158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "The hour of 1:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. Members will be in their seats. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and pagers. And rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the assistant doorkeeper."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Lord, we come before You today in sound body and mind, praying that on this day, You grant us wisdom and guidance. We pray that during this Veto Session everyone can come together on one common ground and resolve the issues for the people of Illinois. We pray for the men and women in our armed services, both here and abroad. Provide them with Your protection and give them the strength to make it through these tough times. Let us also pray for the men, women, and their families, who have made the ultimate sacrifice to defend our country. These things we ask in Your Son's name, amen."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Bellock, will you lead us in the Pledge?"
- Bellock 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."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Will Davis, May, Molaro, and Patterson are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "And Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bassi and Meyer are excused today."
- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 112

  Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. On
  page 16 of the Calendar, under the Order of Amendatory Veto
  Motions, Representative Nekritz, you have Senate Bill 46.
  Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on Senate Bill 46. In the year 2005, pursuant to an executive order, the Governor appointed Lieutenant Governor Pat Quinn as Chair of the Illinois Green Government's Coordinating Council. Bill 46 as originally passed codifies the existence of the Green Government Coordinating Council and places the Lieutenant Governor as its Chair. The Governor's Amendatory Veto puts the appointment back... of the chair back into the hands of the Governor. Currently, the Lieutenant Governor has the budget and staff in place to continue the functions of the council and is ready, willing, and able to continue his leadership role in this effort. So, I urge an override of the Amendatory Veto. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Representative Nekritz moves that Senate Bill 46 do pass, notwithstanding the specific

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

recommendation for change of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 46 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. Representative Verschoore, you're recognized on the Amendatory Veto Motion for Senate Bill 215. Representative Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, give me one second here. This is the energy efficiency Bill that I proposed before that got 115 votes. And what this does is allows my constituents that are customers of MidAmerican Energy to be able to get these energy efficiency programs in the State of Illinois. They are now in the State of Iowa and they've been in service over there for fifteen (15) years. It's a good Bill. I brought an article from the paper of yesterday that shows that you could save up to two thousand dollars (\$2,000) on a new furnace and air conditioner if this program was available in Illinois. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Representative Verschoore moves that Senate Bill 215 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

requires 71 votes. 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'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 215 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. Representative Lyons, you have Senate Bill 315. You're recognized for your Amendatory Veto Motion."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, it's 314, Senate Bill 314. I misspoke, Representative. But Representative Lyons, you're recognized."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Lyons: I'll try it again here, Gary. Senate Bill 314, which passed out of this chamber by 113 to 2 last spring and out of the Senate, 56 to 0. Basically, it's a ongoing discussion between the Bicycle Federation and the State of Illinois, particularly the Illinois Department Transportation, to make sure that bicycles are considered on... in... in projects that IDOT will be addressing over the... from the near future and beyond to make sure that bicycles are included in the... in the process of safety concerns for bicyclists. The Governor made some changes, changes in the language to 'may' rather than 'shall'. And I'm asking that the chamber stand with me as we did in the Senate and support this, which was at the time a well thought through work with IDOT, I believe, was neutral on the Bill, when it passed out here last spring. I'd ask you to stand with me

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

in support with this agreement and override the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Representative Lyons moves that Senate Bill 314 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This requires 71 votes. 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 3 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 314 is hereby passed, notwithstanding the declared recommendation for change of the Governor. Representative Fritchey, you have Senate Bill 593. You're recognized on a Motion to Override."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I simply request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Representative Fritchey moves that Senate Bill 593 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. All those 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 593 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- the Governor. Representative Tracy, you're recognized on Senate Bill 641, a Motion to Override. Representative Tracy."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a do pass Motion to... move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of this Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Representative Tracy moves that Senate Bill 641 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. All those in favor vote… excuse me, Representative Black."
- Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was filling in for you at Rules Committee."
- Speaker Hannig: "Thank you, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, it was my pleasure. Will the Speaker... will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."
- Black: "Representative, did the Governor give a particular reason for his Veto? Was it based on cost or... I mean, what was his reason for his Amendatory Veto?"
- Tracy: "I did not read or hear of any reason given, but it did substantially change the Bill."
- Black: "Okay. Refresh my memory, in the original Bill, do schools regard this as a mandate, an unfunded mandate?"
- Tracy: "No, they do not."
- Black: "How will the screening exams be paid for?"
- Tracy: "Well, they'll be paid for initially when they're required upon a child entering kindergarten by the parents by the health insurance coverage that a child would have or

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

through the… ya know, either privately or through Medicaid services or All Kids Insurance, or the like."

Black: "All right. So, children or the children of families who don't have the resources will be able to access resources to do this?"

Tracy: "Yes, absolutely."

Black: "Okay."

Tracy: "There was a lot of discussion about that in the early stages."

Black: "And there... there was no opposition from the Optometric Association. The reason I'm asking is that in rural areas there're very few ophthalmologists, if any, and they are 'X' number of optometrists. And I didn't get a chance to talk to my optometrist. The Optometric Association didn't say anything about in some areas we may not have enough people to handle the additional children being screened?"

Tracy: "That... well, actually, the optometrists are very much in support of this Bill..."

Black: "Okay."

Tracy: "...as well as the ophthalmologists. It's understood that they'll do everything possible to try to bring these services."

Black: "Okay."

Tracy: "And if for some reason they cannot obtain them, then the parents could opt out of the program. However, we feel like it'd be very much in the child's benefit to enhance his learning to get it at the very onset of his education. And it's... basically, the Governor's Veto language changes the thoroughness of this visual examination. It changed it

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

to more of a screening, which it had previously been. But we want to make it as much of a thorough eye examination as under the ophthalmologists and optometrists rulings."

Black: "Okay."

Tracy: "And also the optometrists have put together some very affordable packages."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. I think I can see my way clear to supporting your Motion. Thank you."

Tracy: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Eddy: "Representative, just very quickly, this legislation was a result of a pretty lengthy compromise that took place between the School Management Alliance and the optometrists and several others?"

Tracy: "Yes, yes. We were all included in discussions of it and it passed overwhelmingly in the Senate and the House.

And then it's repassed in the Senate overwhelmingly as well."

Eddy: "And I think the key here is that there is an opt-out provision and that opt-out provision was a major part of that compromise. So, that if... if children could not either afford or find a... an optometrist in their area that met the qualifications... they would not miss school. And that was really kind of the key concern was the exclusion of students from school. And you worked that out with the Management Alliance and there is that opt-out provision?"

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Tracy: "There is. We want to make it as accessible as possible so that the children can have the benefit of the examination. But yes, in the extreme circumstance if it's not available, a child could opt out through his parents."
- Eddy: "Thank you. To the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good example of someone who worked very, very hard on a Bill to take care of many of the concerns that were stated by the previous speaker. That in rural areas especially you might not have availability. And also that if parents were not able to afford the... the eye exam rather than the screening that they would be excluded from school. She sat down and listened to all of those concerns, worked out a compromise that everybody supported, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Override Motion."
- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "She indicates she'll yield."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, how will the parent be notified that the child will be excluded if he doesn't have an eye exam?"
- Tracy: "Well, the noti... I mean, it's done in the same way that the parents when they enroll the child for school at the initial kindergarten or first grade level. The same way that they are notified that the physical examination and the dental examination is required. And then also, just as the dental examination can be opted out, it would be in the same way disseminated as that."
- Davis, M.: "I'm a cosponsor with you on the legislation."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Tracy: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "And I think we need to push the State Board of Education to do a better job of informing parents of that exclusion date. I believe the exclusion date is October 15?"

