And then I would yield to Representative Scully to talk about our discussions on a potential trailer Bill for this."

Speaker Hannig: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Scully."

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

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

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

Scully: "Mr. Reboletti, one of the issues that we discussed when the original Bill was being debated was whether there was going to be any record... is there a requirement that there be a record of any sort of this conversation between the law enforcement official and the State's Attorneys Office?"

Reboletti: "Representative, not as it stands right now, but I would be willing through a trailer Bill to type... put that type of language in where the state's attorney would have to memorialize that, so it would be discoverable if the investigation continued. And it could also be presented as far as the eavesdrop will be concerned after the forty-eight (48) hours that expired."

Scully: "Thank you. And by memorializing it, do you mean a written record of the communication?"

Reboletti: "That'd be a written record, yes,

Representative."

Scully: "Is it your intention that that written record has to be created simultaneously?"

Reboletti: "That's contemporaneously. Yes."

Scully: "Contemporaneously."

Reboletti: "Yes, absolutely."

Scully: "Okay. Mr. Reboletti, thank you very much for your efforts on this. With those commitments that you will work on those revisions in a trailer Bill to specifically require that there be a contemporaneous written record of this communication, I am willing to support this Bill."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Reboletti to close."

Reboletti: "I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "This requires 60 votes. And so the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment and 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. Bost, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meyer on House Bill 50."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 50."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to and shall this Bill pass?' This requires 60 votes. 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 Tryon and Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano on House Bill 121. Out of the record. Representative Dunn, on House Bill 133. Representative Dunn, you're up."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 133. This is specialty plates for the Rotary and they added the Special Olympics of Illinois. Both ideas previously passed the House earlier this year. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "This is final passage. Is there any discussion? This requires 60 votes. And the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and 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 Mitchell, Kosel, Cultra, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes' and 6 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano on House Bill 121."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 121. This is just an agreement that we've had. It just cleans it up. It provides that applicants for licensure as audiologist whose degree was conferred on or after January 1, once they have received the doctoral degree in audiology. And I would ask that we concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 121."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This requires 71 votes and is final passage.

Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was getting very nervous at the number of police officers in the gallery. There something going on I'm not supposed to know or don't want to know? Now, will the Sponsor yield for just one (1) guick guestion?"

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

Black: "Representative, I am not sure I understand the definition of 'audiologist'. The reason I am asking, in a rural district like mine, I have a number of people who operate hearing aid clinics, I guess you would call them. And they do little tests or whatever it is they do and I know my mother-in-law goes to one (1) or did before she went into a nursing home and then they get a hearing aid. Now, is that person an audiologist?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Black: "And then that person would need a doctoral degree?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Black: "In the Senate Amendment. Does it grandfather those in who have been practicing thirty (30), forty (40) years?"

Saviano: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Saviano to close."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 121."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and 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 Golar and Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes' and 4 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, is House Bill 174. Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur to adopt the Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 174. Senator Sullivan had a Senate Bill that was almost identical to House Bill 174 and what the Senate Amendment does is to make House Bill 174 identical to the very similar Senate Bill. And in substance, I don't think there's a major change but I would move to concur for that passage. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This requires 60 votes. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendments. And this Bill, having received a Three-

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock on House Bill 182."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 182. What this does is just that... that University of Illinois at Chicago and Southern Illinois University will negotiate with the agencies which would be DHS for the supervision of any marginal costs associated with providing the forensic psychiatric fellows."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? This requires 71 votes and is final passage. And then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and 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 Mitchell and Brauer, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise?"

Miller: "An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Hannig: "State your inquiry."

Miller: "A few years ago we used to have an Agreed Bill List where we had a master list of a bunch of Bills. And I noticed that many of these Bills, whether it needed 60 votes or 71 have reach Supermajority and just for the efficiency of government and not to waste our time, not that this is a waste of time, but is there a possibility we

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

could have a list of Bills that Members can check off yes, no, maybe, present, whatever they want to check off. They could put in additional comments if they want, they can put in their own stump speech if they want. If they can do whatever, just so we can just go home and be with our families and it's my son's second birthday today so I can get there sooner and give him his... his Hot Wheel and things like. Is there a possibility of that happening?"

