34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. The Illinois House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at their desks. We'll be led in prayer today by the Reverend Leroy Smith, who is a pastor of Jesus Cares Outreach in Decatur, Illinois. Reverend Smith is the guest of Representative Bob Flider. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops and to turn off all cell phones and pagers, and the Members and guests are asked to rise and join us in the invocation and the Pledge of allegiance. Reverend Smith."

Reverend Smith: "Good morning. Most gracious Father, we thank You for this opportunity, a God who created Heaven and We thank You for this Assembly today and we thank You for Your grace and mercy as those, our leaders, who travel to be here to assemble together. We asked, Lord, that all things are done in decent in order for the benefit of our country, our state and our communities. We thank You, Lord, to have dedicated people who have sacrificed to do the things to help another individual or family. praise You for people who have a desire to assemble themselves together, even with different opinions but be able to reconcile to see the good that could come out of putting all the gifts and minds together that You have blessed them with. We thank You for their talents, we thank you for the resources, Father. And today, we just thank You for the business at hand will go as smooth as possible. And those things that need to be addressed, Lord, we thank You, Lord, it will be addressed in the most appropriate way. We look for the victory, we claim the

34th Legislative Day

- victory. We claim that our country, our state, will be moving to a better direction. We thank You for the guidance of those that representing from the least to the highest. We ask You for all of these blessings in Jesus' name, Amen and Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "We're led in our Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Shane Cultra."
- Cultra et al: "I pledge Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives: Feigenholtz, Careen Gordon, Harris, and Riley are excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Rose, Sacia, Tryon and Durkin are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Bost. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 106 Members present. We have a quorum, we're prepared to do the work of the State of Illinois. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, you have on page 40 of the Calendar, House Bill 4088. Ready to rock and roll? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4088, a Bill for an Act concerning privacy. Third Reading of this House Bill."

34th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a measure that would protect privacy interests in records that are available in governmental hands but should not be released to other people. Essentially, it says private information about me shouldn't be shared with you just because the government has it. I'd be pleased to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there anyone seeking discussion, questions? See none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4088 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Raymond Poe, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 104. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon County, Representative Raymond Poe."
- Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this creates and income tax deduction for... at the state fairgrounds, we have the sale of champions each year and youth under 18 years, this would give them a tax deduction

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

because a lot of that money is used for their college education. And this is a great gesture on the part of the State of Illinois to help our youth."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion, any questions on House Bill 1004? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1004 pass?' Those is favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mike Smith, Art Turner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keith Farnham, on page 35 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 705. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House..."

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record.

 Out of the record? Out of the record. Representative

 Betsy Hannig, you have on page 38 of the cal... of the

 Calendar, House Bill 2405. Do you wish to call the Bill?

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2405, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Montgomery,

 Representative Betsy Hannig."
- Hannig, B.: "This Bill amends the Adoption Act by changing the methods by which required consent are... of the parents of the adopted can give consent. It provides for the consent of the adoption in the following ways: before a judge in the court; before a representative of a public welfare,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

child welfare, or child placing agency, before a person other than an attorney for the parents of the child or the adopted child. This person should be appointed by the court. The Bill additionally provides that if the person signing the consent is incarcerated or detained in a facility, the execution of the consent... the execution of the consent may be acknowledged before a social service personnel of the institution or be a... or a person of the... that the court has designated. The consenter's surrender may also be acknowledged by telephone, audio/visual connection, other electronic means, provided that the court has approved it and the court has designated an individual be physically present with the parent giving The Bill passed at 5 to 0 out of the Adoption consent. Reform Committee and I ask for your approval. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hannig, I know you'd never guess it, but Representative Black and Lang both have questions of you. Representative... Representative Lang's light went on first. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Hello, Representative."

Hannig, B.: "Hello."

Lang: "Where did you get this great Bill?"

Hannig, B.: "From a longtime friend."

Lang: "From a... that's good. I like that. So, when did you develop this interest in adoptions?"

34th Legislative Day

- Hannig, B.: "Well, I don't have any children. I do have five nieces and nephews that we spoil rotten and one of those is... my nephew is adopted."
- Lang: "Now, this Bill doesn't have anything to do with IDOT, does it?"
- Hannig, B.: "It has nothing to do with IDOT, roads or potholes."
- Lang: "Is this the new Adopt A Road program that IDOT is bringing forth for us to look at?"
- Hannig, B.: "No, it is not."
- Lang: "No, it is not. Well, Representative, I think you've done a great job with an absolutely terrific Bill, and in the interest of time, I'd just say thank you for bringing this Bill forth and good luck to you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, how good of a mood are you in this morning? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I need some Pepto-Bismol after that last repartee from Representative Lang. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields, Representative."
- Black: "Representative Hannig, who is the biological parent of House Bill 2405?"
- Hannig, B.: "The Chicago Bar Association Adoption Committee."
- Black: "Oh, they. I can think of many things they are, but biological parent is not one I would give to the Chicago Bar Association. I've always questioned whether any of them had parents that were married, but anyway. Is there someone in the House chamber that could be, without having

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

to go through blood tests or paternity suits, is, in fact, the biological parent of the Bill not currently in the House of Representatives?"

Hannig, B.: "Yeah."

Black: "Who might that be?"

Hannig, B.: "Could you be more specific?"

Black: "Well, yes, I..."

Hannig, B.: "What are you really trying to get to, Representative Black?"

Black: "I've noticed over the years that this particular individual fathers more bad Bills than anybody in the chamber and then when he gets a new Member who doesn't always read everything, he very quickly relinquishes all birth parent rights and gives consent to somebody else to carry language that he, in fact, brought forth into this world. Is the… the father of this Bill in… in the House of Representatives?"

Hannig, B.: "I don't see him here now."

Black: "I don't... I don't blame him. I don't blame him. So, he... he did a quick disappearing act? Well, let me ask you one thing, Representative, you got to learn about that man. Do you have an order of child and bill support from him before he left? Because I'll guarantee you, he won't pay without a court order. Does... does this Bill have a full head of hair?"

Hannig, B.: "Well, you know, babies aren't born with a full head of hair and sometimes we leave the world..."

Black: "Now, the father wasn't born with a full head of hair either."

34th Legislative Day

- Hannig, B.: "...without a full head of hair, too."
- Black: "This Bill resembles, now that I look at it, now that the system's finally working. Does this Bill resemble Representative Lou do Lang. Remember, I think we met him in China?"
- Hannig, B.: "We may have."
- Black: "Yes. Is this... does this resemble Representative Lang?"
- Hannig, B.: "I think it... it may represent Lou Do Lang from China and his missing luggage, Mr. Black."
- Black: "Yes, I... I wanted the... the DNA of this Bill examined, but the State Police are 38 years behind in the DNA lab so they couldn't get me an answer. By the way, Representative, have you met the new director of the Illinois State Police?"
- Hannig, B.: "I have not met him yet."
- Black: "He is younger than both of my children. So, did them did Representative Lang get... tell you anything about this Bill before he gave it to you?"
- Hannig, B.: "We discussed it."
- Black: "Ahhh. And did he give you any hints about what the Bill does?
- Hannig, B.: "Right. It changes the provisions that parents can provide their consent for the adoption."
- Black: "So, in other words, it makes it easier for someone to give away the rights to a child, correct?"
- Hannig, B.: "It standardizes the current practice."
- Black: "Standardizes the current practice, as I thought. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. Here we have a Gentleman who has literally abdicated

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

his responsibility for the last several weeks. Doing things I haven't seen him do, but he's getting older and forgetful. He hijacks Bills. He disappears often from the floor. He is abdicating his responsibility. He spells words wrong in a simple Bill. He can't even tell the difference between identify and identity. That required Floor Amendment that takes... takes further time from this Body. He is doing to this good Representative what he is doing to the rest of us on this floor. He is abdicating parental responsibility, handing off bad legislation to unsuspecting Legislators, not offering to pay any kind of child support or Bill support, whatsoever. When the questions begin, he's not there. This is a classic case of an absentee father. Join with me in putting that Representative's name and picture on the State Police network. You know, I passed years ago, legislation dealing with deadbeat fathers. This man is going to be as a result of what he's done with this Bill, which is a criminal action, he is going to once again appear on the deadbeat father's list. I think, if what I heard yesterday, on his way home today, because all Legislators only go the speed limit when they're going home, we'll have the State Police Amber Alert out and we'll catch him. And to you, to you, Representative Hannig, you must learn that there are men here who will take advantage of your good will and will hand off, literally, fatherless Bills which they don't want to take responsibility for and they find young women who will accept this responsibility and then be abandoned by

34th Legislative Day

- the man who inseminated this horrible piece of legislation. I would suggest a 'no' vote would be in order."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, the Chair takes no offense to the fact that some of brightest and the best of us have a problem with hair issues on the floor of the House here.

 The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Biggins, the Representative from DuPage."
- Biggins: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I'd like to ask a question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."
- Biggins: "Your name is familiar. Is that your first name or your last name?"
- Hannig, B.: "My first name is Betsy and my last name is Hannig.

 I think you..."
- Biggins: "We had a... I worked... my first term, I served with a person with the same last name as you."
- Hannig, B.: "Yeah."
- Biggins: "And that was on the Appropriations Committee. Did you... did you know him?"
- Hannig, B.: "I... I'm familiar with him, yes."
- Biggins: "All right. I... we used to have appropriation meetings that started at 4:00 p.m. and he was the chairman of the committee and the meetings didn't end until 8 or 9. Do you serve on any appropriations committee?"
- Hannig, B.: "No, I've learned my lesson from him. Thank you."
- Biggins: "Well, that's good to hear. A quick… a quicker learner than I was, 'cause I stayed through those meetings and they would be very slow in the process and… he used to ask a lot

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

of questions and they were detailed questions. Do you ask a lot questions in any committee that you serve on?"

Hannig, B.: "I came late to the game and I'm not currently on any committees."

Biggins: "Can I have your seat."

Hannig, B.: "I... I would..."

Biggins: "Then... then you don't... then what I'm going to do just to help you, I'm going to go back and get some of those tapes..."

Hannig, B.: "Yeah, I..."

Biggins: "... because I... I'd like to have you listen to them and learn what legislative pain is all about. And... and I think this would be a good tool for you to appreciate the situation that you're currently in. Would you agree to... If I give you those tapes would you listen to them?"

Hannig, B.: "Sure."

Biggins: "And what about this Bill now? What does the Bill do?

Does it make people have to agree to adopt somebody? If

they're adopting somebody, aren't they already consented to
adopt them?"

Hannig, B.: "It changes the method of consent for the parents of a child in which adoption can be given. It codifies standard practice, current practice."

Biggins: "I don't know what that means. What does that mean?"

Hannig, B.: "It's... it's a clean up Bill that amends the Adoption Act."

Biggins: "Clean up what?"

Hannig, B.: "It provides... some of the older language, for example, instead of seeing DCFS or licensed welfare agency,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

it says public welfare, or child welfare, or child placing agency."

Biggins: "Okay. I'll tell you what I'm going to do. You explained it very well. I think I understand it and I'm going to vote for your Bill..."

Hannig, B.: "Thank you."

Biggins: "... but please, I don't want to listen to those tapes anymore, so if you get... when I give them to you, you can do whatever you want with them. Don't give them back to me."

Hannig, B.: "I'd be glad to have them and take them off your hands..."

Biggins: "Well, thank you."

Hannig, B.: "... and relieve your pain, Sir."

Biggins: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lyons: "You're the last speaker, Representative. So, Betsy Hannig to close."

Hannig, B.: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2405 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Congratulations, Betsy Hannig on your first Bill.

34th Legislative Day

- Good job. Representative Randy Ramey, on page 40 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3909. Representative Ramey, do you care to call the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3009, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Randy Ramey."
- Ramey: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We talked about House Bill 3909 a couple of weeks ago. We had to change some language which we approved yesterday in an Amendment. What this Bill does is enhance penalties on aggravated domestic violence... domestic violence and criminal domestic violence. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3909 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flider. Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 107 Members voting 'yes', This Bill, having received the 0 voting 'no'. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Arroyo, on page 32 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 12. Do you wish to call that Bill? Out of the record. Representative John Bradley, on page 40 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3878. Out of the record. Representative Annazette Collins, on page 39 of Calendar, you have House Bill 2627. You wish to call the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

34th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2627, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I've been told by the Clerk that there are Floor Amendments that need to be adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, can you move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading? What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2627, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Collins, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Collins on Floor Amendment 1."
- Collins: "Yes, Floor Amendment 1, it just... House Amendment changes current law so that children between the ages of 12 and 17 will be held up to 24 hours. Currently, the laws say that between 12- and 17-year-olds can be held up for seven days and we're changing that back to six hours."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion on the Amendment? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Representative, on Floor Amendment #1, there was opposition by the Illinois Sheriffs, the Fraternal Order of Police, the Cook County State's Attorneys Office, and Metro Counties. Does this Floor Amendment alleviate any of their concerns?"
- Collins: "Yes. This is the Floor Amendment that was agreed between the State's Attorney and... So the State's Attorney and our office negotiated this Amendment and now their opposition is removed."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Reboletti: "What about the... the other parties, are they all neutral or..."