Tracy: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. This is one of those Bills for health care that all of us support in this Body. We believe that the vision of a child entering school can determine the success or failure of that child at a very early date, at a very early age. And for us to be proactive when the child is entering school is one of the most important events in his or her life and one of the best things that we can do for health care for children entering school. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree and I think we should override the Veto."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Currie: "I... I basically support the Bill and your Motion, but I'm a little concerned that among the items that the doctor must test for is glaucoma. Now my understanding is that glaucoma is a disease that is generally something that people in later life face, not five-year-olds. So, I would wonder whether it's worth the cost if there is any benefit to having glaucoma exams for the kindergarten set."

Tracy: "In that particular area I deferred to the knowledge and skill of the Ophthalmologists and the Optometrists Association and that was part of what they recommended."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Currie: "Public health... public health professionals say that that's wasted money and time because glaucoma, just plain is not an issue for the five-year-old set. And if that... if it turns out they're right then I would hope you'd come back next year with a corrective so that we're not testing for diseases that hit the sixty-five-year-old set at the age of five."
- Tracy: "It's a certainly a very good point and I would certainly revisit it, but as I said not having the expertise in that field, I did defer to the knowledge of the doctors and the like."
- Currie: "Okay. Well, maybe it's worth your revisiting after we pass this Bill."
- Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion?

  Representative Tracy recognized to close."
- Tracy: "Yes, thank you. I would just urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Tracy moves that Senate Bill 641 do pass, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Repres... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 641 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the specific recommendation for change of the Governor. On page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Veto Motions, Representative Flider, you're recognized on Senate Bill 540."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I'm here to ask for your override of Senate Bill 540. The Senate overwhelmingly overrode the Governor's And those of who are old enough to remember back during the Jimmy Carter era, the speed limits used to be seventy (70) and above throughout the nation. President at that time and the Congress imposed lower speed limits because of the Mideast oil embargo. Congress repealed the nationwide maximum speed limit. today more than thirty-two (32) states have raised their limits to seventy (70) miles an hour or higher or some portion of their highway system. But we're not asking for that with this legislation, we're asking for uniformity on rural interstate highways. Now this legislation is not about speed, but it's about uniform speed limits. And it's about how uniform speed limits have been safer in other It's about how the twelve (12) states that have states. uniform speed limits of sixty-five (65) miles an hour have fewer accidents per mile driven than highways in Illinois. Many have transformed this into an issue of speed, but it truly is an issue of uniformity and uniform speed limits. The legislation provides for uniform speed limits on rural highways only, not on expressways, not on the Stevenson, not on the I55 bypass around Springfield, only rural stretches of highway. Ninety (90) Members of the House supported this legislation when it passed. And certainly, many things are being said statistically about speed, but this is about uniformity. And it's about how other states, including the twelve (12) states, which have uniform speed

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

limits of sixty-five (65) miles an hour for cars and trucks on rural highways, have fewer accidents per mile of... per mile driven. So, the facts are and the studies support that uniform speed limits actually can improve the safety of rural interstate highways. And I would ask for your concurrence... or excuse me, your override of the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. We've got a lot of people wishing to debate the Bill. We'll try to accommodate everyone if they'll be reasonable. And so, Representative Sacia, you're recognized on the Motion to Override."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I understand that the Governor is lobbying very hard to prevent the override. I don't know that the Governor has ever driven a heavy truck. I don't do it as a vocation, but I do it very regular. business my son owns has two (2) eighty thousand (80,000) pound trucks we run regularly between Pecatonica, Illinois and Sikeston, Missouri. That's three hundred (300) miles in Illinois, a hundred and fifty (150) miles in Missouri. The difference of driving on Illinois interstates with the irregular speed limit compared to the evenness of the speed limit in Missouri is daylight and dark. Mr. Speaker, could I get some attention, please. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very, very, very important Bill for both safety and for the trucking industry. The trucking industry has lobbied for years to get an even speed limit. This does not affect interstate highways in or around metropolitan areas; it only affects major highways in rural

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Illinois. All of the studies... all of the current studies show that we are much safer with an even speed limit on our rural interstate highways. Many of you make an argument that you get in congested areas, it's a problem. legislation specifically eliminates the area around the major metropolitan areas. This is absolutely a Bill about safety. There isn't anybody in here that would argue that you aren't going to have significant fatalities when an eighty thousand (80,000) pound truck hits anything. the reality is the trucking industry is as closely regulated an industry as there is other than the airline industry. Drive down your interstates. Notice the number weigh stations. I can tell you from personal experience, at least every fourth time I run over the scales I get pulled inside, my paperwork is checked, and I, as an individual, am looked over and my log book is very carefully scrutinized. Are there cowboys out there? Of course, there are. But the reality is, Gentlemen and Ladies, the trucking industry polices itself, is working very, very hard to obtain a uniform speed limit for safety on our major interstate highways. We desperately need it. It is a Bill whose time has come. It has passed out of the It has passed out of the House. Those of us involved with heavy trucks recognize the need for it, and we ask for your support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Motion. It's pretty clear based on evidence from states

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

that have raised their rural speed limits for trucks to sixty-five (65) miles an hour that traffic fatalities and traffic crashes are on the increase. Our own neighbors, Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa, saw collisions involving trucks jump after the large vehicles were allowed to drive more quickly. And in Ohio, the highway patrol found that truckrelated crashes on the turnpike spiked 40 percent after raising bus and truck speed limits from fifty-five (55) to sixty-five (65). You know that it takes a truck driving at sixty-five (65) miles an hour a lot longer to stop than one driving at fifty-five (55) miles an hour, approximately 40 percent. Think of this, we know that many people, drivers of cars as well as trucks, consider the speed limit the bottom. So, if it says sixty-five (65) many people think seventy-two (72), seventy-five (75) is really okay. takes a truck 40 percent longer to stop when traveling at sixty-five (65) than fifty-five (55), think how much it would take for that same truck when traveling at seventyfive (75) miles an hour to come to a stop. I'd ask you to join the State Department of Transportation, our State Police, the National Highway Transportation Safety Board, and the National Safety Council in voting for safety for people who are on our roads, for people who are driving their cars and ought not to be sandwiched between trucks that are out of control. I appreciate that the truckers would like to save time and money, but our job, our job, Speaker and Members of this chamber, is to save lives. Those organizations would not oppose this Bill, would not oppose raising this limit to sixty-five (65) unless they

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

saw a clear correlation between safety, the safety and the lives of our citizen, and the actual road mileage issue. I urge your 'no' vote."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in strong support of the Bill. I have sponsored this Bill in the past which is one of the reasons it probably didn't pass. So, maybe Representative Flider will have more luck than I did. You know, it's a... Mr. Speaker, I can't even hear myself."

Speaker Hannig: "This is final passage on a override. This will be law if this Bill passes. So, would you please listen and give the Gentleman your attention."

Black: "You know let's just focus on what the Bill really does. Let's not refer to a... an editorial that appeared in a major metropolitan newspaper today. And let's not bring up all of the arguments that I've heard over the years about this Bill. It does not change the speed limit on any urbanized interstate highway, doesn't change it at all. It stays at And if an urbanized area wants to fifty-five (55). petition IDOT, I suppose in some areas they could lower the speed limit. And I have no objection to that. Nobody wants to raise the speed limit on the Kennedy, or the Edens, or the tollway, or I80, in highly urbanized areas, 157, I55. Traffic density and volume just simply would not allow that. This Bill doesn't do that. It doesn't raise the speed limit on any urbanized interstate highway. It doesn't raise the speed limit for trucks on any two-lane