- Speaker Hannig: "I am not so sure, Representative, but we can inquire Repre..."
- Miller: "I am sure we can get support on the other side for that."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Rose, do you have the answer?"
- Rose: "David Miller is right. We should do this. I am very, very excited to go home to my constituents and tell them what's going on here. We need this time. I want to go back home and tell them what's happened. David Miller is right. Most of what's happening here is a 118 to 0 minus whoever is not here today. We could easily do that. I want to go home and talk to my constituents and tell them what's happening here in Springfield."
- Speaker Hannig: "Well, we're moving right along on the Calendar. So, maybe that'll happen sooner rather than later. Representative Arroyo on House Bill 202. You're recognized."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Motion to Concur, Senate Bill 1 becomes the Bill. As amended House Bill 202 is exactly the same as what this House passed unanimously a few weeks ago with addition of Section

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- 45. Section 45 requires the Department of Human Services to report back to us each year a Youthbuild program outcome. The Senate Sponsor, Senator Link, thought that was a good idea. I think it is a good idea also and I think you will, too. I just ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then the question is... This requires 71 votes and is final passage. Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment #1 and 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 and Mitchell and Golar, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lindner on House Bill 254."
- Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? This requires 60 votes and is final passage. Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 254 and 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 Golar, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'.

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Holbrook, you're recognized on House Bill 277."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd move to concur with Senate Amendment #2. It just clarifies that banks, financial institutions and lenders are those that can help provide this financing. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? This requires 71 votes and is final passage. And so, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 and 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 Currie, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rose, you're recognized on House Bill 328."

Rose: "Thanks, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that passed the other day to the Senate, but since this is concurrence, this would be the one that'd go straight to the Governor's desk, if the Senate does not act on the other Bill that we already voted on. I believe that Bill was unanimous. This includes an Amendment to the definition of 'public official' to make sure that police officers are included in the definition of 'public

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

official' but when it's a legitimate and real threat. And again, I mention this exact same Bill passed the other day with... unanimously, I believe."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? This requires 60 votes and will be final passage. And so the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Franks, on House Bill 369."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is a Bill we passed unanimously, which would not allow gift cards to have fees or expiration dates. The Amendment takes off IRMA's opposition; they're now neutral. And what it does is that there's... expiration date can't be within five (5) years and that was a... we thought it was a good deal. Would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "So you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This is final passage and requires 71 votes. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1and 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 Reis, Phelps. Mr. Clerk,

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Verschoore, you're recognized on House Bill 405."

- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that we concur with Senate Floor Amendment #1. And I'd ask for your concurrence on that."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This requires 60 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and 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 Mulligan, Krause, Eddy, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes' and 35 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lyons, you're recognized on House Bill 497."
- Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying Bill, 497, was the legislation that would prevent large mega stores from starting their own banking operations at the retail store. And the Senate put on the Amendment in here, two (2) Amendments that... technical changes to the definition of 'affiliate' in the Bill. Removes the definition of 'adjacent premises' and

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

instead leaves the definition of what constitutes 'adjacent to rulemaking', but does nothing to change House Bill 497's effect on already allowable financial institutions that are already operating within... Illinois institutions which are operating in facilities like that. So, I'd ask for your favorable consideration on the concurrence."

"You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Speaker Hannig: requires 71 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments and 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 Harris, Verschoore, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendments. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Nekritz, you are recognized on House Bill 508."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate in Amendment 1 to House Bill 508. I mean it's a clarification of the penalties, the underlying Bill was... and some of the penalty enhancements for crossing guards and school children in crosswalks."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. This requires 60 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sacia, Reis, Pritchard, Mitchell, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Watson, you're recognized for House Bill 570. Representative Watson. Representative Watson, you're recognized on House Bill 570."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2, which makes this subject to appropriation and made the Department of Aging much more happy about this Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This requires 71 votes and is final passage. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Osterman: "What's the... how much money would this cost, potentially?"

Watson: "I think they're looking for three million dollars (\$3,000,000)."

Osterman: "And are you going to put that in the budget?"

Watson: "Am I going to put it in the budget? If I had... given the opportunity, Harry, I'd love to put it in the budget."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Osterman: "Jim, we gave you the opportunity, so please put it in the budget."

Watson: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Hannig: "Any further discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendment and 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 Tryon, Sullivan, Stephens, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Munson, you're recognized on House Bill 574."

Munson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 574. It simply adds two (2) new members to the Social Security Number Protection Task Force, one (1) from the State's... appointed by the state superintendent of education, the other by the Comptroller. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. This requires 71 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 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 Osterman, Leitch, Hamos, Will Davis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record.

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Holbrook, you are recognized on House Bill 616."