Collins: "We... Yeah, I think so."

Reboletti: "... proponents?"

Collins: "We haven't heard from them saying that they objected to the Bill with the Amendments on."

Reboletti: "Representative, before you move this Bill to Third Reading, would you mind if I had the opportunity to talk to the State's Attorneys Office and to the FOP and make sure they're okay with this before we go forward? Would that be all right?"

Collins: "Are you going to do it today?"

Reboletti: "Yeah, I'll do it right now. So..."

Collins: "All right."

Reboletti: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black on Amendment #1."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative Collins, it's my understanding that the...
the no contact, sight, sound or otherwise is current
standard. Is that not correct? Separation, sight and
sound."

Collins: "Oh, I thought I was... I thought I was finished. I'm sorry. Yes."

Black: "All right. So, I don't understand why... evidently the underlying Bill then eliminated the current standard of separation of sight and sound, and you're putting that back in by the Amendment?"

Collins: "Yes."

34th Legislative Day

- Black: "Okay, fine. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, all those is favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #1, signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but a fiscal note and a judicial note have been requested on the Bill as amended, and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we'll leave that Bill on the Order of Second Order (sic-Reading) until the notes are filed and you work it also out with Representative Reboletti on the questions on the Amendment. Leave that Bill on Second Order (sic-Reading). Representative Monique Davis, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2254. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2254, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 2254 is legislation that will allow the physical activity for 10 or 15 minutes per day, and a social worker on duty every day for schools that are in violence-prone communities where the kids cannot go outside for recess, and where the police have determined the school sits in a violent community. I have... there is no known opposition to this Bill at this time and I will answer any questions. Thank you."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair does recognize the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, a couple of quick questions. Is this specific to the City of Chicago? Is this only for the city, Chapter 34 of the Code, or does this cover all schools in the state?"

Davis, M.: "I believe it's for just Chicago, because..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "...you know, we're the... at this point unfortunately, with the violent schools. And it also, if the school has not achieved it's below annually yearly progress for 2 years."

Eddy: "Okay, yeah. I... I just looked at the test analysis and it's Chapter 34..."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Eddy: "... so it is..."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Eddy: "... it is only for the City of Chicago. Now, the underlying Bill required that if a school failed to make AYP, or adequate yearly progress, for two consecutive school years and is located in a violence-prone area. Now, in your... the Chicago Police Department will make the determination as to what defines a violent-prone area. Is that right?'

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

34th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "And they'll notify... is it their responsibility then to notify that... that school that they... they then trigger the need for the 10 to 15 minutes of P.E. activity a day?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, I would think if a person wanted to apply for this program, they would have to get from the police the determination. And the police department and the Chicago Public Schools do work together. They..."
- Eddy: "So, further though, does the Bill then require that that particular school and by the way, I think the Amendment makes this just K through 8, or first through eighth grade.

 This isn't through high schools..."
- Davis, M.: "First through eighth, yes."
- Eddy: "... and then it requires that they have at least one full-time social worker on site."
- Davis, M.: "That is correct."
- Eddy: "They do 10 to 15 minutes of physical education and they have after school activities available for students so..."
- Davis, M.: "That is correct."
- Eddy: "... those three are man... new mandates for the school."
- Davis, M.: "That is correct."
- Eddy: "Has CPS indicated what the potential costs could be for adding social workers and after school physical activities for school districts in quote, 'violence-prone areas'?"
- Davis, M.: "No, they haven't and one good thing about his Bill is it states if the money is available. Some schools currently have social workers on duty. Some of these schools do have social workers. Some of them have parttime social workers, but because of the trauma the children experience on a daily basis going to and from school, and

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

their inability to go outside and play, even when they go home, it affects their learning. And this legislation was a result of a series of articles from the Chicago Sun-Times. I think there were about eight days of stories that showed exactly what was happening in these violence-prone schools where children could not go out and play before school or after school. Many of them did not have any recess during the entire day and it built up, well, what shall we say, bad behavior. And the police are the ones who will determine if the school is in a violence-prone area. In other words: were there three gangs shootings this week; did the kids know about the deaths of three or four people who are in the community or in their high school?"

Eddy: "Well, I... I'm... I'm understanding of the issue and I remember reading some of those articles and it... it certainly needs some type of attention. I think this approach is a reasonable approach. I get concerned about mandates with money and the costs. Is this subject to appropriation? Is this subject to the Chicago Public School System appropriating..."

Davis, M.: "Yes, it is."

Eddy: "... money for the program?"

Davis, M.: "Yes, it..."

Eddy: "If they don't have the money, they don't have to do this?"

Davis, M.: "That is absolutely correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

34th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "And we're... our feeling is with the new stimulus money for education, these are programs that can be implemented."
- Eddy: "So, your hope is that when they receive additional money, either in Title 1 or... or other types of federal stimulus funds appropriated for this purpose that they will then use that money to implement the social worker, the activities, and those types of thing?"
- Davis, M.: "That is correct, Sir."
- Eddy: "Representative, I... I understand what you're trying to do. I appreciate the... the unique challenges that you face in... in some of those neighborhoods and I appreciate the fact that you've brought this forward to the Body. I think it's a good start at... at trying to take care of some of those issues."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative. I hope you'll join me as a Sponsor of this legislation."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis to close."
- Davis, M.: "I would just ask everyone to vote for this legislation and hopefully, we can provide for our children who are in terrible need to enhance their education and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2254 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Representative Sullivan, Osmond, Bassi. Suzi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dennis Reboletti, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1105. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1105, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative... Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. today I bring to you House Bill 1105 and I thank Tim Schmitz for allowing me to be the lead Sponsor on this Back in February, I was on the House Floor and received some disturbing news from my first grade... my son's first grade school in Elmhurst, that they had received a threat of violence to which he and 500 other classmates had to be removed. Not only was that school called, but an entire junior high and grade school district in Bensenville was called, with hundreds of students having to be evacuated and numerous police departments having to deal with checking for bombs and for guns and... and other dangerous situations. The current penalty for calling in a threat like this is a Class C misdemeanor which is barely above a speeding ticket. What this Bill seeks to do is raise that penalty to a Class IV felony, which is probationable, but also up to one to three years in prison. I'll answer any questions and I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I only had one call about this Bill.

It was from an athletic director of a high school in my district wanting to know if this would apply to someone who got out of hand, being upset with a referee or an umpire at a school sporting event?"

Reboletti: "This... this is intending if it's a threat of violence called in to the school during school session or away from school session, but it's not if you got mad at a referee and... and got..."

Black: "So..."

Reboletti: "... heated discussion."

Clerk Bolin: "... it would only be if... if it's called into the school, not that it takes place after the school, during some kind of event?"

Reboletti: "Right. So, if there was an event happening and somebody called in this particular event at my son's school was a nondescript threat of violence. So, they weren't exactly sure what was going to happen. Obviously, if there's a heated argument and tempers flare, there could still be some discretion there but this is one... an entire school had to be evacuated because they weren't sure what the situation was."

Black: "All right. So, I tried to tell the AD, and I'm not an attorney but let me just ask to see… make sure I was right, 'cause I would think if somebody disrupted an athletic event with… with rather outrageous behavior and/or threats

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

to the referee and caused the game to be interrupted for a period of time, there are already remedies for that, aren't there? Disturbing the peace or..."

Reboletti: "That... That is correct? It acknowledges... It depends..."

Black: "Okay."

Reboletti: "... on what the commentary was..."

Black: "Okay."

Reboletti: "... but obviously they can just remove 'em or depending on what he said. If he said..."

Black: "Okay."

Reboletti: "... you know, we're going to kill the referee..."

Black: "All right."

Reboletti: "... that might be different. So..."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti to close."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1105 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'... vote 'no'. The two... voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mark Walker. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', and 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chuck Jefferson, on page 34 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 537. Out of the record. Representative Karen May, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2325.

34th Legislative Day

- Representative May, do you wish to call the Bill? Out of the record. Kevin McCarthy, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2318. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2318, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kevin McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2318 amends the Child Care Act of 1969 and it... requires the Department of Children and Family Services in cooperation with the Department of Public Health, which we changed yesterday by Amendment, to publish on their Web site, the information about the... the need for annual immunization for flu for children six months old and older. It's a recent recommendation from the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices and with the Amendment, I believe there is no opposition."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 2318?

 Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2318

 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those
 opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who
 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill,
 there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This
 Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is
 hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of
 House Bill 2325?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2325 is on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading."

34th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Move that Bill to the Order of Second Reading at the request this Sponsor. Representative Deb Mell, you have House Bill... on page 38 of the Calendar, House Bill 2573. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2573, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Debbie Mell."
- Mell: "HB 2573... Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB 2573 requires institutions of higher education to display a poster talking about sexual harassment, what to do if you feel you have been a victim of sexual harassment. I know of no opposition and I urge an 'aye' vote, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? See none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2573 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, Crespo. Read the Bill... Take the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2573 has received 106 'yes' votes, 0 'no' votes. Receiving the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, on page 39 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2643. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2643, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

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

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the Body. What House Bill 2643 seeks to do is amend the downstate police article for pensions. I have a... a constituent who is a special needs adult, who is in a guardianship and his mother is right now, not one of the guardians in the trust and if she were to pass the adult disabled individual and not be able to receive the pension. COGFA has said that there is no financial impact and I would be willing to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Deborah Graham."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Graham: "Representative Reboletti, can you explain what this Bill does, again?"

Reboletti: "Representative, actually, I think it's a... from the... the father was a former police officer in Oak Park, which I believe is one of your communities. He passed and his pension went on to his wife who has a special needs child. The child is an adult who is in a guardianship. For the adult child... the adult now, to receive a pension, the people who are the guardians of the pension... or of the... of the person, are not family members. So, the law wouldn't allow the pension, once his mother passes, to go into this trust. So he'll be left without the pension. So, the Bill would allow the special needs adult to continue to use... the

34th Legislative Day

- guardians to use that pension of take care of him and his needs."
- Graham: "So, there's nothing on... in statute already that would allow for a special needs child to receive the pension of his parents?"
- Reboletti: "If... if the special needs person was not in a trust, in this guardianship, then that would be the case. By Illinois law, it would pass down to him through a state law. Since he's in a guardianship and the people that are the guardians are not family, to which the pension would pass down, state law says that he would not be able to get the pension."
- Graham: "So, if... so, we're setting this... we're changing the law because this child is a special needs child and the people who is his guardian... guardians are not family members?"
- Reboletti: "Well, they may be family members, but they would not be entitled, at least initially, to the transfer of the pension. So, I believe that they are not family members in this case, but they would be keeping... they would monitor the pension. They would take care of the pension and the adult, disabled person's needs, once mom passes away."
- Graham: "I... I'm dealing with some issues similar to that and I want to continue to listen to the debate if anybody else has any questions with this. And this is only if the child is a special needs child? So, if the child was not a special needs child, and there was a pension out there, that pension would just go where? The child would not be able to... if the..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Reboletti: "Assuming that you're a police officer and you... your child would be in line to receive the pension, however something happens to you and you had friends that were the guardian of this child. Now, for this... this really only deals with disabled because they have a guardianship... those people... you have to show a court that the person is unable to care for their needs and... and their personal needs as well as their business or... or... or other needs."

Graham: "Thank you, Representative."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Reboletti to close."

Reboletti: "Thank you. Members of the Body, I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2643 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Reitz, Chairperson of Health Care License to which the following measures were referred, action taken on March 27, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations; recommends 'be adopted' is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 64, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1292, Floor Amendment

34th Legislative Day

- #1 to House Bill 2247. Recommends 'be adopted' as amended is House Resolution 95."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Michael Bost."
- Bost: "Thank... Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If you could, we need to add Representative Mulligan to the excused list, as well, today."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk will so do so. Representative Susana Mendoza, on page 36 of the Calendar, your House Bill 881, you wish to move the Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 881, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Susana Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 881 is identical to a Bill that we passed out of this chamber last year. It provides a fund for the erection of the roadside memorials for the victims of DUI accidents. In this case, what would happen here, is that the DUI offender would be hit with a \$50 fine that would go into the Roadside Memorial Fund to be able to pay for the signs of those victims of DUI crashes that end up losing their life. We passed this unanimously last year and I would once again ask for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Are there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti. I believe that Representative Reboletti's light

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

was on off again and we'll come back to him if he seeks recognition. The Chair recognizes Representative Ramey."

Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought you had the wrong Gentleman from DuPage confused there for a moment."

Speaker Lyons: "That's a good possibility. My... my apologies."

Ramey: "Possibility."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey."

Ramey: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Representative, why is my name not on this Bill?"

Mendoza: "Well, I'm making sure it is right now. Thanks."

Ramey: "Thank you very much. This is a very good Bill. We talked about his last year. Of course, I would have liked to have seen a bigger fine on these DUI offenders, but I agree with what you're doing here. First and foremost though, who's controlling the fund?"

Mendoza: "The Clerks of Court Act. I mean, it's a DUI Roadside Memorial Fund, so it goes into the clerks account. This... was an initiative from Dorothy Brown at the time."

Ramey: "And so, it's not going to go into anywhere where it could be swept?"

Mendoza: "Right. That would be my intention. I mean, if we need to add that language in the Senate, I'd be happy to.

I know we did in the past with the prior Governor,..."

Ramey: "Right."

Mendoza: "... I don't know that we're doing that at this point, but I'd be happy to make that Amendment..."

Ramey: "Very good."

Mendoza: "...in the Senate."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Ramey: "Good work."

Mendoza: "Thanks."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mendoza to close."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 881 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brandon Phelps, on page 33 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 173. Out of the record. Representative Phelps, you also have House Bill 462. you interested in moving that? Out of the record. Representative Senger, on page 37 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1313. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1313, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Will, Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Representatives of the House for your recognition. House Bill 1313 basically provides that a student may be expelled for gross disobedience or misconduct if a threat... explicit threat is made... made over the Internet to a teacher or another employee of the schools. This also gives the schools ability to do a suspension if... if the same threat was made. Given the Amendment we just made, there are no opponents to

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

the Bill and basically, this is a Bill that has passed the House two times before."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1313 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 102 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Bob Rita, on page 36 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 789. Do you wish to move that Bill? We'll take that Bill out of the record, momentarily. Representative Art Turner. Representative Mark Walker, on page 40 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4120. Representative, do you wish to move that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4120, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mark Walerk."
- Walker: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4120 amends the Property Tax Code to provide that any taxing district may order the County Clerk to abate any portion of its taxes on a property if the facility on that property is rented or owned by a new business, and that property has been vacant for 24 months. This Bill is... is encouraging small businesses and entrepreneurs to... to start up businesses and

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

to use the vacant property available in our communities. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reitz: "Representative, is it our understanding that if a small business wanted to come in on this vacant property or even property that had a building on it, but it was unoccupied, that they would owe the back taxes? Is that how that works?"

Walker: "That is not... not how it works."

Reitz: "Okay. Could you explain how your Bill is going to help?"

Walker: "Yeah. This is going forward as a new company, not a...
an existing company, wants to startup in a vacant property,
the taxing bodies can choose to abate their current taxes
and going forward, real estate taxes, in anywhere from 0 to
100 percent. It's entirely up to the taxing body."

Reitz: "But don't they have that power now?"

Walker: "They have that power to, at least as I understand it in my area, they have the power to abate up to 50 percent, up to 7 years for any company that is growing in there community. This would expand that to new companies and expand it to up to a 100 percent."

Reitz: "What's the genesis for your legislation?"

Walker: "Well, this legislation... the genesis actually was in...
in staff in this area. It probably's an idea that has been
around but it would... it got me excited because the same

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

idea came out of a meeting I had in my community with landlords and the local chambers of commerce as a way to incubate new businesses."

Reitz: "And certainly, we want to do that all we can. I was just trying to get some more clarification on that, so...

Have you had anybody slip in on your legislation at the county level or local level?"

Walker: "No."

Reitz: "So, we don't know if there's any opposition there?"

Walker: "No. I... I would say that the people that I've talked to on the local level are... are excited about it. In fact, supported this idea as we discussed it."

Reitz: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Patti Bellock."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor awaits your questions."

Bellock: "Thank you. Well, maybe our analysis is wrong because on our analysis it said, I want to say... that Metro Counties was opposed or am I reading that wrong?"

Walker: "Yes. I... I was that as well. I have... I have not heard from them. They did not slip on this... this issue. I also have a note that Taxpayers Federation is opposed. I asked them what their opposition was and they have yet to come back to me."

Bellock: "And the Taxpayer Federation of Illinois was opposed, also?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Walker: "That is what the analysis says. I have not heard from them. I asked the representative of the Taxpayers Federation why they were opposed and to date they haven't given me an answer."

Bellock: "You don't think that there were slips on those from the meeting... when you did this?"

Walker: "As far as I know, no."

Bellock: "Really. Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Ed Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support for this Bill. When you think about a start-up, the first few years of a start-up, they could actually be losing money as they're getting their business ramped up over Their biggest problem that they have are fixed costs. One of the biggest fixed costs for any business is real estate taxes. What this Bill allows is for a unit of local government, it could be a municipality, it could be the county, it could be the park district, the schools, to make that determination for themselves at. We want this business to succeed, so we're going to abate a portion of their taxes. It doesn't force any unit of local government to abate the taxes. It's if they choose to. So, if you have empty buildings in your jurisdiction and you want to encourage businesses to come to your jurisdiction, this is a tremendous tool that could be used, should your local government choose to enforce it so, I... I do rise in strong support and I think I'm a cosponsor, but if I'm not, I'd like to be added. Thank you."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake,
Representative Cole."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Cole: "Representative Walker, who's going to pick up the slack?

Who's going to pick up the property taxes that are being abated to this business? Would this be local property tax owners?"

Walker: "Yes."

Cole: "So, local individuals that are struggling with their families to make ends meet in a recession, are going to be picking up the slack for a business that may come in to the town?"

Walker: "This is... there's no requirement that this occur. This is up to the decision of the local taxing bodies."

Cole: "And what makes this different than a TIF district, the tax incremental financing? Because all the property tax, all the taxing districts come together and decide whether they... they agree, or would consent, or would support tax incremental financing. So, what makes this different?"

Walker: "Well, the difference is that this is one taxing district or more. The... the... the goal here is there are a lot individuals out of work. There's a lot of capital sitting on the sideline. There are a lot of empty buildings and I think it's fairly clear that if we can cover all those issues at once, this is a good idea."

Cole: "Would this have to be a new dis... a new business or could this just be a business that already exists in the municipality and they're just moving to a different site?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Walker: "This has to be a brand new business."

Cole: "I don't read that in the legislation. So, is... is there a... where would that be? I mean, what defines 'new business'? Is it... is..."

Walker: "Yeah, it's on line 11 of the Bill. It is..."

Cole: "And the definition would be... this could be a... this could be a law firm that's on one side of town, they have a new partner, they change their name, now they can go into a... property..."

Walker: "There is..."

Cole: "... tax free on another site?"

Walker: "I would... I would guess that's correct, that it is a new business, a new corporation, a new partnership."

Cole: "Okay. And I understand the wording new business, but the definition..."

Walker: "But again, the..."

Cole: "... definition of 'new business' is very vague."

Walker: "The control here is... is in the local taxing district that chooses to abate their own taxes."

Cole: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I rise in strong... not support this Bill. I think the burden of the additional property taxes for the taxing district that... that says they're abating it for a business, it will fall to the equalized on local property tax owners."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Walker to close."

Walker: "Yeah, we... we... as we all know, we have a very difficult economic situation going on in our communities that involves people losing jobs, income going down, businesses struggling to start and yet, we have a capital sitting on

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

the sidelines. I think anything we can do to help small businesses… help small businesses start and grow, that is left up to the local community, I think, is a good thing. I... I urge and 'aye' vote on this."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 4120 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? May.
 McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 90 Members voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared pass. Representative Rita, do you wish to call 789 (sic-House Bill) or do you wish to...
 Representative Rita, do you wish to call 789 (sic-House Bill)? Out of the record. Representative Dan Beiser, on page 34 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 563. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 563, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Dan Beiser."
- Beiser: "Yeah, thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 563 is an initiative of the Illinois Dental Society and it reestablishes a system of testing... regional testing to help out with the requirement of... for licensure of dentists. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and appreciate an 'aye' vote."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Renée Kosel."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "This Bill was brought before our committee and I want to thank you for bringing it forward. It... it really is going to answer a very serious problem we have in getting professors in dental schools, and will allow us to recruit the very best and finest from across this state. So, I wanted to thank you for bringing this forward and would encourage a 'yes' vote on it."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative David Miller."

Miller: "To the Bill. I want to thank the Sponsor, too, for... about bringing this forward. It is a very important issue of trying to get the best and brightest into our... our field. Currently, right now, there are basically two standards of... of dental examination. This would help standardize those tests that practitioners that took a test somewhere else can at least not go through the different requirements and be able to have some sense of uniformity. I ask and request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "See no further discussion, the question is, 'Should House Bill 563 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Fritchey. Representative Senger. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's a 104 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

- This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Frank Mautino in the Chair."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, on page 36 in the Calendar appears House Bill 921. Representative Burke. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 921, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very simple matter. House Bill 921 would require that dental offices prepare... offer to have an emergency preparedness plan and also have an AED in offices that would administer general anesthesia. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage from... for House Bill 921 and on that, Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Will the Sponsor yield? I just want to make sure that when... in your comments you had said that those practices that offer administered general anesthesia or all offices regardless of their scope of practice?"
- Burke: "Those that offer patients general anesthesia."
- Miller: "Okay. And they would be required a... a... a plan in sense of emergency medical, meaning who to call, what to do, a course of action for themselves and staff?"

Burke: "That's right."

Miller: "All right. Is there any requirements in them being trained for it... the initiation within the first 30 days of being hired if it's a new assistant or associate?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Burke: "No. We have no provisions for that in the Bill."

Miller: "Is there any indication that if an incident happens before... like the... for day one that they would be in violation of this law or just a plan had to be at least available for those individuals?"

Burke: "Just that the plan be available."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons in the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative JoAnn Osmond."

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

Speaker Lyons: "I'm sorry, Representative Burke, what's the question?"

Burke: "She has a question."

Speaker Lyons: "Yeah. Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you. Representative, in the Amendment of this Bill, does it not cover the question that all of us have been faced with recently about AEDs being on school grounds, properties and when they're rented... I'm sorry. When the properties are used by different organizations like youth baseball or things like that, that this Bill clarifies the use of an AED on those premises?"

Burke: "Yes. Yes, Representative. Any physical fitness entity that would not be conducting supervised activities. So, in a facility was being used by a private citizen for a private activity, then they do not have to have the AED... the trained AED operator on premises."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

- Osmond: "To the Bill. This... the Amendment definitely clarifies some of the questions that our school districts are faced with, with the up and coming season for summer baseball and that, and I really think that you can go back to your districts with this information and make it a lot clearer on the use of AEDs and I stand in support of this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Burke to close."
- Burke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen,

 I think we've discussed the matter sufficiently. I would

 ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 921 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kevin Joyce. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bill Black, on page 36 of the Calendar, you're House Bill 862. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 862, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was brought to me by the Illinois Community College Trustees Association. It simply says that bids for various goods and services can be

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

submitted electronically under the certain conditions as outlined in the Bill with the current, doesn't increase the threshold, \$25,000. As amended yesterday, it says specifically that bids for construction purposes are prohibited from being submitted electronically. They think this simply makes for a more efficient process. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have."

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 862 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Burns, Davis. Take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Michael Bost, on page 40 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4153. Representative Bost. Michael, do you wish to call that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4153, a Bill for an Act concerning highways. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Mike Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4153, a very simple Bill. At a time whenever we have been short on funds here in the state, and as you drive up and down the highway, as you've noticed, we were not doing the mowings like we were able to before. What this Bill does, is that it simply allows IDOT to go out on contract

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

with farmers and people who are able to go ahead and harvest the hay off the right-of-ways if that is... if they have the right liability insurance and is cleared through IDOT. So, I'll be glad to answer any questions on this."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harry Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Osterman: "Representative, harvesting hay, explain the process of what actually happens."

Bost: "Well, basically, what happens is, and it depends on whether you're using the round bales or you're using square bales, and based on that, you do a cut and after you do the cut you have to do a rake and then that... then that hay has to have the opportunity to dry, 'cause if you harvest it too quick, you can start a fire in the barns. With that being said, once you've done that, then you come by and you... you harvest that hay and then that hay can be sold for... for feed or whichever process someone wants to use the hay for. It would be an opportunity for farmers to go ahead and help the state out in this way."

Osterman: "This would not about burning of..."