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

highway, such as Route 1, the first designated state highway in Illinois that goes through my district. fact, runs through a residential area. That speed limit is set by the City of Danville at thirty-five (35) miles an hour. And this Bill will not change that. All it does, is it says in the area that I represent where interstate highways do not have the traffic volume, do not have the traffic density, and IDOT can tell you where these interstate highways are already. It allows trucks to go sixty-five (65) miles an hour. The Federal Highway Administration statistics show that all twelve (12) states that have adopted a uniform sixty-five (65) mile an hour speed limit on rural interstate highways have had a lower fatality rate on those roads over the last ten (10) years than Illinois. Those numbers don't lie. They're not general assumptions. In a letter sent to our Governor from the former Chief Safety Officer for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Julie Cirillo wrote, 'There is sound research repeated over the last thirty (30) years that confirms drivers are safer operating at or about the average speed of all traffic.' The editorial pointed out to Missouri that when it raised its speed limit to a uniform seventy (70) miles an hour, they had an increase in fatalities. The Missouri... the transportation officials say that argument is not valid because of a quirk in their In the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Missouri DOT numbers. officials stand by their decision to increase Missouri speed limit to seventy (70) miles an hour for all vehicles, saying having all vehicles travel at the same speed is the

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

safest way to go. We don't need any inflammatory language about endangering people in metropolitan areas, this does not do that. It does not raise the speed limit on any twolane state highway anywhere in the State of Illinois. is, to echo Representative Sacia, an idea whose time has come. A majority of the states have already done it. don't know why it's so hard to get certain things done in Illinois. As it happens years ago, Indiana, a uniform weight limit on all highways in Indiana. Been that way for thirty-five (35) years. Nobody tells me of any problems in But when you propose that in Illinois, good grief, you'd think you were outlawing motherhood, and apple pie, and the American flag. This is a good Bill, it's been around a long time, the Sponsors have worked on it, the statistics are there. It's time to pass this Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I simply ask for a verification if this receives the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Hannig: "And you'll be recognized at the appropriate time, Representative Hoffman. Representative Winters."

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

Winters: "Representative Flider, on a four-lane divided interstate highway, what is the most common conflict that cars and trucks have? What is the traffic condition where there's a potential conflict, something happening in front of a driver that might lead to an accident?"

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Flider: "Well, it would be that cars are driving sixty-five (65) and trucks are driving fifty-five (55). And so therefore, lane changes are much more frequent. And in fact just to... though you didn't ask me this, what I've... this leads me to say that studies have shown that it's the lane changing that actually results in the accidents occurring, more accidents occurring because of lane changes."
- Winters: "So, if you have uniform speed limits trucks are traveling at the same speed as cars, inherently, you'll have less conflict. In Springfield in this atmosphere, isn't trying to have less conflict a useful idea?"
- Flider: "I believe that less conflict is much more of a useful idea. And it certainly, I think, would result in safer highways. In fact, twelve (12) states who have uniform sixty-five (65) mile an hour speed limits, where the speed limit on rural highways for trucks and cars are identical, have lower accident rates, lower fatality rates than we have here in Illinois."
- Winters: "I'd also like to add just to reiterate, this does not affect two-lane rural highways, state highways. It has to be a four-lane divided highway. Is that correct?"
- Flider: "It must be a four-lane divided highway, interstate type highway in a rural area."
- Winters: "And again, if it's a four-lane divided highway in an urban area... and the Department of Transportation is responsible for designating urban versus rural?"
- Flider: "In fact, the legislation specifies that it would be rural areas. So, that's correct. So, the Department of

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Transportation actually would be able to ensure that the speed limits would remain uniform only in rural areas."

Winters: "My last question. In looking at uniformity and at conflict, I would urge you to also next year put in a Bill that would have a uniform eighty thousand (80,000) pound limit for trucks. I think that would also help interstate commerce in Illinois and lead to more business growth, which we certainly need in this... in this State and less conflict overall. Thank you."

Flider: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Froehlich. Representative Froehlich, you're recognized."

Froehlich: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield for question?"

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

Froehlich: "Representative Flider, you don't think big rigs should be exceeding seventy (70) miles an hour do you?"

Flider: "I would not advocate that any vehicle drive faster than the speed limit."

Froehlich: "Okay. And that's good, because you know the American Trucking Association says going faster than sixty-eight (68) miles an hour isn't safe for big trucks. That's why they advocate speed governors in all new trucks. Okay. Can I ask you, if we raise our truck speed limit to sixty-five (65), is there any reason to believe we will not also see an increase in the proportion of trucks exceeding seventy (70) miles an hour in this State?"

Flider: "I think studies have addressed this issue. And, you know, certainly, I would just say this that we have during the recent years seen a reduction in accidents and

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

fatalities in various states around Illinois, including those that have the uniform speed limit. And so, from my standpoint, what we would make sure that we would do is continue the good job that our law enforcement is doing and our departments of transportation are doing in educating and making sure that our roads are safer."

- Froehlich: "But if... if we raise the limit by ten (10) miles an hour and if motorists continue to drive at least five (5) miles over the limit, won't we have a bigger proportion of these trucks exceeding seventy (70) miles an hour, which the trucking industry tells us is not safe for eighty thousand (80,000) pound rigs?"
- Flider: "Well, in fact, I believe that there are some studies that would conflict with that... with your viewpoint. One of which was conducted by the University of Arkansas."
- Froehlich: "Well, did they, I mean... can you tell us... convince me that raising the speed limit will not increase the number of trucks exceeding seventy (70), which I think we agree is not safe for big rigs. So, you raise it ten (10) miles an hour, but we're not gonna see trucks going... continue to go at least five (5) miles over the limit, which would put them at seventy (70)?"
- Flider: "Well, Representative, I would just say to you this. I am not the kind of person who can predict human behavior. I don't believe that necessarily even when a speed limit is sixty-five (65) that all vehicles would go sixty-five (65), some go slower than sixty-five (65). Now, you know, again, I cannot predict human behavior, I think, you know, statistics have shown that when... when a truck... when the

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

speed limit is sixty-five (65) and we have uniform speed limits and we have uniform speed limits throughout the nation in twelve (12) states and they have had lower accident rates for the past ten (10) years, excuse me, lower fatality rates during the past ten (10) years, I think that's a significant statistic."

- Froehlich: "Well, when Iowa had a truck speed limit of sixtyfive (65), 9 percent of their trucks were exceeding seventy
  (70) miles an hour. Currently, that's... we have 3 percent
  of trucks exceeding seventy (70) miles an hour. What's to
  prevent, I mean, yeah, sure the future's hard to predict,
  but based on what we know from other states, why should we
  adopt the policy that may double or triple the number of
  trucks exceeding seventy (70) in the State of Illinois?"
- Flider: "Well, I think that's pure speculation on your part. I think that's kind of fear mongering in a way. You know, I think the matter… matter of fact is a study in Missouri had shown that when there was this… when they raised the speed limit to seventy (70) miles an hour, actually the speed of trucks was between sixty-three (63) and sixty-eight (68) miles an hour."
- Froehlich: "But the proportion of trucks exceeding seventy (70) rises as you raise the speed limit. I think that's them that is the clear experience in other states. Thank you."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Stephens. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Gentleman from DuPage, I don't understand the line of questioning. As I understand this Bill it raises the speed limit to sixty-

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

five (65) miles an hour in rural areas on interstates for trucks. And then these trucks rattling on about sixtyeight (68) miles an hour and going over seventy (70), I don't get it. I mean it's like, that's like declaring yourself to be a Republican and asking for Republican signatures and then joining the Democratic Party. I don't get it. There are certain lines of questioning, Mr. Speaker, that I guess I'll just never understand."

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

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."

McCarthy: "I originally put on my light because of the fact that many of these Override Motions have been going through very, very quickly. I'm glad to see that we have given this the gravity that it deserves. But I'd like to ask the Sponsor, does he know if the National Safety Council has a position on his legislation? I think the Sponsor's disappeared, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "He indicates he'll yield. Representative Flider's the Sponsor."

Flider: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question?"

McCarthy: "First of all, I don't appreciate the Sponsor changing seats halfway through my questioning. He seems to try to avoid the questions, Mr. Speaker. And I'd ask him to stay in one spot for the rest of the Session here. Does the National Safety Council have position on your legislation?"