- Holbrook: "I move for concurrence on Senate Bill (sic-Amendment) #1 to House Bill 616. It incorporates a recommendation of the office of the Inspector General to the Department of Children and Family Services to permit state's attorneys to petition for continuing supervision in abuse and neglect cases. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This requires 60 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 616 and 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 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stephens, you are recognized on House Bill 617."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 617. In November of last year, the <a href="Belleville-News Democrat">Belleville-News Democrat</a> did a story called <a href="Lethal Lapses">Lethal Lapses</a>, and in that story despite... it was reported that the Department of Children and Family

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Services, despite receiving specific warnings regarding fifty-three (53) child deaths between 1998 and 2005, case workers, child protection investigators, supervisors and contracted private agency workers made repeated errors, failed to properly gauge danger to children or failed to This is companion legislation follow regulations. Representative Holbrook's Bill 616. I want to thank Representative Beiser for his work on this issue and the Speaker for creating this special committee. requires that the director provide written response to the Inspector General indicating the status of any sanctions, disciplinary actions against employees or providers services involving any investigation under review. gives more strength to the office of Inspector General creates an error reduction team, requires a quality assurance division of DCFS to prepare public reports in relation to error reduction implementation plans, creates a child death review team task force with... that among other things is charged with creating a plan to examine child deaths, establishes a three-year pilot program in the southern region of the state. The task force will work with DCFS, OIG, state's attorneys, also requires reporting to the General Assembly and individual Members of the General Assembly in districts where a death occurs and requires reporting to the Governor, the General Assembly, director of DCFS and other items. I would be glad to respond to any questions. And stand in support of concurrence."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This requires 60 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock. Okay. The Lady does not... the Lady does not wish to speak. And so the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 617 and 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 Osterman, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendments. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you record me as voting 'no' on House Bill 405, please."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect your intentions.

  Representative Soto, you're recognized on House Bill 619."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. I move Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 619."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then the question is... and this requires 60 votes and is final passage. And so, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment and 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 Myers and Colvin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes'

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, you are recognized on House Bill 625."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move concurrence to Senate
  Amendment #1 to this Bill. It would provide that the Act
  does not apply to facilities operated by a county or
  Illinois veterans' homes. That's all it does."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. This requires 71 votes and is final passage. Is there any discussion? Then the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1and 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, Colvin, Cole, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in the Senate Amendment. And this Bill, having received a Three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Adjournment Resolution. House Joint Resolution 72, 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 Friday, June 01, 2007, the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Monday, June 04, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

adjourned until Tuesday, June 05, 2007, at 2:00 o'clock p.m.; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 06, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, June 07, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, June 08, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, June 11, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 12, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 13, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, June 14, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, June 15, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, June 18, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 19, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 20, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, June 21, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, June 22, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, June 25, 2007, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 26, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, June 27, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Thursday, June 28, 2007, and when

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Friday, June 29, 2007, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Saturday, June 30, 2007, and the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 05, 2007, at 12 o'clock 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 in adopted. We need to adopt three (3) small resolutions. On page 27 of the Calendar, Representative Will Davis, you have House Joint Resolution 46. Do you just wish us to adopt it? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 46. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. On page 33 of the Calendar we have House Resolution 414, Representative Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It recognizes June 3 as the Why Me Day. And just brings a little more awareness to breast cancer."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any discussion? Then all in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 30 of the Calendar is House Resolution 174. Representative Mautino, did you wish to say a few words before we adopt it?"
- Mautino: "Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This will extend the Disposal Review Committee, which is looking into the NPDES permits. It's been up for two (2) years and this will extend it on to 2008."

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

Speaker Hannig: "This Resolution requires a vote. So, all in favor of the Resolution vote 'aye' and in opposition vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Riley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, would you like to announce the committee schedule."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Committee schedule for Tuesday, June 5, 2007. At 3 p.m. or upon adjournment: The Revenue Committee will meet in Room 115, Judiciary-Civil Law will meet in Room C-1, State Government Administration will meet in Room 122-B, and Registration & Regulation will meet in Room 118. All of these at 3 p.m. or upon adjournment on Tuesday, June 5, 2007. On Wednesday, June 6, at 8:30 a.m., the Gaming Committee will meet in Room 114. That's 8:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 6, the Gaming Committee."

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

Black: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Hannig: "State your point."

Black: "As we start out towards home, a day late, many of us are extremely tired, some of us are extremely frustrated. I would urge my colleges drive safely. When you're tired, when you're frustrated, when you're trying to figure out what happened and what didn't happen you tend not to concentrate on your driving. We can't... we don't want to lose any of you or anybody else. So, drive very carefully

66th Legislative Day

6/1/2007

today on the way home. It makes for a very difficult trip when we have been through a very long and exhausting week. So, drive carefully and see all of you next week."

Speaker Hannig: "And along that topic, Representative, for all of us, just to be advised that were scheduled to be back here Tuesday, but we're not the only ones who determine that schedule. The Governor could call a Special Session. We have no information that he wishes to, but you just need to be advised that he has that authority and could exercise it at any time, so be prepared. So, Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions. Okay. So, no Agreed Resolutions today. And Representative Currie now... Is there any other announcements before we adjourn? Then Representative Currie moves, that providing perfunctory time for the Clerk, that the House stands adjourned until Tuesday, June 5, at the hour of 2:00 p.m., 2:00 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the House stands adjourned."