Bost: "No. As a matter of fact, that's the problem I see right now. If you travel up and down, we've decided to start burning and when areas are dry, that's a high risk problem. This would not be a concern that way and... and it would be safe... You know, with the insurance, they think that would be a safety..."

Osterman: "I would..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "...the safety factor would be covered."

Osterman: "I would agree with you. Having come up from Chicago, they were burning with the wind on Tuesday..."

Bost: "Not a good idea."

Osterman: "...and it was dangerous at some point, so good luck with your Bill."

Bost: "Thank you."

Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnabego, Representative Winters."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Representative Bost, are you aware of other states where they harvest hay on their road *REVIEW* ..."

Bost: "Yeah. Actually there are. I don't know which state they were but when we were first doing the research here and I don't... I'd have to go deep into the analysis but there are other states that have done this process for quite some time. It does make sense. You know, not every place can be harvested because of the danger of being too close to heavy traffic flow. But if it's in a rural area and/or around our... clover leafs and things like that, it make sense."

Winters: "Will IDOT be responsible then for drawing up rules on this? In one of the scenarios that I'm thinking of is often, when you're trying to make hay, you need an... several days of... of good sunshine, low humidity weather to get the hay dry enough to bale. If that doesn't happen, if you end up with a couple of showers, the hay's not ready to make... it can create a problem later on."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "Sure."

Winters: "You've got to crop hay wind-rowed, it will kill out the grass underneath, it if it's left. Have you anticipated that or has..."

Bost: "Well, it..."

Winters: "...IDOT talked about the operating procedures..."

Bost: "It..."

Winters: "...that they would require?"

Bost: "In... in answer to the first part of your question, it is IDOT's rules, it can be moved and used... moved forward. I know that there are concerns, you know. All of us that have been around whenever we make hay, no pun intended. It does, if the weather changes, those things happen. Could there be lines left on the... on the areas? Sure. That's a possibility where... where the hay has laid too long and didn't have the chance to dry, but right now with what we're seeing up and down our highways is they grow up. And actually, sometimes even the danger of just the grass growing up, I think this is a better process."

Winters: "And they have some kind of procedure on how to move the equipment and not only that, but do you... if you have up to five miles of right-of-way that you have the right to harvest, we're probably talking either big, square bales, the size that you would move with a forklift to put on a semi truck. Do they have mechanisms that they can do that and safely accommodate the highway traffic?"

Bost: "Yes. That... that's why it's important to allow that to be with IDOT, for them to clarify the rules on what they would prefer to be used in certain areas. You know the...

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

the… possibly the baling of a… of a square bale might be better in one area and a round bale in another. And then you'd have to use a tractor with your forklift and a lowbed type trailer to… to load it on to get it out of the median and then also out of the… off the shoulder."

Winters: "Is this applicable to both two-lane highways and... and four-lane interstates?"

Bost: "It is... it is for all highways, yes."

Winters: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative David Reis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, did I hear you're trying to make hay out of a political situation?"

Bost: "I... I am trying to make hay out of a political situation.

Yes."

Reis: "Well, I have some technical questions for you."

Bost: "Oh, good."

Reis: "Does this provide exemptions for... does this provide exemptions? You can't have tractors on interstates."

Bost: "Yes. It actually has to and that was why the rules were left up to IDOT, to allow that opportunity for tractors to move up and down the side and along the right-of-ways to do this."

Reis: "Now... now, some of our farmers don't have modern hay baling equipment. They have horses and things. Does this allow exemptions for that as well?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "You know, I guess that's something that they could write into the rules. I... I think it depends on where you're at in this state. You know, one important thing is that... that... and I don't know whether they'll allow this. I... I'm a big believer that the hay... round hay bale has been the ruination of... of America. I think that it has taken away a tremendous amount of job opportunities for younger people to really realize what work's all about. I talked to the... to the young kids coming up now and they don't know what it's like to go out and bale hay or why it is that one person has to sit on the wagon to watch to make sure that whenever they're picking up a bale, the snake isn't down underneath there. So, you know, maybe this'll be a golden opportunity for people to have the opportunity to go back to square bales and... and good hard labor."

Reis: "My dad always called that character building."

Bost: "It is character building to say the least."

Reis: "A couple more questions. You know... does your Bill specify the make or model of the equipment? I mean, can it be green, or blue, or red?"

Bost: "It actually does not. I know that many members of my family are... are... they prefer green and the yellow writing always seems to be good for them, but it does not... it's not... it's not tractor specific."

Reis: "I have one last question. I think I'm getting the hook here. You know there's many wildflower areas in the state that have now been deemed not wildflowers, can they bale in these areas then?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "Actually... actually, if IDOT allows it, that's wonderful.

And speaking of that, though, you know, you find that since
we have had many concerns for horses from this floor this
year, this... you find that those wild flowers are
tremendously good for feed for horses when you put it in
the hay. It must add something to flavor. They really
enjoy it and for the... for the sake of the horses, I think
it's wonderful to bale that as well."

Reis: "Great protein."

Bost: "Great protein."

Reis: "Thanks to your legislation, Representative. Great piece."

Speaker Lyons: "This Bill is on Short Debate, Ladies and Gentlemen. We have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven people waiting to speak. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "He awaits your question, Sir."

Eddy: "Representative, I had constituents in my area offer a suggestion to IDOT regarding a similar activity. They were interested in switch grass being harvested in right-of-ways and medians. Did you consider expanding this from anything besides just hay, to switch grass or..."

Bost: "It... it could open up to anything and I'd be... I'd be more than willing in the future. But if we move it on out of here, if we want to put what, just any type of grass to be harvested would be fine."

Eddy: "Well, and I... I think that this has potential. They gave... the answer they gave me had... had several concerns

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

regarding equipment... it's maybe some of the things you've heard from them. Drainage, the type of sight/vision... And I know they have to take care of those issues, but I think there's a great potential here to cut costs of mowing..."

Bost: "Right."

Eddy: "... number one, and then if you're going to permit fee that, obviously, that could... And they could also maybe even, like we do some rent, cash rent in farms around..."

Bost: "That... that... that's the..."

Eddy: "... that part of the state."

Bost: "That's the idea and intent. Is the… Okay, first off, we don't have the costs of mowing."

Eddy: "Right."

Bost: "Secondly, there would be a profit, and that's why a farmer might… would take this up, naturally. And that's what we want to do is do that and that's what other states have done."

Eddy: "Well, I would... I would only ask that as you move this along and... and you get it to the Senate, if there's a possibility of looking at switch grass as... as an option along with hay, this is something that would support the ethanol industry. We're looking for, you know, some alternatives and support for fuel for the alternative energy. And... and if you would do that, I'd appreciate that... as you move it through."

Bost: "Okay. I'll... I'll add that to there but a Legislator right here beside mentioned the fact, he doesn't believe that switch grass is even good for goats. He's... he doesn't

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

believe it's a real good product, but I'm more than willing to look at it."

Eddy: "Well, he'll have to… I'll talk to him and ethanol is what… I'm not worried about goats, ethenol is what we're concerned with. All right, thank you."

Bost: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Karen May."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

May: "Yes, thank you, Representative. I have a couple questions and I've been reading your Bill. What notification provisions are there to communities?"

Bost: "As of right now, I don't… we don't have anything. I don't… we don't have anything as far as notification to communities. It would be through IDOT that this would be coordinated."

May: "Uh huh. I..."

Bost: "So..."

May: "I would suggest maybe you want to think about that."

Bost: "Okay."

May: "And I bring it up... one other person asked about the wildflower areas."

Bost: "Right."

May: "There are many communities that have planted prairie flowers and wildflowers along the highway and it's very... it's very hard sometimes for IDOT to recognize this and crews will come in and mow off areas..."

Bost: "Right."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

May: "... that have beautiful plants. So, I've got several of those communities. So..."

Bost: "We can... we can look at that when we get over to the Senate..."

May: "I... I would..."

Bost: "... and be glad to."

May: "Yeah, I would love to see something about notification or protection of wild flower areas."

Bost: "Okay."

May: "I... I do think you need to address that. And I would appreciate that very much."

Bost: "I will definitely look at that."

May: "The notification and a carve out for wild flower areas where... where people have done that. That would..."

Bost: "We'll talk to our Senate Sponsor..."

May: "That would be great. Thank you."

Bost: "... and see if we can get that added."

May: "And then another Representative, who doesn't have the courage to ask this himself, wants to know if we could solve two problems at once. If Representative Sacia's horses could maybe be allowed to graze along the road..."

Bost: "Graze... graze along the right-of-way..."

May: "... at some times."

Bost: "We could... you know, we could look at that. I..."

May: "Okay. And... and this... this Representative is standing over there, but he didn't have the courage to ask that..."

Bost: "I understand."

May: "... question. Thank you."

Bost: "I understand."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

May: "Thank you for your consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Rich Myers."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Myers: "Representative Bost..."

Bost: "Hey, Rich."

Myers: "...thank you for carrying this Bill. I am a cosponsor on there and I have had constituents that have asked that... that have asked the ability to hay and graze before, not graze, but at least hay. I do have a serious question' though. As I'm reading your Bill, or reading the analysis, our analysis of it, it says that the permit issued under this subsection may be valid from July 15 each year until September 15. Is that the only window of time that an individual has to harvest the hay off of the state right-of-way?"

Bost: "That... that was the time suggested by IDOT for proper harvesting."

Myers: "Speaking as one who used to raise an awful lot of hay in my day when I was farming, in many cases, especially with the grass hay like that, that's... that's beyond the peak nutritive value time of the hay. Okay, did IDOT give you an explanation as to why they didn't want any hay harvested until July 15?"

Bost: "They... they did not. We can get back to them and... and find out what their ruling was...

Myers: "All right."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "...whether it was based on their... on a betterment not of the hay but on their own paperwork. And if that's the case then it's something that we may be able to..."

Myers: "I suspect..."

Bost: "...*REVIEW*

Myers: "...that it may have something to do with the wildlife that may be habitating that right-of-way. I don't know."

Bost: "I... I don't know."

Myers: "It was one of the arguments that I've heard in the past, but I would urge you to really talk to IDOT, because if I was wanting to harvest that hay and harvest good quality hay to be able to sell to either..."

Bost: "You'd want to harvest..."

Myers: "...horse people or cattle people..."

Bost: "...earlier in the year."

Myers: "Yeah. I'd... I'd want the peak value out of that grass and July 15 to September 15, all you're going to get is dried stems at that point."

Bost: "Okay."

Myers: "Thank you."

Bost: "That is something that I'll ask."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Mr. Bost, I have some serious questions about this Bill. I've just read it and..."

Bost: "Okay."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Franks: "...I didn't know about it coming up before. Are we talking about... when you're talking about rights-of-way, are you talking about like on the sides of the road where the grass is really high..."

Bost: "Correct."

Franks: "...and you want to have that mowed down?"

Bost: "Yeah. Basically, we're wanting to turn it over to the private farmer, because that farmer will be able to go ahead and... and through this permitting process, use it for their benefit for harvesting it and then our benefit for the fact that we're not having to send somebody out to mow it."

Franks: "Well, here's my... I got some serious concerns."

Bost: "Okay."

Franks: "First of all, why aren't we cutting the grass on time?

And here's the reason why I'm asking, I'm think there's real questions of liability when it comes to sight lines.

'Cause I know I've called IDOT a number of times when they've let the grass get too high where people can't even pull out of their driveways if they're on a curve because they can't see around the stuff they haven't cut."

Bost: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. So, I understand what you're trying to solve but my concern is when you give it to a private individual, or an intity..."

Bost: "Okay."

Franks: "...we're really increasing our liability. I understand in the Bill you hear, they say they're going to indemnify,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

but all that really means is it's one extra person to sue. Would you..."

Bost: "Right."

Franks: "...agree?"

Bost: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. Because I've seen people, private... private farmers trying to help out to cut the grass with... where IDOT hasn't it and they... there tractor has nicked the pole,..."

Bost: "Right."

Franks: "...knocked over the electrical line, caused accidents, caused untold type of things. So, I'm not sure that the private guys would have the proper equipment, because sometimes these tractors are so big that they may not fit correctly and they may have a much higher chance of knocking over a power line as where IDOT has specific equipment for this mowing. Would you agree?"

Bost: "That... that's why we've left... if you look at the language, it leaves the opportunity for IDOT to make the final say on these areas. And also in response to, like the areas where the state liability for not being able to see around a curve or whatever because the grass has grown up, that doesn't remove that responsibility from the state. They would still have to go in and make sure that was taken care of early."

Franks: "In a perverse sort of way, we're sort of giving the state... well, we are giving the state an incentive not to maintain the roadways. Because what we're saying is if you

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

pay me forty bucks, it's not our problem. You're going to... you're going to be..."