Flider: "Well, I will tell you this, Representative."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- McCarthy: "Just tell me whether the National Safety Council has a position on your legislation, please."
- Flider: "I've been sitting in this seat all Session, just so you know."
- McCarthy: "I believe you were over here a few seconds ago, young man."
- Flider: "Last year I was over there. I was over there last year. I do not know. They have not contacted me about this."
- McCarthy: "They do. They do. They're very much opposed. Does the Triple A Chicago Motorclub have a position on your legislation?"
- Flider: "Well, the… I could tell you that the Illinois Triple A representative has been lobbying against the Bill here in Illinois in contrast to what the Triple A has been doing in other states where they've supported it and actually made definitive statements that the uniform… uniform speed limit is actually safer."
- McCarthy: "Okay. So... but your answer is they oppose the legislation. Correct?"
- Flider: "For some reason they do here in Illinois."
- McCarthy: "Yeah, they do. And these are basically considered nonbiased groups that look at the roads of our country and try to determine the safety in the interests of the motorists of our country. Wouldn't you say so, as far as National Safety Council and Triple A?"
- Flider: "And again, I would say that, ya know, when they supported it in other states they were doing... they were looking at safety statistics and saying those highways

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

would be safer with the uniform speed limit. In support of legislation."

McCarthy: "I think their statistics show just the opposite.

And they show an increase in fatal accidents in Missouri that somehow equated about a hundred and thirty (130) new fatalities on our roads if we go ahead and do what they do and make it a uniform speed limit."

"Well, Representative, let me answer that... let me Flider: respond to that because, ya know, I'm the kind of guy... I don't want to just take information that somebody hands me and use it on the House Floor, I do a little of my own research. And some of the research that I've seen and you the to the website of National can go Transportation Administration and you can see this for yourself. In Missouri, last year the fatality rate on Missouri highways decreased between 2005 and 2006 by 13 percent compared to Illinois, where the fatality rate was reduced by 8 percent. This is on the National Highway Transportation Safety Authority website."

McCarthy: "Well, I do want to tell you that I appeared with these gentlemen at a press conference and I think I have a real solid foundation in their facts. I believe they think this is a safety hazard to the motorists of our state. And I do think that the... their position being opposed to this should mean a lot to all the Members of this chamber. Another group that I think we should all care about their position on this legislation is the Illinois State Police.

Do you have any idea where they stand on the legislation?" Flider: "I believe that they are opposed to this legislation."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

McCarthy: "They are. You're correct. So... and I think they're opposed because last December 5, I know all of you know December 5, because it's my birthday, but actually December 5, 2006, one of their patrol officers, I think he was a sergeant, but his first name is Lanny, if you saw the squad where he was hit while writing a ticket on a interstate highway just outside Peoria, it's a miracle that this gentleman ever got back to work. He did return to light duty I believe in April. He returned to full duty in June, ya know. If you saw the squad, you'd say God bless him that he was ever able to come back. But I think that when the State Police see one of their own almost killed on one of our highways by a truck that plowed into him while he was stopped, it means a lot to the State Police. They are firmly opposed to this legislation and I think all of us should give real serious consideration to it. And hopefully, you'll join me in voting 'no' on the override. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from McClain, Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Brady: "Ya know, in this debate, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's been brought up that this is about safety and I agree it is about safety. And I'm not gonna quote alleged scientific studies that can show just about anything. I'm just going to revert back to some experience, experiences as a county coroner that has on numerous occasions been on county roads, state highways, and seen what happens when a

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

fatality occurs or great bodily injury, as well, occurs when a truck comes in contact with a smaller vehicle. In that experience I never ran into a situation where the truck was either going the same speed of that vehicle or was going faster than the vehicle or possibly even slower than the vehicle or the vehicle was in better shape or withstood the impact from the truck. So, simple physics, in my opinion, would state that if a truck, loaded or unloaded is going as fast or faster than the object they come in contact with if that object is smaller, the damage and potential bodily harm is gonna be greater. In my opinion it's simply as simple as that. Thank you very much."

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

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

Feigenholtz: "Representative Flider, I'm not sure how many times we have seen this legislation during the Veto Session. I think that this is maybe the fourth time that this legislation has come before us. We should give it a name, that's how may times we see this. One of the things that confuses me about this is Bill is I'm curious to know how you delineate in this legislation between urban and rural and how law enforcement is able to enforce this. Was there any language change in it?"

Flider: "Well, the… obviously, the speed limits would be… would be indicative of where trucks and cars would be able to drive on a uniform speed limit. But the Department of

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Transportation actually would have the authority to post those speed limit signs and determine where those rural areas are versus the urban areas."

Feigenholtz: "And you don't see any difficulty in enforcing that, do you?"

Flider: "Well, what I would suggest is that if the Department of Transportation is opposed like they are, they're gonna err on the side of safety and probably makes sure that what they're labeling as a uniform speed limit area for trucks would truly and in fact be a rural stretch of interstate highway."

Feigenholtz: "So, did I hear you say earlier... did you indicate the position of the Teamsters Union who predominantly are people interested in legislation like this? Do they have a position?"

Flider: "I have not articulated the position of the Teamsters."

Feigenholtz: "We've been told they're neutral on the Bill, which is kind of surprising, ya know, that they, ya know, if they were supportive I'm sure they would have weighed in on it. We've heard a lot of statistics today, Ladies and Gentlemen, about this legislation and for those of us who drive smaller vehicles from the city into urban and rural areas we've all had our personal experiences driving near, behind, in front of, passing trucks and it's often been very challenging sometimes to stay on the road. But interesting... some of the previous speakers were talking about how much safer Illinois is. The information that I'm reading says that the National Highway Transportation Safety Council ranked Illinois sixth in the nation in the

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

number of large trucks involved in fatal crashes. My colleague, Representative McCarthy, just told us a harrowing story, but again, we are sixth in the nation following Texas, California, Florida, Georgia, and North Carolina. So, for those of us who drive down the highway with trucks that are already exceeding the fifty-five (55) mile an hour speed limit and have fear of trucks sometimes, I'd like to encourage everyone to vote 'no' on this Bill and support the Total Veto because I think that this sets a dangerous precedent. It will make our roads unsafe and put our lives and the lives of our families and children in peril. I appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, Reis: sometimes the double standards and where we go with legislation and how much of a sense of urgency stuff is from one day to the next never ceases to amaze me. We are not reinventing the wheel here, that no matter how many statistics you come up with, forty-two (42) other states have uniform speed limits. Twelve (12) states have uniform speed limits for trucks of sixty-five (65) or over, including every state that touches Illinois. We talk about the rural versus urban transition. Every state has this There's not a big problem with this. Illinois challenge. speed bump in the Midwest known as the transportation. Truckers get paid on however many miles they drive. They're less efficient in Illinois, let alone the taxes and fee increases that we imposed on this poor

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

industry. And all that gets passed onto our businesses. We saw on the report today that the unemployment rate in Illinois's a percent higher than the national average. All this plays in to how efficient the trucking companies are and how efficient our businesses are. You look at the vote totals over the years. Ninety (90) votes this year, eighty-one (81) votes this year, eighty-six (86) votes back in March of 2003. The Senate has voted to override the Governor's Veto on this at least on one occasion, I think two. And here we are again, ninety (90) votes. And that begs the question, how do you pull twenty (20) votes off for a Veto override when we voted on this in this chamber for a third time. You can't say you didn't know what was going on with the Bill. You can't say anything other than someone's pulling you off. So, I say to you, go with your votes on this. It's passed the Senate, it's passed the House. The Senate has voted to override. Let's make our roads uniform speed. You travel anywhere else in the United States, the traffic is flowing nice. You go to Indiana, you can go to Missouri, Kentucky, all those states, everybody's traveling at the same speed. It's much safer; it's much more enjoyable to drive. Let's make Illinois one of those states. I ask for your... your vote to override the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

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

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker.

Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Flowers: "Representative, how would this impact the drivers on the Dan Ryan?"

Flider: "Well, it would have zero (0) impact whatsoever for the drivers on the Dan Ryan."

Flowers: "So, you're saying that a truck that's going down the Dan Ryan will still be going fifty-five (55) miles an hour?"

Flider: "That's correct."

Flowers: "What about the Stevenson Expressway?"

Flider: "No impact."

Flowers: "What about the Edens Expressway?"

Flider: "No impact."

Flowers: "What about metropolitan, period?"

Flider: "No impact on Lakeshore Drive, Archer Avenue, Cicero, Pulaski, none at all."

Flowers: "So, therefore, this Bill is applicable in certain rural areas of the State of Illinois."

Flider: "That's correct. Rural downstate areas where there are... where they're determined to be rural areas and not urban areas."

Flowers: "Thank you very much, Sir. I just wanted some clarification on the legislation."

Flider: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, most of us have experience driving from our homes to Springfield everyday we're in Session. And I emphasize driving. Unlike some people that are lobbying

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

this Bill that choose to fly around the state, we have more experience with road conditions and how speed impacts safety on our roads. I would just ask you to reflect how many times you've come down to Springfield where the traffic is backed up maybe a half mile long because one slow-moving truck at say, fifty-five (55) miles an hour is trying to pass another one at say fifty (50) miles an hour when the average traffic is moving at sixty (60) or sixtyfive (65) miles an hour. That is a safety hazard. Bill would try to speak to that. Look at the statistics that have been mentioned and listen to the statistics that have been mentioned this afternoon. All of the states around us have speed limits that are faster than Illinois. They've had them for several years. If in fact, this is going to increase safety hazards, more accidents, don't you think there would be a hue and cry in those states to change their speed limits? I think by experience we know that this is a safety issue that deals with uniform traffic speeds not dissimilar traffic speeds. And by changing this we're going to improve the safety conditions in our state. I would urge you to reflect upon your experiences rather than listen to some of the rhetoric about what might be and what could be. I think it's important to also remember that the AAA endorsed Iowa's uniform seventy (70) mile per hour speed limit when that state came up for discussion a few years ago. And that the St. Louis Post Dispatch has commented that having all vehicles travel at the same speed is the safest way to go. I would urge your support of this override."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Hannig: "Indicates he'll yield."
- Davis, M.: "As you travel up and down the highway and if a truck is behind you and you must make an immediate stop, how many feet does the trucker need before... I mean in applying his breaks, how many feet does he need? If you're traveling at the same rate of speed..."
- Flider: "Well, Representative, that's a question I don't have a direct answer for, but I do believe that the law of physics would indicate that if a heavy truck is traveling it would take longer to stop than a car would take to stop."
- Davis, M.: "So, the law of physics tells us that an... that an object moving at the same rate of speed as another object will travel much faster if its weight is heavier. And we know that trucks are extremely heavy. The weight of that truck sometimes is three times the weight of that car. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Hannig: "To the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I rise to vote or to urge you to vote 'no' on overriding this Veto. I urge you to vote 'no' because our children are strapped in vehicles behind us and a truck traveling at the same rate of speed that you are cannot stop as quickly as you can and it really puts all of us in jeopardy. I read the editorial from the Chicago Sun Times, the Chicago Tribune, from the South Town Economist, from each of those major newspapers who thoroughly examined the Governor's Veto. And for once we all agree. We should

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

sustain this Veto in the interest of safety, in the interest of safety for all Illinoisans. A truck that has eighteen (18) wheels that's carrying eighty-something tons will hit you so fast... will hit you so fast and you will be so crushed and you'll ask yourself, did I make the wrong vote on that issue? We should all be concerned with the safety of children on buses, with the safety of children in those car seats. We should be concerned when the highway says the left lane is ending. You got a truck next to you and the left lane is ending and he's traveling at the same rate of speed that you are, who's gonna get there first? And the impact will not be minor. The impact will not be minor. I urge you, I urge you to be concerned with all citizens in the State of Illinois, with all children. There's no business that important that you can put the safety of these people's lives at risk. Vote 'no'. Sustain the Governor's Veto. Put a big, red 'no' on that board."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have...
I'm really glad that I get to follow the former speaker
because, ya know, each one of us tried to give input in the
different debates based on our life experience. And I can
probably safely say that I've seen more windshield time
behind an eighty thousand (80,000) pound load than anybody
in this chamber. That's what my family business was. I
drove my first tractor-trailer... tractor-trailer across the
parking lot of Bost Truck Service when I was nine (9) years

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

I also had my tractor-trailer license because whenever I turned sixteen (16) you could get it as long as you were working for a family business or the family farm. Ladies and Gentlemen, I understand what is involved with controlling the speed of trucks and traffic flow. I know that everybody's raising these flags, and I think somebody said it best when they said it's a fear of trucks. the reality is the fear should be that if you don't understand them then listen to those who do. Those people who drive them everyday understand that in a rural area uniform speed limit is appropriate. It's safer. one Member... one speaker brought up the fact that as you come down from Chicago, if you have one truck trying to pass another and it kind of clogs up and the safety problems you have there. One thing that wasn't mentioned is the fact that one problem we've dealt with around this chamber and in places all over the United States is road rage. Wonder what the factor is of the amount of people that are bothered by the fact when two trucks are blocking the road and how they get angry and then all of a sudden lose their temper and road rage is set in. Folks, fortytwo (42) other states, and it's been mentioned over and over again, have a uniform speed limit, twelve (12) of them at sixty-five (65). Those twelve (12) show it is safe. The statistics show it, the numbers show it. Now, each one of us want to vote to for what is safe. I'm telling you as an experienced driver, an experienced driver of a tractortrailer, that this will be and is safe. Another thing that I'd really want to mention is, is that when this left this

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

chamber it got ninety (90) 'yes' votes. There's nothing that has changed since you voted 'yes' back when this... that legislation was passed to the Governor. I would just simply encourage you at this time to stay with your vote, vote 'yes'. Let's override the Governor's Veto and for heaven sakes that way we don't have to debate this year after year after year. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Sacia, you've spoken previously in debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Sacia: "My name was used in debate. I'll be very brief."

Speaker Hannig: "Proceed."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a Gentleman from the other side of the aisle used the example of a car, a squad car being hit alongside the road by a heavy truck. know, unfortunately, that's kind of like the guy that comes to sell you fire alarms and shows you a very vivid display of a family of five (5) who dies in a fire. Squad cars get hit all the time. It is not heavy trucks that cause these problems. A Gentleman stood and spoke of experience. experience that he has had. I am also thankful that I have a chance to speak following the previous speaker. I don't question that he has more windshield time than anyone in this chamber, but I'm close behind him and I'm driving regularly whenever we're not in Session. As I mentioned earlier, when I'm running in Missouri, it is a comfortable, even drive, an easy drive. In Illinois, it is horrific. I'm on the brake, I'm on the gas, I'm on the brake, I'm on the gas. It does create a safety hazard. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, this is a Bill whose time has come.

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Forty-two (42) states have uniform speed limits including every state surrounding Illinois. I urge a 'yes' vote to override this Veto. Thank you."