Bost: "Yeah, but it..."

Franks: "...cutting the grass, or mowing, or doing whatever. And let's assume..."

Bost: "But I don't think that removes the liability from the state, though. So..."

Franks: "Oh, I know. But let's... but here's my problem, let's assume we sell the permit to farmer A, and farmer A says, you know what, I'm not going to make any money off of this. I'm not going to deal with it. Forget it. It was a stupid deal. I took five miles worth of road frontage. I'm just not going to do it because the price of hay is so low now, the quality is so poor, gas prices have risen. Forget it. I've got the permit, but I'm not going to do it. But now, if the state would go on and harvest it, then the farmer would have a cause of action against the state for taking his crop."

Bost: "Right."

Franks: "And that's... Once again, that still falls back into the case as we put all this together with IDOT. We're giving a lot of leeway to IDOT to make sure this happens. Other states have been successful at this and it only makes sense in a time when we..."

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

If you can conclude your questions, we'd appreciate it."

Franks: "I appreciate what you're trying to do. I've got real reservations about this and I'd like to learn more about what other states are doing. All right. Thank you."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and House. This Gentlemen of the is certainly Representative Bost's first Bill. I think some people have had a great deal of fun with it, but that's not the intent of his Bill. For those of you who don't live in rural areas, first of all, there's nothing new about this. During the last major drought out west, IDOT came to many farmers and said if they would harvest the roadside, they could ship the hay to their fellow farmers out in the Dakotas and others that were just absolutely devastated by drought. And so, thousands of bales were sent out to the Dakotas, and Nebraska, and Colorado in order to help feed livestock in those states that were so impacted by drought. My neighboring state of Indiana has done this for more than 40 years and it works very well. And this does not supplant IDOT, it simply allows in some cases, where IDOT would say yes, you can mow and harvest the hay along this particular highway. Ιt does not eliminate responsibility. If the farmer, for whatever the reason, decides he doesn't want to or can't, then it's still IDOT's responsibility. But we all know that IDOT last year, pulled all of their lawnmowers off the road and many of us only had our... the right-of-way mowed once last year. IDOT is not opposed to this Bill. It is not supplanting what IDOT is supposed to do. It simply gives a unique partnership between a private individual and IDOT and in some cases, that's to the taxpayers' benefit. If you

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

eliminate even a hundred miles that they may not have to mow once or twice this spring and summer, it's to the taxpayers' benefit and advantage to do that. And it's also to the advantage and benefit of the farmer. This is not an insignificant Bill. It's not one that is... is offered in jest. It's a real Bill to address a real problem and real concerns, particularly in rural areas. Many states have done it. They've not had any difficulties with it. I would summit to you that Illinois has done it before in the case of the severe drought out west a few years ago. I stand in strong support of the Gentlemen's Bill. And any of the legitimate concerns that you've had and have been addressed, I think Representative Bost has clearly said he will work with you on those concerns as the Bill moves through the process. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brauer."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I... I guess I am a little confused why there's all this debate."

Bost: "Thank you. You and I both."

Brauer: "I mean we... we take a liability to this state and turn it into and asset for the farmer?"

Bost: "That is correct."

Brauer: "Now, I... I know around my district, the only time it's typically mowed, especially with the high gas prices, is right before the state fair."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bost: "When they're wanting... wanting it to look nice and those issues, especially with the... especially over the last couple of years."

Brauer: "Speaker, To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is one of those simple, commonsense Bill. It's going to be typically done downstate where the farmers are, where they can take advantage of this asset. If you drive over to Indiana in the summertime, you will notice a huge difference between their roadsides, between our roadsides. This also becomes a safety issue as it was mentioned before as a line of sight when you're looking at deer running out in the road. A lot of times when the side of the road's not mowed, that gives deer a place to hide. So, it's not only an asset for the farmers, it becomes a safety issue. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lyons: "You... you're the last speaker? Representative Bost to close."

Bost: "Thank you very much for the debate on this issue. It's a pretty simple Bill and I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 4153 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Hoffman. Representative Will Burns, want to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

passed. Representative Will Burns, on page 38 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2383. Do you wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 2383, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading."

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

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm presenting House Bill 2383. This Bill is designed to ensure that during this economic crisis that people who are suffering have access to the benefits that they're entitled to in a more expeditious manner. amended it to meet the needs of the Department of Human Services. What's important to note is that the Federal Government, through the stimulus plan, will provide 80% of any additional costs that is incurred by the state as a consequence of expanding the case load for Temporary Aid to Needy Families. This Bill enjoys... enjoys broad bipartisan support. It does not change any of the work requirements that were negotiated in 1997. It requires a speed up of payments to TANF recipients. It would give the state 30 days to approve an application as opposed to 45, and requires the state to provide benefits to persons as soon as they qualify for the benefit. I look forward to answering any questions and look forward to your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman yields."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Stephens: "Representative, I appreciate the fact that you're reaching out to... to bring benefit to those who are in need.

Are you aware that the Department of Human Services is closing local offices around downstate and indeed, in the city, even as we speak?"

Burns: "I am not specifically aware of that issue."

Stephens: "Well, let me... let me just bring you up to date. For instance, in Fayette County, one of the counties that I'm proud to represent, the... the local office is being closed. Now, they serve 2620 head count at the last review. I asked the department, well, why are you closing? 'What are your... what are your parameters? How... how did you make this decision of which office to close? They said, 'Well, any office that serves less than 2000 people will be included on that list.' Fayette County serves 2620 as of this day. Would you agree with me that if you're going to be closing offices that serve the most needy in our state, that it should be based on logical rationale and not... and if you then have that logical rationale, that you should stick to it. That's seems to make sense, doesn't it?"

Burns: "I certainly agree with you, Representative, that we need to make sure that people have access to services and in Chicago, and in Cook County, one of the concerns is that in DHS offices, they've not been staffed appropriately so that case workers are not making... not giving information to folks about all the benefits that they're entitled to apply for."

Stephens: "And that's another good..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Burns: "So, I... I look forward... I look forward to working with you on making sure that DHS is accountable and working to make sure that poor people and people who have been affected by this economic downturn get the benefits they deserve."

Stephens: "Representative, that's something that I... I can work with you on and I will tell the department and the Governor, I hope you're listening. The people in Fayette County, they're... they're told, well, you'll only have to drive an extra 30 miles. Well, tell that to the people in Herrick who have to drive about 80 miles now to go to their... to their local office. It's absolutely irresponsible to the... the people are that in the most need in this trying economic time and you're going to say, well good luck. Good luck. It's just not right. I challenge the department, and I challenge the Governor, rethink this They... for 12 years in Fayette County they've issue. understaffed the office and then they say, well, you've only got six people working there so it can't be so bad. These people work hard every day on behalf of the most needy people in Illinois. And our Governor, our administration is ignoring their very real needs."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I'm actually not sure where you are."

Burns: "Right here..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

- Sullivan: "Oh, okay. Walker's in the way. So, we're asking the Federal Government to come in with some federal stimulus dollars. What happens when the federal stimulus program runs out?"
- Burns: "In 2 years, the TANF Bill will be reauthorized at the national level. And in my conversation with advocates and folks are who experts in this field, they believe that if the states avail themselves of the additional... of the stimulus money, that makes the case for retaining the expansion when TANF is reauthorized 2 years from now. I can tell you if we don't avail ourselves in this stimulus money now, it'll be very difficult to make a case to the Federal Government to maintain funding levels as we move forward."
- Sullivan: "Have you had any discussions with anyone in the Obama administration that this truly take place or is this just a hope?"
- Burns: "To which are you referring, Representative?"
- Sullivan: "Well, in 2 years from when we have this reauthorized. There's not guarantee that they're going to reauthorize the funds flowing down to the states, is there?"
- Burns: "There is no guarantee. I mean and so, if that's the case, then we will have to revisit some of these changes that we've made and I look forward to working for people in this chamber to do that. However, I do know this from the advocates who've been working and going to Washington, D.C., and talking with federal experts, that if states are not moving forward to avail themselves of stimulus money,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

it makes it very difficult to convince the Federal Government and Congress that these benefits should remain as part of TANF as we move forward."

Sullivan: "So... so, what could happen then is if we avail ourselves to this money and a lot of other states don't and they x out this program at the federal level 2 years from now, then we're on the hook for the rest to make a decision to either somehow fund this or reduce the program."

Burns: "Well, let me be clear about something very quickly,

Representative. This Bill does not actually increase cash

benefits. This Bill..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Burns: "... speeds up the process..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Burns: "... by which TANF applicant receive their payment..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Burn: "...and it shortens the period of time for the state to approve the program. It does allow folks who have the income disregard for work to keep a little bit more of their money but that's a nominal cost... nominal cost to the program. Any additional costs to the program will be because there will be an increased caseload, which we would expect as a consequence of the economic downturn."

Sullivan: "Rep... Representative, I just want to clarify, this...
this does increase eligibility for deep poverty
recipients?"

Burns: "It does increase eligibility."

Sullivan: "Okay. So..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Burns: "But it does not increase the cash benefit. This is...
that's not in this Bill."

Sullivan: "And I understand that but more people will be covered under this provision."

Burns: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, when the federal money potentially, and we don't know, 'cause it's 2 years out, I understand that. If that does not follow... flow through in 2 years, or reauthorize, we'll have an increase benefit without the funds to provide that."

Burns: "We will have an increased benefit without… you… you're correct. If the Federal Government does not come through when they reauthorize TANF…"

Sullivan: "Yeah"

Burns: "... that will be a case and we will have to figure out a way to deal with the issue."

Sullivan: "Wouldn't it be better then potentially that, and maybe with moving over into the Senate you could do this, just sunset this subject to whether the Federal Government would not provide the funds?"

Burns: "Well, you know what, I would prefer not to do that at this time. You know."

Sullivan: "I mean, what's the harm?"

Burns: "The harm is is that we want to make... we want to send a strong signal to the Federal Government that states are responding to the federal stimulus program and we want to keep pressure on the Federal Government to retain these levels of support once TANF is reauthorized. If we put the sunset on it, that takes away the impetus for the Federal

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Government to retain support for these programs in 2 years."

Sullivan: "All right. I don't get that. Thank you for your...

for your answers."

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

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Sullivan: Gentlemen of the House. This is a very well intended Bill but let me... let me just try to again, indicate what the previous speaker was talking about. There are a number of things in the stimulus package that create a level of spending that when the federal stimulus dollars go away, and they will, the spending level is at a, perhaps, at level that the State of Illinois cannot maintain. have thought over the last 6 years we've learned that. think the Gentleman's request for a sunset clause is not only reasonable, I think it's good public policy. know, if... one of the things I learned the hard way was on a previous administration, previous to President Bush, and a Democrat administration had a program to help put police officers on the street. Many small communities in my district took advantage of that, because they could not afford to hire a police officer on their own. So they use this federal money... I think the program was called a cop on the block, or a cop on every block, or whatever it was called, it was a good program. So they could buy a police car and they could hire a police officer or maybe two. And the public liked it and it... I think it had a good result. Unfortunately, when the federal grant dollars ran out, many

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

communities found they could no longer pay the salaries, nor the expense of the police cars from their relatively small budget. So they had to lay off the police officer and sell the police car. And I think the previous speaker was simply saying, why not put a sunset clause on the Bill? If you do that, I think it could pass overwhelmingly and may pass overwhelmingly anyway, but I think it would give everybody a... a sense, a comfort level if you will, that while we want to speed up this process, and while we want to see these federal stimulus dollars used as efficiently and quickly as possible, that when the federal dollars go away, we don't build a level of spending that the State of Illinois will not then be able to meet, but will be under tremendous pressure to meet. That's... that's just part in parcel of what we are seeing now in this budget meltdown in Illinois. When you build spending appetites that you cannot continue, you're faced with either Draconian budget cuts or Draconian tax increases to pay for it. I... I would simply ask the Sponsor to commit to a sunset clause when the Bill goes to the Senate and that gives some degree of confidence to the state taxpayers that, yes, we're going to use these federal dollars quickly and efficiently. yes, when the federal dollars go away, if in fact they do, the level of state funding will go back to what it was and what the state feels it can afford. If 2 or 3 years from now the state can afford to maintain it, fine. Gentleman will be free to bring that back and perhaps pass at the state level of funding. So, I... I don't think it's a request designed to kill the Bill or to denigrate the

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

importance of the Bill. I think it's just trying to do what we hopefully have learned over the last 6 years. You need certain safeguards before you build in increased spending to a state budget that when the federal grant dollars or stimulus dollars go away, we then perhaps and what we're seeing already, is we can't maintain that level of spending. All right, to the Sponsor. I'll be more than happy to vote for the Bill if you'll simply commit to a sunset clause... that will come back from the Senate with a sunset clause on it. I'll certainly support the Bill with that clause on it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Burns to close."