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

Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take an opportunity to thank all of our supporters and those who have concerns about this legislation for their comments. But I would... I do wanna conclude with some information that I, again, ya know, this becomes a very emotional kind of an issue, but we do have the twelve (12) states that have uniform speed limits of sixty-five (65) miles an hour. in each of those twelve (12) states the rates of fatalities are lower than in the State of Illinois. It's been stated by a previous speaker that we have more fatalities than other states. Well, the fact of the matter is there are more vehicles on our roads than in other states. But when you look at the rate of accidents per mile driven and the fatalities, we trail those twelve (12) states that have a sixty-five (65) mile an hour uniform speed limit. That's a fact. You can't deny that fact. The USDOT statistics show that those states that have adopted a sixty-five (65) mile an hour limit, have a lower fatality rate over the last ten (10) years. And we talk about surrounding states. Let's talk about Iowa, which has a seventy (70) mile an hour speed limit, which is higher than we're asking for. reduced their fatalities last year 2.4 percent. Indiana, sixty-five (65) mile an hour uniform speed limit, reduced their fatality rate 4.2 percent. Kentucky, seventy (70)

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

miles an hour uniform speed limit, they reduced their fatality rate 7.3 percent last year. Wisconsin, sixty-five (65) mile an hour uniform speed limit, reduced their fatality rate 11 percent last year. Missouri, which is cited by the administration, seventy (70) mile an hour uniform speed limit, reduced their accident rate by 13 percent last year. And the largest decrease in traffic fatalities throughout the nation last year was in New Hampshire where they have a sixty-five (65) mile an hour uniform speed limit, they reduced their traffic accident rate... their fatality rate by 23 percent on rural interstate highways. Ladies and Gentlemen, the statistics are clear. I hope that you will join me in overriding this Veto because a uniform speed limit in Illinois on rural roads only will be safer. Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Flider moves that Senate Bill 540 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This requires 71 votes and there's been a request for verification. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mre all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', and 53 voting 'no'. And the Motion fails. Representative Hamos, on page 15 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 599. You're recognized for the Veto override."

Hamos: "Thank you."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Speaker Hannig: "Excuse me, Representative Hamos.

  Representative Gordon is seeking recognition, for what reason do you rise?"
- Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hitting my 'yes' button on the last vote and the button never turned on. I'd like to be recorded as a 'green' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "The record will so reflect. Representative Hamos, you're now recognized on Senate Bill 599."
- Hamos: "Thank you. I move to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 599. Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you. This is a Bill for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. They were given stormwater management responsibilities throughout Cook County in the year 2003, but they don't fully... their boundaries don't fully extend throughout Cook County. So, what this Bill does is to allow them to charge user fees for stormwater management services in the part of Cook County that they don't receive taxes from. It's... this is not a tax increase. These are user fees for really important services, stormwater management. It's a fairness approach to making sure that people pay for government services that they need. And I seek an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Hannig: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Then Repre... the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Black: "Representative, what... what did the Governor, I'm sorry
  I don't have his Veto message in my file. What did he say...
  I mean, what was his rationale for a Veto of this Bill?"
- Hamos: "I'm sorry, I don't have that in front of me because my computer is not up right now. I believe he said... I think he did call these... this is a tax increase."
- Black: "That's an interesting... would it not be a tax increase for people who are in fact currently not taxed, but receive the services?"
- Hamos: "Well, I think of it more as user fees, to tell you the truth, because people are getting services for stormwater management and not paying for it. So, it's a way to allocate reasonable costs to provide some fairness throughout Cook County. Otherwise, it's really a subsidy of the Cook County taxpayers and the water... Water Reclamation District portion of Cook County to... for those people who receive these services but don't pay for them. It's... again it's fairness in the South Suburban Mayors and Managers, who are the major beneficiaries of this, support this concept."
- Black: "Is there anyone who speaks for the people in these unincorporated areas or since they perhaps aren't represented by a municipality or some unit of government? What are... can you give me any idea what their views are about this Bill?"
- Hamos: "Well, I actually just cited one group that represents them, the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association.

  These are not unincorporated areas, they just happen to be

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- outside the Water Reclamation District boundaries within Cook."
- Black: "How did that happen? I mean, I thought MWRD annexed all of that territory. So, how did... how did these two parcels escape annexation?"
- Hamos: "I think it's an accident of history, actually, that the Water Reclamation District boundaries years ago were drawn not to fully include all of Cook County. I believe I asked that question and that's what I got back as an answer, I think."
- Black: "Okay. Well, let me get to the heart of the issue, Representative. The MWRD does... I'm gonna make sure I'm straight. Is that the agency that delivers potable water or is it the agency that takes away gray water to be treated in a sewage treatment plant?"

Hamos: "It treats sewage."

- Black: "All right. So, they would... they would collect the sewage from the areas annexed... it goes in pipes, obviously, and through pumping stations and is treated. And I assume MWRD treatment plants... are they only located within the city of Chicago limits or are there others in the suburban Cook, treatment facilities?"
- Hamos: "No, 93 percent of the Cook County area is within the district's corporate boundaries. So, in this Bill we're talking about the 7 percent that's not... for stormwater."
- Black: "Well, how many treatment plants are there, to handle the sewage that would be in that population density? I assume would be a number of treatment plants."

Hamos: "Yeah, I'm sorry. I don't know."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Black: "Are those treatment plants spread throughout the county or are they concentrated in the City of Chicago?"

Hamos: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I just don't know enough about the structure of this. This is a public policy that is directly related to a Bill that we passed in 2003..."

Black: "Okay."

Hamos: "...which did expand the responsibilities for the district but only... it only covered the 93 percent, but we extended the responsibilities for the full Cook County."

Black: "Well, do you know when this gray water and waste water enters the system, do the pipes run downhill or uphill?"

Hamos: "I don't know."

Black: "Well, I think I know. The stuff you're talking about treating does not run uphill."

Hamos: "Yeah."

Black: "That stuff always runs downhill."

Hamos: "That was my wild guess."

Black: "Unless you have a pumping station. What's the speed limit on that waste water when it leaves these unincorporated areas? How fast does that waste water move? Sixty-five (65) miles an hour?"

Hamos: "Sixty-five (65) miles an hour... I was just going to say."

Black: "That's what I thought."

Hamos: "Representative..."

Black: "And so, this waste water's going to move at a rapid rate of speed through a highly populated area. So, I'm going to assume that if one of these sanitary sewer tiles would break, it would be under tremendous pressure and it

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

would erupt into a geyser of heaven knows what. It could be an environmental disaster. You sure we want to do this? I think you oughta put a speed limit on this waste. No more than eight (8) miles an hour."

Hamos: "Okay. I can live with that as a friendly Amendment."

Black: "As soon as we amend the Bill, I'll vote for it. And what a delightful subject to talk about right after I just had a delicious piece of pumpkin cake. Couldn't we have delayed this until long after lunch? Just the mere thought of the millions of gallons of raw sewage traveling through this network of pipes at God knows what speed limit, under what known pressure. An environmental disaster waiting to erupt. Oh, thank God I live downstate."

Hamos: "I thought I would show solidarity, Representative. So,
I understand your position on this."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Black."

Black: "Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative Ryg for coming over. I never want to deliberately mislead as happened on a previous Bill. Nekritz, Representative Nekritz, I told you that's why I'm retiring, I can't remember. I would never want to deliberately mislead anybody on the House Floor, even though, I heard it done awhile ago, but my apologies. It does not... MWRD does not take raw sewage. It takes stormwater. So, I stand corrected. It's stormwater, no chunks of anything in it, just stormwater. And it's always good to debate my good friend, Representative Hamos, wearing the John Deere hat that I gave her because she will go down in history known as the champion of the organic farmers. Hear, hear."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Speaker Hannig: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Hannig: "Indicates she'll yield."

Mulligan: "Did you ever find out... perhaps staff could come up with why the Governor did an Amendatory Veto or did he do a Total Veto? Oh, he did a Total Veto?"

Hamos: "Total Veto."

Mulligan: "'Cause it was a tax... or a way of reclaiming..."

Hamos: "You know, if you've noticed the Governor's Amendatory Vetoes this year have been exceedingly short. So, it's a little hard to understand the full extent of the reasoning. This one seems to say the Senate Bill 599 increases the fees for users located outside the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. So, that's true. It does. And I concede that point."

Mulligan: "Managing stormwater for our area is a really tough thing to do. And it's taken a long time to pass a lot of different laws for us. Going back to when I worked for the law firm and we represented water districts and they made people break apart storm sewers and sanitary sewers and other things that they've been doing over the years. I've worked with them for a long time. I think what they're asking is rational. Quite frankly, I'm to the point of this Session, if you want to call it this Session or Veto Session, where things that make no sense are starting to irritate me. Now, I don't care if you want to do public policy. I'd rather do public policy. I don't want to get involved in the feud. And I'm tired of voting or not

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

voting for things that make no sense because there's a feud This was a rational thing to do. It charged people for things that we were providing services for. This is very expensive to do all this work. We've tried over the years on both sides of the aisle in particularly, ya know, in our area where Democrats and Republicans have worked well in order to try and manage stormwater and to see how we're gonna pay for it and where the money's coming There was no reason to do this other than at some whim. At some point we separate out intelligence and policy from the baloney that's going on here. I certainly think it's about time that we do that. And today I would certainly urge that we go along with this. It costs a lot of money to manage stormwater. We're managing it so it doesn't flow up or downstream to other areas, to Lake County or another county in another area or into a lake or a river. And what we're doing here is we're trying to get everybody together to pay their fair share and do this. So, I don't really care what the heck is the personal arguments between whoever's fighting and this rather asinine, excuse me, Amendatory Veto that doesn't say much except that it increases user fees. Well, who the heck should pay them is not the users, give me a break here. Now if you want to keep on going on with this and we want to keep going on with what's going on here, I think at some point we all stand up and we start doing what's good public policy and what's rational and get our self outta here and stop playing these stupid games."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Hamos to close."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Hamos: "I... I think the last speaker said it really well. I seek an 'aye' vote. This is a fairness Bill and it's a very modest user fee at that. So, I seek an 'aye' vote."

"Representative Hamos moves that Senate Bill Speaker Hannig: 599 do pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. All those 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? all voted who wish? Last call. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes' and 41 voting 'no'. The Motion, having received a Supermajority, Senate Bill 599 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. Page 17 of Calendar, under the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, Representative Holbrook, you have Senate Bill 1317. Out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Third... of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Representative Brosnahan, you have Senate Bill 546. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 546, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Brosnahan."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 546 amends the Illinois Notary Public Act and requires that notarial record be kept for every notarial act in Illinois involving documents of conveyance, transferring title to residential real property located in Cook County. This Bill is simply a pilot program that's gonna last for three (3) years. The notarial records shall contain among other information, the thumbprint or

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

fingerprint of the grantor as well as a description of the identification presented for the satisfactory evidence of the identity of the person whose signature to which the notary is attesting to. It should be kept as part of the business records of title insurance companies, financial institutions, and attorneys at law for a period of up to seven (7) years. This is an agreed Bill. I know Senator Cullerton worked very hard and dealt with a lot of groups coming together for this. It's supported by the Cook County State's Attorney's Office in an effort to combat mortgage fraud. It's also supported by the Illinois State Bar Association, financial institutions. And again, I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 546. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Will the speaker yield... Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Hannig: "Sponsor will yield."

Mathias: "Representative, there you are. Tell me again, does this apply to every notary or every notary notarization or only in special circumstances?"

Brosnahan: "It only involves notaries when they're dealing with conveyance of real property and that real property is located in Cook County, Illinois. And it's a pilot program for up to three (3) years."

Mathias: "And it's only for Cook County, only for real... and what will the notary have to do?"

Brosnahan: "The notary would have to do a number of things.

One thing, it's gonna have to either take a thumbprint of

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

the grantor or a fingerprint. And also, include in documentation, what type of identification was used to verify the identity of the grantor."

Mathias: "Again, the… obviously, the identification is… is certainly something that should be done. You don't think the thumbprint is gonna be kind of onerous. I mean is a notary gonna be carrying ink and a pad with them for every time that they want to notarize somebody's signature?"

Brosnahan: "Well, again I know this was the subject of many meetings. Everybody came to an agreement that this was something worth doing in an effort to at least attempt to prevent mortgage fraud in the future. That's why we settled on a three-year term, it sunsets in three (3) years. But I know of no opposition. We are just trying... there have been so many instances, especially in Cook County, where mortgage fraud takes place because identity theft is occurring. And when the transaction is complete, it's finalized. The police have nowhere to go to look for the person because false identification was used. So this was just an attempt to combat a very serious problem, especially in Cook County."

Mathias: "And is the title association, the title companies...
they're in agreement with this Bill?"

Brosnahan: "I do have a list a... Attorney (sic-Attorneys') Title Guaranty Fund, Chicago Title and Trust Company, the Community Bankers Association, the Illinois Association of Realtors', the Illinois Land Title Association, Illinois League of Financial Institutions, the Mortgage Brokers Association. I know of no opposition. And I know no one

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

filed a slip in opposition either when this went through committee."

Mathias: "Great. Well, it sounds like these are the organizations who have the, ya know, not most to lose, but well, they have the most to lose financially if it's not... if someone falsely signs, but they also, like the title companies, have to do the work. And if they're willing to do it, then obviously, we should try it as a pilot program. Thank you."

Brosnahan: "Thank you."

Speaker Hannig: "Is there any further discussion? Then Representative Brosnahan is recognized to close."

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

Speaker Hannig: "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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes' and 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 18 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Joint Resolutions, is House Joint Resolution 77. Representative Osterman. So, let's move on down the list. And on the Order of Senate Joint Resolutions, we also have Senate Resolution 63. Representative Joint Saviano. Representative Saviano. Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise this morning to bring to the floor a Resolution... a Senate

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Joint Resolution 63, which commemorates and celebrates the life of a man who is very important, not only to me, but I think and I know, to the whole State of Illinois. Here's a man at the age of twenty-six-year-old, took a garbage dump and created a world class city, making it one of the premier convention cities in the whole United States. late as this morning I was talking with the Department of Revenue to try to get an idea what kind of revenues are generated from the Village of Rosemont for the State of Illinois. And in the fifty-plus years that town has generated hundreds of millions of dollars for this state, which is quite remarkable considering the little potential it had over 50 years ago. But with a vision and the perseverance and the deliberate nature of the man who was the only mayor of that town for fifty (50) years and incorporated the town at such a young age is quite remarkable in itself. Personally, twenty (20) years ago I met Mayor Stephens, I was introduced to him by the past mayor of my hometown, Elmwood Park. And I met with him for coffee one morning at 7:30, if you can imagine I was up at 7:30. But I sat there and spent the day with this, this icon as he turned out to be and from that day on I never learned as much from any individual person in my life as I learned from him. And it's... it was quite an experience and I think if you could talk to all the people who worked with him over the years or who were acquainted with him, most likely they would have to say the same thing. So, today it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the life of one of the most important and remarkable people that this great

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

state produced. And it's great to see the evolution of that town over those fifty (50) years. Today I have with me the new mayor of Rosemont, Brad Stephens, who came down to observe this... this process and I can tell ya that over the years working with Bradley and watching him study his father's vision, that tradition will be carried on for a long, long time. So, with that, I would ask that Senate Joint Resolution 63 be approved and put in the official record. Thank you."