"I'd like to thank the Representatives for their Burns: questions and comments. Here's what I will state to the previous speaker. I am certainly willing to discuss a sunset with the Senate Sponsor, the department... the State Department of Human Services and other advocates and have that conversation and see whether or not that makes sense and report back to you, Representative, on those conversations. I... I'm not necessarily certain without having communicated with the agency and with the advocates that I'm willing to make an ironclad commitment at this time on the sunset. I want to thank the Members of the Body for paying attention to the debate. This is an important Bill that many people who have fallen through the safety cracks... through our safety net... through the cracks in our safety net and we need to make sure that folks have access to the resources to keep them out of poverty and

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

keep them out of hunger, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 2383 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Shane Cultra, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 38 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rich Brauer, on page 36 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 771. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 771, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Braur."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the of the chamber, this is a local issue where we have Springfield wanting to build a lake reservoir and what it will do is actually cut into the Chatham Library District which is the same district as the Chatham school. Both sides have worked out and there is no one that's opposed to this. So, I'll answer all questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 771 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Marlow Colvin, on page 35 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 688. You wish to move that Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 688, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marlow Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 688 for your consideration is a Bill that was brought forth by the City of Chicago dealing with the disposition of buildings that were illegally or perhaps, not properly converted into condominium units. It specifically isolates the problem of those buildings once they go into default and the owner loses possession of the building and many times, dealing with condominiums in the City of Chicago where owners are not clearly identified, buildings are left vacant and in decay, and it's difficult to track down the owners. Ιt gives the City of Chicago and other municipalities certain rights and provisions to help them to dissolve the condominium association so that they may properly take care of a building that may be in the middle of a community that has become blighted and become a center of illegal activity that's often very difficult to deal with in a court of law. This Acts amends the condominium... Condominium Property Act to allow municipalities to file a complaint on a distressed condominium property which is a condominium that's operated in a manner or has conditions that may constitute a danger or a blight or nuisance to surrounding communities...

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

community or general public. If 50 percent or more of the units aren't occupied by people with a legal right to reside there, the building has serious violations or any applicable local building code or zoning ordinances, any percent of the units are in foreclosure, have judgments of foreclosure entered within the last 18 months, if there's a recording of more than units that are physically exist and any essential utilities to the parcel of 40 percent or more of the units is terminated or threatened without... with termination and there's delinquency on the property taxes for at least 80 percent of the units. There was some pushback initially when we passed this Bill unanimously last year from the realtors. There were an Amendment that was filed on this Bill last year that took away the opposition. Currently, there's no known opposition. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand what you're doing and I agree with the Bill and I support the Bill. The only question I have as I'm reading the analysis and I'm trying to read the Bill quickly is the question... or the statement on our analysis indicating that this type of action can be expedited over all others and I'm trying to find that in the Bill if you can help me."

Colvin: "In the language of the Bill or in the analysis of the Bill?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

- Franks: "Well, I saw the analysis. I don't see where it says in the. in the language and I'm trying to find that 'cause that part does concern me. That's the only part of the Bill that if it is in there, I'd wonder why."
- Colvin: "On page 4, lines 1 and 2, I think, relate to your question in the Bill, Representative."
- Franks: "What... what subsection is that? I'm looking at subsection D and I don't see that."
- Colvin: "It's in subsection B. In the very last sentence of subsection B."
- Franks: "Could you read that to me 'cause I... What my subsection B..."
- Colvin: "Sure."
- Franks: "... does not show that? On page 4, line 22. 'Cause it does not show..."
- Colvin: "Lines 1 and 2, Jack. In subsection B, 'the hearing upon the suit shall be expedited by the court and shall be given precedence over other actions.'"
- Franks: "Okay. Can I ask why we would do that? Because if you file it in chancery, which I presume this is where it would go, why would it have precedence over any other typical foreclosure action? Because what you're... what you're trying to do is basically the same as what everybody else is..."
- Colvin: "What we're... what we're trying to do... speaks to the direct intent of this Bill. What we're trying to do is to give municipalities, specifically in to the City of Chicago where the problem has been somewhat acute, to give municipalities a tool to move expeditiously to dissolve

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

these condominium associations. As a lawyer, I know you're aware that often times when you deal with a condominium building, we're talking about multiple owners, who may be in multiple locations, summons and other court filings that have to be filed and given to a number of individuals. If you'll go back and look at the analysis in the Bill, there are several standards that have to be met. These are demands that the realtors made to make sure that if these... if these demands were met, or these thresholds were met, that the City of Chicago could then move expeditiously to dissolve that condominium association, so that they could securely deal with that building up to and including raising the building to eliminate any..."

Franks: "Representative, I agree with that. I agree with everything you're saying and I think that's hyper-critical and I... I want to support the Bill. The one... that piece of language, though, could push everything else to the bottom of the docket. I think an easier way to do this would be to allow for emergency Motions to be heard and to cut the time that way. But to say you're taking precedence over all other actions, I mean, you could theoretically move a murder case to the bottom of the docket, when you have that language. So, if it's something you would consider amending in the Senate to allow for emergency Motions, I think you'd get the same affect, but you wouldn't necessarily push everything off behind it."

Colvin: "I don't… Well, for one, I don't think we're pushing everything off the table, number one. Number two, again,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

dealing with all of the different provisions that have to be met before they can take such action."

Franks: "You're missing my point."

Colvin: "... but being sensitive..."

Franks: "I agree with all those conditions."

Colvin: "... to the deadline and the Bill that we have to call here, I would be open to discussing this with the City of Chicago and would more than... more than happy to ask you to come in and meet with them as well, to mitigate any concern you might have with regard to this spec..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "I apologize, Representative. I didn't hear the introduction. Does this allow the condominium to be... I mean, if there's one unit that's blighted they can..."

Colvin: "No. No, not..."

Nekritz: "...undo the whole thing and all?"

Colvin: "...at all. Not..."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Colvin: "... even close.

Nekritz: "Okay."

Colvin: "This deals with entire condominium associations. Many of which have fraudulently been put together through declarations that do not... right from the beginning, deal with all of the issues with regard to how a condominium is properly declared. In the City of Chicago, what we have seen is the enormous amount of condominium buildings that have been fraudulently declared as condominiums in attempt

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

to sell those units. Many of those units are not properly... do not have owners who are... that are properly listed in the declaration and what have you. Often times, those units are being rented out to two and three different families and they're... when they're defaulted on. What's at stake terms of ownership, no of the owners condominiums rights are... are going to be abridged in this particular piece of legislation. All we're really trying to do here once certain standards are being met to prove that if a condominium has entered into an enormous amount of blight, if you refer to the analysis with regard to the percentages that take place, again, this is language that the realtors agreed to. Because when we first brought this Bill to Jud I last year, that was essentially the issue. And the City of Chicago sat down with the realtor association, came up with this alternative language so that the city would still be given the tool to deal with condominium buildings that have met... being left and neglected by owners to deal with the issue of blight in communities."

Nekritz: "Okay. I... I think I understand that a little better.

Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harry Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Osterman: "Representative, so this would also then give the ability for a receiver to be appointed in those distressed buildings where there are owners of units that are still trying to make a go of it and give them some protections

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

that the receiver can try to help fix the building, get it in repair, and then try to find... sell some of those units that are vacant so that those people that have an investment in that condo can stay there with their families and try to get the building going in the right direction?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

- Osterman: "Okay. To the Bill. This is an issue that came up also when we had the condo advisory council. It's an issue that affecting more and more people, not only in Chicago but around the state, and I applaud the Sponsor's efforts and ask everyone to vote for the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Colvin to close."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very important issue. It would help us deal with a lot of blighted condominiums in the City of Chicago and probably other places in this state. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 688 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Representative Bost. Betsy Hannig. Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, is 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Michael Connelly, you have on page 36 of the Calendar House Bill 880. Are you ready to move the Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 880, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Mike Connelly."
- Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 880 amends the Professional Geologists Licensing Act. It creates a certification of enrollment for geologist interns who are college students in their senior year. It allows these interns to practice professional geology without a license as long as they are supervised by a licensed professional geologist. For those of us who are attorneys, it's similar to Supreme Court Rule 7-11. This is an initiative of a retired geologist from Naperville. He indicated that it provides a competitive edge for them for geology students. Three other states provide this today. This matter passed unanimously last year. I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano. That light was on on mistake. Anyone else... anyone else seeking recognition on House Bill 880? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 880 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative...

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Representative Emily McAsey, on page 34 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 327. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 327, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Will, Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you. This is a Bill... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of the House. This Bill addresses sex offenders who have committed criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual assault, predatory criminal sexual assault to the child, criminal sexual abuse, ag criminal sexual abuse, and ritualized sexual abuse of a child through force or threat of force against a victim under 18. And what this legislation would do would... it would require those offenders to wear GPS tracking devices during the term of parole or at mandatory supervised release. I would ask for an 'aye' vote as to this legislation."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, my analysis is showing that this was Representative Franks' Bill. Did you take over chief sponsorship of the Bill?"

McAsey: "Representative Reboletti, that is correct. I did take over as Chief Sponsor of this piece legislation."

Reboletti: "Looking at... our analysis shows there are some opponents, that being Kane County and Metro Counties. Did

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

you have a chance to talk to them as to what their opposition was?"

McAsey: "With relation to them being opponents to this legislation?"

Reboletti: "Yes."

McAsey: "I did not speak with either of those agencies. I do know that at one point the Department of Corrections was opposed to this legislation, prior to there having been a gut and replace Amendment filed. After that, Department of Corrections removed their opposition to the Bill. It's my understanding that the burden to carry out this program would be on the Department of Corrections. I really can't speak to why those two agencies would have opposition to this legislation."

Reboletti: "What is the cost to the department? I mean, obviously, this is a... I don't think this is going to be an objection to the... here to the Bill but is there... is there a cost and does DOC have the money? I mean, I talked to DOC all the time and while this, obviously is needed, they have issues with removing garbage from facilities because they can't pay their bills or they're about to have their water disconnected from some facilities. What is... what's the additional costs going to be to the department?"

McAsey: "Representative Reboletti, I can't speak to the additional... or to any specific cost. I don't have figures related to the cost. What I can tell you is that the Department of Corrections is not opposed to this Bill. They have raised no oppositions related to cost and I... I think that this legislation is very important to protect a

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

very vulnerable population. To make sure that we're protecting our children against predators in our community and I... I think that we need to pass legislation like this regardless of any... any of the concerns that... that you may have raised."

- Reboletti: "Well... And I appreciate that, but at the end of the day, we still have to make sure we pay our bills. And we can't... we do a lot on of unfunded mandates around here and... and pass the burden along and ask the department to manage it. So, this would only be for the term of mandatory supervised release. So, it would... I don't know if there's another Bill that came into our committee that would have extended out way past that. So, this is only when the department has control... jurisdiction over the inmate?"
- McAsey: "That's correct. This is when the... when that individual is on mandatory supervised released or parole, when they are under the jurisdiction of the department."
- Reboletti: "And so then, the parole agents will be the ones who would monitor or... is there some kind of central location like within Stateville, which I know is in your district, who... where's this monitoring system located? Do you know?"
- McAsey: "That's something that would have to still be worked out within the Department of Corrections, but would... would be something within that agency related to, you know, nuts and bolts. It... and this would be something that would move into the other programs that they currently have related to monitoring offenders who are on parole..."
- Reboletti: "Do you... Do you have a Senate Sponsor for this Bill already?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

McAsey: "... or mandatory supervised release. I'm sorry. What..."

Reboletti: "Do you have a Senate Sponsor for this Bill already?"

McAsey: "Actually, Representative Reboletti, I have not had a conversation."

Reboletti: "And I... I appreciate that. The reason I asked you this, if we could at least on the Senate side, get some ideas of what this is going to cost so that we make sure that obviously, as we go through budgetary concerns, that we address this issue, and I will talk to DOC about it by the time it catches itself over there, but I do support your legislation. If I'm not a cosponsor, I'd be glad to be asked to be added to the list."

McAsey: "Well, thank you. I appreciate that."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

McAsey: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, does the... Committee Amendment #1, what does that do? How did it change the Bill?"

McAsey: "Committee Amendment 1 was a gut and replace Amendment, changed the language, it added an additional offense. It also addressed the issue of the term of the GPS monitoring, setting that term to the offender's term of parole or mandatory supervised release."