- Speaker Hannig: "Mr. Clerk, would you read the Resolution please."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution 63.
  - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois General Assembly join together in honoring the memory of Donald E. Stephens, Mayor of the Village of Rosemont, who passed away on April 18, 2007; and
  - WHEREAS, Donald Stephens was the first and only chief executive of Rosemont; he was serving his 13th term as mayor, believed to be the longest serving incumbent mayor in the country; under his leadership the Rosemont community became one of the most progressive and successful municipalities in the State of Illinois; and
  - WHEREAS, Donald Stephens was elected president of the homeowner's association in the 1950s and began to see the potential in living close to O'Hare Airport; he was able to incorporate the village in 1956; and
  - WHEREAS, He oversaw the building of one of the first Hyatt Regency hotels in his community; eventually 14 hotels would make Rosemont their home; he oversaw the creation of the

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

O'Hare Exposition Center in 1975 (changed in 2000 to the Donald E. Stephens Convention and Conference Center), now one of the top ten centers in the country, the Rosemont Horizon in 1980 (now the Allstate Arena), home to the DePaul Blue Demons, the Chicago Wolves, and the Chicago Rush sports teams, as well as a venue for major music concerts and festivals, and the Rosemont Theatre, a 4,000 seat venue that is home to the Chicagoland Pops Orchestra of Rosemont; and

- WHEREAS, At the time of his passing Mayor Stephens was creating Rosemont Walk, a \$500 million entertainment district that will include a movie theatre megaplex, three new hotels, the biggest water park in the State, nationally famous restaurants, and many more businesses for the community; and
- WHEREAS, The passing of Mayor Donald Stephens will be deeply felt by those who knew and loved him, especially his wife, Katherine; his brother, Arthur; his son, Donald E. Stephens II, his son, Mark Stephens; his daughter, Gail Stephens; his son, Bradley Stephens; his grandchildren, Donald E. Stephens III, Christopher R. Stephens, Bradley Stephens, Jr., Brittany Rosemont, Jacqueline, Michelle, Kaila, Tiana, Racquel, Mark Richard, Mark Donald, and Danny; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we mourn, along with his family, friends, and the Rosemont community, the passing of Mayor Donald E. Stephens; and be it further

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Mayor Donald E. Stephens as a symbol of our sympathy."

Speaker Hannig: "And on the Resolution, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise to support this Resolution and suggest that my occasion to know the Mayor of Rosemont was very fortunate. I think we will probably never understand the extent of this man's generosity and kindness. He certainly held Rosemont as first in his mind and certainly first in his heart. And being one who had the distinct honor of knowing him, I can tell you that on two separate occasions he offered his kind facilities to the Latino Caucus for our annual conference. He did this with no fuss, no muss. was his pleasure to do it. Never asked a thing of us. was a kind, generous mayor, a leader in our society and certainly a leader in our nation. He is one who was a visionary. One who thought of Rosemont as the world. And certainly for those who knew him well and for his family, I offer my sincere condolences and insist that we indeed will miss this memorable individual, one who I'm sure will not be in our experience anytime soon. Thank you so much."

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

Hamos: "Thank you. I rise to salute Mayor Stephens. I didn't really think I'd ever do this. I don't usually speak on these death Resolutions, but I'm so taken by this Resolution because I have such a strong memory of him from my first year here in 1999 when Mayor Stephens came to

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Springfield quite often that spring. There was something really important to him that he wanted and there was something that a few of us wanted back. And you know what, Mayor Stephens was the old-fashioned kind of political figure, public official, who understood that this is not a one-way street, that this is really about horse-trading. That you could make... that is was important to respect other's... other people's needs and wishes. And when we shook hands on what we needed and what he needed, we didn't need an MOU in those days. We knew that we could trust him and we knew that he would not break his promise. And that's how I will remember Mayor Stephens, as a man of integrity and a man of his word."

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

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1996 when I first was running for State Representative, I had the fortunate opportunity of not only meeting Don Stephens, but also I was his State Representative, he was my constituent. If it wasn't for him I wouldn't be standing here now eleven (11) years later. His influence not only in the town of Rosemont, but also in the other parts of Leyden Township where he was a committee man, made it a lot easier for me to be elected. In fact if it wasn't for him, I don't think I would have been elected for the first term. On a lighter side, in the last couple of years they've been doing a lot of activities in Rosemont for the fifty-year celebration. And even though the mayor wasn't able to attend some of those because of his health, one thing I did notice were

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

the senior citizens that were in that town from the beginning. And also the interaction that he always had with the seniors that he knew that when they first incorporated Rosemont. So, as you may see and read in the newspapers what a big person he was, not just in politics but also the type of person he was to his community and how he always had the time to talk to the people that he knew for many years. And the state will surely miss him as all of us will. Thank you."

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

Durkin: "I rise in support of this Resolution. I met Mayor Stephens in 1991 and I decided at that point, I was gonna get involved in local politics or ran for school board and I met him for the first time. I was told that Mayor Stephens is a man who's got a very dynamic and a large presence and a very booming voice. So, he may be a bit intimidating. And sure enough, when I met him he was very intimidating with a very large presence and he did have a very booming voice. But as I got to know him over the years, the only thing that was larger was his heart. This is the man who could not say no to anybody. He was a man that provided for people he did not know. A person who would take phone calls from strangers and he would take meetings from strangers to ask his advice on government and many other issues. He was great to his family. He's got a very loving family, wonderful sons and grandchildren, wonderful daughter. And it's been an honor and privilege to know him. And I guess, in a sense, I owe

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

him a deep debt of gratitude for being here 'cause he was very responsible, first of all, my election to the Tritan College Board of Trustees with his son Mark, but also becoming a Member of the House of Representatives in 1996. So, I'm very pleased that Bradley Stephens is taking his place and I know that he will continue to serve out the great tradition of honor and dignity that has come from that office. So, Bradley, I wish you well and Mayor Stephens, I know you're looking down on us, thank you for everything you've done for the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Hannig: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."

Biggins: " Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the occasion to meet Mayor Stephens when I first ran for the House and we sat down, had a nice meeting in Rosemont and then he asked me some questions about government. I knew a little bit about the town, I grew up in Franklin Park. And so I had a little information, but he just explained things, what he likes to look for in government, what he'd like to look for if I were to be successful. He helped me get elected. I carried one precinct by a huge number in Leyden Township; it was just overwhelmingly 90-something percent in one precinct. The Mayor had people... good people work for him. And I also went to his wake. It was a very warm summer Sunday in April. And I waited outside the Rosemont Theater for probably about an hour and fifteen minutes to get in. And ahead of me was a family of four, two younger children, the mother and the father. The father was on the force and

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

he actually came when it was time to get in. And the mom was telling me what Mayor Stephens had done for the town and in his life and she wanted her children to be there to say good-bye to him as well. So, if people have people like that, that remember them and honored and respect them, are a certain caliber that don't come along all that often. So, it was a pleasure for me to work with him and serve in government the same time he was serving as mayor of a very dynamic and... village in our area. I look forward to working with his son in the future."

Speaker Hannig: "Representative Saviano moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 63. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. We have just a couple other orders of business before we adjourn. Representative McCarthy, you're recognized on a Motion to suspend a posting requirement. Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements on Senate Joint Resolution 59."

Speaker Hannig: "Fifty-nine (59)."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I did okay this with the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Hannig: "Okay. So, Representative McCarthy moves to suspend the posting requirement on Senate Joint Resolution 59 so that the Resolution can be heard in Higher Education tomorrow at 12:30. Is there any discussion? Is there Leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted and the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, read the Agreed Resolutions."

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 759, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 760, offered by Representative Froehlich. House Resolution 762, offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Hannig: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there any announcements? All right. So, now Representative Currie moves, that allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, that the House adjourn until tomorrow Thursday, October 11, at the hour of 1 P.M. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted and the House stands adjourned."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Regular House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on October 10, 2007, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' and 'recommends be adopted' is House Resolution 750 and Senate Joint Resolution 17. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on October 10, 2007, reported the with same back the recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' Senate Bill 934. Introduction and referral to the Rules Committee is House Resolution 761, offered by Representative Jefferson. Reading of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate

158th Legislative Day

10/10/2007

Bill 934, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. This Bill will be held on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Seeing no further business, the Perfunctory Session stands adjourned 'til Thursday, October 11, 2007."