Black: "I'm sorry. You said the Amendment gutted the Bill?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

McAsey: "It was a gut and replace Amendment. Yes. So, what it... what it did ultimately, as a gut and replace Amendment, it replaced all the prior language that had been filed with House Bill 327. The Bill that you have before you, it... it essentially, changed the prior Bill to the term of parole or mandatory supervised release, and added one additional offense to what had been the prior legislation."

Black: "So, in other words, if we boil it down, Committee

Amendment #1 actually becomes the Bill."

McAsey: "That's correct."

Black: "Oh, I see. So, it didn't really change the underlying Bill, it replaced the underlying Bill."

McAsey: "That's correct."

Black: "Ahh, okay, now..."

McAsey: "But it... it did..."

Black: "Now, that we're not..."

McAsey: "... clean up some language."

Black: "... in court now. You've answered my question. We're not in court. You're not prosecuting me, I hope. Did the underlying Bill say that the offender would wear the monitoring device forever, only to be taken off when they were buried or cremated?"

McAsey: "The underlying Bill, prior to the gut and replace

Amendment did discuss a term of natural life."

Black: "So, they would have to wear this..."

McAsey: "But..."

Black: "... forever? I assume you would take it off when the individual was buried, otherwise, they'd... they'd continually track that individual to a cemetery. Correct?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

McAsey: "That would be correct."

Black: "Okay. Now, that costs a lot of money. The Department of Corrections' objection was to the original Bill. Correct? Because of costs?"

McAsey: "This Bill addresses some concerns the Department of Correction had related to being able to monitor these offenders and this Bill allows for monitoring these predators during the time of mandatory supervised release and parole."

Black: "Okay. Well, you confuse me when you say this Bill. I was talking about the… the original Bill that DOC opposed because of the costs factor of life long usage of a GPS device. That… that's where their objection focused. Correct? In the original Bill?"

McAsey: "The language of the Bill as originally drafted."

Black: "And the language said you had to wear the device for the rest of your natural life. Correct?"

McAsey: "That was the original language."

Black: "Okay. And DOC said that would cost 10 billion dollars, correct?"

McAsey: "There... there were costs associated, but there was also an impossibility related to carrying out that monitoring and this language addresses a real concern..."

Black: "Now, what language?"

McAsey: "... and also..."

Black: "Well, wait. What language? The original Bill or the Amendment that becomes the Bill?"

McAsey: "The language before this Body. The Amendment that becomes the Bill. The way that this language appears, this

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

allows for the Department of Corrections to work within the system that they have to monitor these offenders during the term of parole or mandatory supervised release..."

Black: "Okay."

McAsey: "... at a time when they are... remain under the jurisdiction of the department."

Black: "So, when their parole or release is done, the GPS monitoring is also done?"

McAsey: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. Now, who bears the cost of the initial monitoring device and the monitoring of said device? Is it the county where the sentence was imposed, or is it the Illinois Department of Corrections?"

McAsey: "This would be within the Illinois Department of Corrections. That agency, being the agency that oversee the offender..."

Black: "Okay."

McAsey: "...when on mandatory supervisory release..."

Black: "Well, that's..."

McAsey: "...or paroled."

Black: "... what confuses me, Representative, because why are two..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black, your time is expired. If you think you can conclude your remarks in the next minute or so, we'd appreciate it."

Black: "Well, I'll do the best I can, Mr. Speaker, but again, I'm... I've asked 45 seconds' worth of questions and I've gotten 4 minutes' worth of answers, but I'll try. I... I promise you I will. If the Department of Corrections,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

i.e., the taxpayer, is paying the costs, why are two counties still listed as opponents to the legislation?"

McAsey: "And, Representative Reboletti, did ask me that question. I said that I... I do not know. I don't know why they filed in opposition. I do not know whether they still are in opposition. I do know that the Department of Corrections is not in opposition to this Bill and they would be the agency that..."

Black: "Okay."

McAsey: "... would be carrying out this function."

Black: "All right. Did the Department of Corrections give you any kind of fiscal impact on this... the Bill before us, as amended? Did IDOC indicate to you what it might cost to administer this particular program?"

McAsey: "Representative, I can't speak to those costs. I don't have that information."

Black: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, have you been... have you been watching this exchange?"

Speaker Lyons: "I've been listening to your response."

Black: "Yes, well, listening doesn't really cut it. Have you been watching this? The speaker… one of the speaker's staff is behind her. I can just… sometimes I see him. His head will come around and it looks to me like what we have here is one of the old variety show ventriloquist acts. I'm not sure whether she's the one answering the question or that speaker's staff member behind her…"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black,..."

Black: "... is answering the..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "... could I ask who those people are to the right of you?"

Black: "Well, you... you don't see his hand up the back of my coat, do you?"

McAsey: "Representative, I don't see the hand up the back of my coat, either."

Black: "Whoa. Mr. Speaker, that's more information than I asked for and certainly more than I need to know. Good Heavens. May I... do you have anything on your ankle?"

McAsey: "It's..."

Black: "Are you being monitored, Representative?"

McAsey: "Well, you're standing on the other side of the chamber here and seem to be looking at me. I suppose that... that that would qualify as monitoring in... in someone's definition."

Black: "I've been monitoring you very carefully,

Representative."

McAsey: "Well, thank you."

Black: "And will continue to do so. I appreciate your..."

McAsey: "Well, thank you."

Black: "... answering the question. I also appreciate..."

McAsey: "And..."

Black: "... Speaker Madigan's staffer backing up about two feet so it... it looks much better that way. But he... I want to just... he did an excellent job by the way. It's not easy to whisper in somebody's ear as efficiently as he did. And I just want you to know this young man did not whisper in my ear whatsoever. He did hand me some notes, however."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "That's not what we heard at the Chair, Mr. Black, but we'll leave that alone. ... David Miller."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Miller: "I was going through a... a magazine that we all get, it's <u>Government Technology</u>. I actually want to ask some very serious questions regarding this and I would ask every Member to sort of look at this article. There's an article entitled <u>GPS Monitoring</u>, and talked about the promises and some of the problems associated with GPS monitoring and I at least want to be able to see if you can address. For instance, one of the claims they make here is in Arizona, the 2007 Legislature study found that more than 35 thousand false alerts by 140 subjects wearing the GPS monitoring device. Is this intended to sort of move this issue forward and/or is it some at point, how do you plan on dealing with false readings of individuals?"

McAsey: "Representative Miller, if I may. First, I don't have a copy of the article that you refer to in front of me. I would be happy to look at that, but my intent here, which I believe that I did discuss with Representative Reboletti, is to protect our community."

Miller: "That... that's not..."

McAsey: "Particularly, to protect children in our community from predators."

Miller: "I would respond then, a lot of people think that if you're a GPS... if you're on a GPS, somebody is sitting at a computer and they know your whereabouts at all time. This is from the Executive Director of Connecticut's Supreme

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Court Services. Other comments have been, 'We are concerned and is still that GPS monitoring view as a panacea and will prevent future crime. It isn't and it Executive Director Washington Association Sheriffs and Police Chiefs. So, it's not the question. Of course, we all, in this chamber, want to protect children from sex offenders. We have plenty of laws against it, but what I'm trying to get at is, is that if somebody or some system is providing incorrect information. We've had a whole moratorium because of false convictions on the death People been released. All I'm asking is, is there some way in which... that your legislation can or will deal with this in terms of other states having implemented this and they're acting like it's not a silver bullet."

- McAsey: "Well, right now, we're talking about the State of Illinois and this is a program that would be implemented by the Department of Corrections in our state. That agency would be given the authority by this Body going forward to implement the program and to address concerns that come up related to implementation."
- Miller: "Hold on. Say that again, now. Hold on. Hold on. You said you're leaving it to the agency to come up with... to be able to deal with problems such as false recording of individuals?"
- McAsey: "The agency, Department of Corrections, would be engaged in the day-to-day monitoring of this program that this Body would create."
- Miller: "No. According to, once again, the report, I just want to get you on record on this. You're asking for that

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

somebody day-to-day, watch an individual or be able to monitor... monitor somebody with a GPS system, and some of the Members on the other side of the aisle talked about costs. Do you have an estimate on costs for day-to-day monitoring in addition to that... the conception is that somebody will not be monitored day-to-day, even if they have a GPS system on... on their ankle."

- McAsey: "Representative Miller, I cannot speak to the cost. I don't have those figures and this would allow Department of Corrections to implement this monitoring program like other programs that they do have within the... their agency that already exist, related to monitoring of parolees, people who are on mandatory supervised release."
- Miller: "And so... so with this legislation would essentially do is create a GPS monitoring... monitoring device system... a program as part of an entire package to prevent sex offenders from... from certain areas where they shouldn't be. Is that correct?"
- McAsey: "This would be a tool that can be used the Department of Corrections to monitor... convicted sex... people convicted of these specific offenses."
- Miller: "No, no, no, no, no. Where... where in the language... I'm not trying to... where in the language does it says it because..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Miller, we'll give you another minute to try and conclude your questions."
- Miller: "This gets to intent. You know, I support the concept.

 I just want to make sure, you know, after reading this article that... that these issues are sort of dealt with and...

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

and if you don't have all the answers, I'm sure this Bill's going to pass this chamber, but however, I think as this... this goes along, it'll... it'll only... we want good public policy. We want people who... who need to be monitored... monitored and this is a tool. So, where in the language does it say that... what you just said, that either day-to-day or where that... that the department will come up with rules that will dictate how this will be implemented? Just a... just a little latitude, Mr. Speaker."

McAsey: "Representative Miller, this just creates this as a condition of parole (inaudible)."

Miller: "Okay. So, there's no where in... I would argue... I would just argue as... first off, I would argue everyone should look at this article 'cause it did sort of give the... the view of this is where law enforcement is going. To... to the Bill. To the Bill. This is where law enforcement is going and I would argue everyone should look at it because it does weigh some of the pros and cons. And as the Sponsor moves this Bill forward, at least possibly in the Senate, would the Senate Sponsor try to address some of these issues. Some of them is... is even creating a task force to see the effectiveness of an individual wearing a GPS system just so we don't have false readings on it. And that's all I would say is that possibly try to work with the Sponsor on some of these issues as this Bill's moved forward. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Randy Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Ramey: "Representative, this Bill is related to Jessica's Law?

Do you know what Jessica's Law is?"

McAsey: "The... the idea is somewhat similar to Jessica's Law, but I don't know all the specifics related to Jessica's Law. This is very specific to monitoring these predators during the term of parole and mandatory supervised release."

Ramey: "Well, Jessica's Law has three components. One is monitoring, one is minimum sentencing, and one is reporting twice a year. We passed monitoring last year. Representative Watson and I had introduced similar legislation. We worked with his Bill, got it passed out. Do you know that?"

McAsey: "I was not here during..."

Ramey: "It... it was signed by the Governor."

McAsey: "Okay."

Ramey: "You don't know anything about that? How is your Bill then different than what we've already passed?"

McAsey: "Well, I don't know the specifics of your Bill, having not been here last year. Now, did you just say that that was or was not signed into law?"

Ramey: "It was signed into law."

McAsey: "It was signed into law."

Ramey: "Yes. So, I'm asking you, what's different with your Bill than what we've already done and produced?"

McAsey: "Would you be able to give me a reference to look at?"

Ramey: "It is... it was House Bill 4222, became Public Act 94-988."

McAsey: "I don't know."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Ramey: "So, do you think we're duplicating?"

McAsey: "I don't believe that this is duplicate legislation. I think that this is important to address..."

Ramey: "Well, I thought..."

McAsey: "... very specific needs."

Ramey: "... we thought it was important, also."

McAsey: "Umm hmm."

Ramey: "I just want to understand what the difference then.

Are you making it better?"

McAsey: "Was your law specific to victims under the age of 18..."

Ramey: "Yes. That's what..."

McAsey: "... where there was threat of force?"

Ramey: "... that's what Jessica's Law does."

McAsey: "Okay. And your legislation also was for the... for what term of monitoring?"

Ramey: "For the life of their parole."

McAsey: "And that... that's how this legislation is different.

This is specific to the term of parole, mandatory supervised release."

Ramey: "Yeah, that's what we have. Right? That's what we had. She carried this. That's what Jessica's Law states. So that's... Are you..."

McAsey: "I... I thought you just said that it was for lifetime?"

Ramey: "... improving upon that... I'm sorry."

McAsey: "I thought that you just state that your legislation was related to lifetime monitoring."

Ramey: "Of their parole. Correct. Isn't that what yours does?"

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

McAsey: "You... you said that your legislation addressed lifetime monitoring for the offenders. And this is specific to the term of parole or mandatory supervised release. It's not a lifetime monitoring."

Ramey: "No, no. I said..."

McAsey: "And because..."

Ramey: "... the lifetime of their parole."

McAsey: "Okay."

Ramey: "So, it's basically the same. Okay. Well, on to the next question. The reason we had opposition once was the funding. We got over that opposition. The Governor signed it, but it was at that time, was 5 million dollars a year. The problem came is that when the Governor did his budget, the 5 million dollars was not added on to the Department of Correction's budget. They had to absorb it, so it became an unfunded mandate. Have you talked with the Governor? Are they going to put this line item into the budget so it is properly funded?"

McAsey: "There have been conversations with the Department of Corrections related to the Department of Corrections carrying out this as a function of their agency."

Ramey: "Well, they're already carrying it out. My question is, is that since the Governor didn't add the extra 5 million dollars at that time to cover this Bill. Yours is now saying it's \$7,000,000 estimated... is that correct? That's the number we have in our..."

McAsey: "I don't believe that I made any statement related to a figure of 7 million dollars."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Ramey: "In our fiscal impact statement, it says IDOC indicates that the fiscal impact of this Bill would be much greater than the 7 million dollars per year as our Bill was, which actually was 5 million dollars at the time. So, they're estimating much more than the 7 million dollars."

McAsey: "Well, and... and I would ask you whether that is related to the... the underlying Bill prior to the gut and replace Amendment, was that figure related to that and not..."

Ramey: "So, what... you don't..."

McAsey: "... related to..."

Ramey: "... then you don't know what the..."

McAsey: "... the... the term of parole and mandatory supervised release."

Ramey: "With your... with your Amendment then, you don't, as you've stated before, you don't know what those costs are and with your discussion on the line item for the budget, will... whatever you... whenever you decide what that cost is, will the Governor then support it and keep it in..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time is expired. If you could bring your remarks to a conclusion, we'd appreciate it, please."

Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just saying, we... we did this before or can't find out if it is any better than what we have already done before. I mean, it's important legislation. I... guess I'm saying is why duplicate what we've already done. So, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Fritchey: "Representative, I think you've gotten off to a great start so far since you've been here and I mean it. This is not these typical type of enhancement Bills. There's a lot of issues that you are creating here. I don't think knowingly. I don't think willingly. But the way this Bill is drafted does a couple of things that I want to see if you're aware of. First of all, the actual language of the Bill simply says that they have to wear this monitoring device, correct?"

McAsey: "During the term of mandatory supervised release..."

Fritchey: "Correct."

McAsey: "... and parole."

Fritchey: "But it... it makes no requirements on whether they are to be... is it your intention that they would be monitored constantly, weekly, monthly, randomly?"

McAsey: "It's my intention that they would be monitored. It would be..."

Fritchey: "Would you..."

McAsey: "... constant..."

Fritchey: "Would you agree that it... right now, under the terms of parole for one of these offenses, all of which are heinous offenses?"

McAsey: "Um hmm."

Fritchey: "We put restrictions on these individuals and nobody's coming to their defense and that's why these Bills are going to fly out, because people are scared crapless to vote against a Bill like this, thinking it's going to be used against them in a mail piece. But we have restrictions on where they can live, where they can work..."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

McAsey: "Um hmm."

Fritchey: "... who they can associate with, what they can do.

They have to check in now with parole officers, et cetera, et cetera."

McAsey: "Right."

Fritchey: "It is a dramatic change in our corrections system to say that as a term of your parole the state is going to be entitled to know where you are every second of the day and every second of the night, which is what this Bill would provide. Correct?"

McAsey: "And... and, Representative, I would disagree with you, related to that. Because what this Bill does, is this Bill creates a means to monitor where these people... where these convicted preditors..."

Fritchey: "The... the Bill creates..."

McAsey: "... are and..."

Fritchey: "... the Bill creates a means to know where they are every second of the day and night. That's what the Bill says."

McAsey: "No. This... this is not a new concept and as you are stating right now, there are specific prohibitions on where folks can be, be it a park, be it a school. And what this allows for is to monitor where these individuals are. It is a tool so that if this person has gone into a school, has gone into a park, that that information is available to their parole officer. This is necessary legislation..."

Fritchey: "To know... to know where they are..."

McAsey: "... to follow through and to give effect to those prior laws."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Fritchey: "Do... do we provide for mandatory... mandatory constant monitoring of multiple murderers? If somebody's convict... if somebody's convicted of murder or multiple murders and they get paroled, do we provide for constant monitoring of them?"

McAsey: "Not..."

Fritchey: "We don't."

McAsey: "Not to my knowledge but..."

Fritchey: "We... we don't."

McAsey: "... this... this is..."

Fritchey: "If somebody... if somebody was a serial rapist and is released, do we provide for constant monitoring of them?"

McAsey: "From whom? I'm sorry."

Fritchey: "You know..."

McAsey: "We do provide monitoring for folks who have been convicted of domestic violence, violating order of protections. This is not a new concept and... and this is..."

Fritchey: "No, it... it's not a new concept, but it is a... the way this is written, it does one of two things and... this is not directed at you and I promise you that. This Bill either doesn't go far enough because it doesn't specify to what extent they should be monitored. It's not the type of monitoring device where it says, you know, where they're confined to home confinement and if they leave a certain zone, it sets off an alarm. It's not that kind of monitoring. It's not a monitoring to make sure that if they go within 500 feet of a school, or if they... they can't drive an ice cream truck, they can't do all these other things. It's not that. It is, you're going to be

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

monitored every second of the day or night, which is a dramatic, dramatic infringement on somebody's rights, even as a subject of a term of parole. This Bill will probably come out close to unanimously. Nobody... every restriction that we've... that I've seen us do since I've been here, when we try to enhance something or do something when it comes down to child... sex offenders, et cetera, these Bills all Most of them have been good ideas, but the biggest reason is because people don't bother to read the Bills and see what they do and they're worried about... turning into a mail piece. This Bill does not accomplish what you purported to us. It's not written the way that you've represented it is. It does not have the enforcement mechanism that you think that it does. It's going to give people either a false sense of security, where they don't have one, or it's going to be an undue restriction on somebody's individual liber ... "

Speaker Lyons: "John, your time has expired. If you could bring your conclusion to a... remarks to a conclusion, please."

Fritchey: "It... it's going to sound cliché. I respect what you're trying to do. I'm not supporting this. This is a bad idea in the long run. It is a dramatic deviation, Ladies and Gentlemen, from our Criminal Code and from the concept of somebody serving their time, being released subject to restrictions, and reasonable restrictions. It's a very dramatic policy that people are going to come back and realize one day when they... if this thing becomes law. Thank you."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "... Speaker, my name was used in debate. Representative Fritchey, what the Bill is trying to do is, it... when it monitors somebody, you can monitor within somebody who cannot be within a thousand feet of a school, or a thousand feet of a park. If that... that would be called a technical violation. Therefore, if the parole agent found that out, that could be used as evidence to either get a parole warrant and bring the person back in and revoke the parole, or it could be used as a new Another felony could be charged and then the person could serve the remainder of their parole, as well as the new case being... being consecutive. So, I want to make sure that that's clear. Also, to Representative Miller's concerns, I think it's the same thing. If there's a technical violation and it's found out that the person isn't where the device says, that the parole does not have to be revoked, a new charge does not have to be filed. This is not some special expansion or protection of civil liberties for sex offenders. They don't have as much liberties as the rest of us do. They don't deserve those liberties. They should be monitored. There obviously have been issues in the past when sex offenders get out, they do tend to reoffend, much higher than most other criminals do, at much higher rates. Now, Representative Fortner was kind enough to tell me that the reason that Kane County, and the that Metro Counties are opposed is potentially some of these crimes are going to be monitored by probation. Your counties will get to monitor these,

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

that's where they're concerned about the costs and do they have the budget line items to have this person on GPS and... and to have them taken care of. I wanted to make sure that was part of this debate as far as legislative intent is concerned. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I apologize for getting you into this, apparently. Some people that don't want to protect our... 'Cause listen. our streets, it sounds like. everyone of us voted for this last year. Everyone of us voted for it last year, but did you... but wait a second. I think you're making specious arguments, because this is... this is a better Bill than last year. Listen. I... No. think the arguments that have been used have been specious for this reason, the reason... we passed this last year to have monitoring for life and I don't remember hardly any questions. Now, because of budget concerns from the Department of Corrections, they said you know what, we could afford to be able to monitor during the period of parole. You know, Wisconsin does it for life. That's why we had the original Bill that we passed 116 to nothing. But because of budgetary concerns that we're facing a multi-billion dollar budget hole, we thought, well, let's bring it down so the Department of Corrections could be okay with it during the period of parole. And that's the only difference. Okay? Now, if there's any other arguments, we could have had these last year, but to bring

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

these up now, I think it's… it's improper. So, Representative, you're aware that other states are doing this, correct?"

McAsey: "Correct."

Franks: "All right. Now, the Amendment was my Amendment to bring it down to the Department of Corrections. You understand now that they're neutral."

McAsey: "I'm sorry?"

Franks: "You understand now the Department of Corrections is neutral on the Bill? They're fine."

McAsey: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. I was unaware that Kane County had a problem with the Bill and I think that you were unaware as well.

Correct?"

McAsey: "Yes."

Franks: "But it sounds to me that their only objection is deal...

dealing with fiscal issues. Correct?"

McAsey: "Their only objection is..."

Franks: "Is to deal with the fiscal portion of it?"

McAsey: "I didn't have a conversation with them so I do not know but..."

Franks: "Yeah, they had never... they had never contacted me either, so this was a first that I... that I hear of it. Well, I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this. I think we've had a lot of debate. We understand what's... what the issue is here, but there is an extraordinarily high recidivism rate for those that are predatory criminal sexual abusers. We have an obligation to protect our children and our

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

society from these predators. This Bill will go a long way to accomplish that goal. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flider."

- Flider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have and the Motion carries. The question is... Representative McAsey to close."
- McAsey: "Thank you. I appreciate an 'aye' vote on this very important legislation to protect children in our community from sexual predators. The legislation would provide for the GPS monitoring during the term of parole and mandatory supervised release. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 327 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Representative Golar. Crespo. Mr. Clerk, take the record.
 On this Bill, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 6 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you recognized me a little late. I wanted to simply exercise the rights of any Member under Robert's Rules of Order and the House Rules of Order. The

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Chair was clearly, clearly mistaken in the voice vote and I wanted to divide the question or to... not to divide the question. I wanted you to declare the Chair in doubt and have a Roll Call on whether or not to move that debate. Clearly, the vast majority of this chamber did not vote for you to close debate on the ... on the previous question. But you deliberately refused to recognize me, as is your prerogative, but under Robert's Rules of Order, Members are signing, and myself, are signing a dissent which when we file formally, will forbid you to ever be in the Chair again. And if ... I'm not if that's in the House Rules, but we're going to look. All I'd like to say after 30 minutes of debate, Mr. Speaker, and putting you at risk in the Chair, if Representative... if the Representative who... who claimed authorship of the Bill would have presented his own Bill, things may have gone much more smoothly."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Representative Monique Davis, what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

Davis, M.: "First, I'd like to say I agree with Representative Black, that some of us had our lights on and we... we really wanted to ask questions on this Bill. Representative Black is correct. This is a significant piece of legislation in the State of Illinois. My question to the honorable Representative who did a wonderful job of presenting this Bill was, what about a 17-year-old who's charged with criminal sexual assault if he's having sex with his 16-year-old girlfriend? That was a question I had. You know, we still have laws in Illinois that say a 17-year-old can

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

be charged with what adult behavior and if a 17 year old is having a relationship with a 16-year-old, and her father or his mother or whatever, charged... charged this guy, he could be charged as... he could be a sexual offender for the rest of his life. And that was my question. It's unanswered. I voted for the Bill, but I hope the Senate will ask that question."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Beth Coulson, on page 40 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3925. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 3925, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Beth Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that this Bill can bring us all together. We've been able to pass a safe haven law that has saved 51 babies lives in the State of Illinois and we should all be proud of that. This Bill and the Amendment that was put on it, essentially, extends the time in which a new born might be relinquished from 7 days to 30 days and makes a technical Amendment to who can, at a fire station, take the baby when it is being relinquished. I hope that we can all vote unanimously for this and I'd appreciate and 'aye' vote. I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 3925?

 Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 3925

 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Representative Boland. Collins. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Osterman, you have House Bill 866. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 866, a Bill for an Act concerning labor. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harry Osterman."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 866 is legislation dealing with a situation in my community would but basically would, moving forward, restrict any day or temporary labor agency from establishing itself within a thousand feet of a school or Boys and Girls Club, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on House Bill 866?

 Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 866 pass?'

 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Bradley. John Bradley. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

 This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 225, offered by Representative Leitch. House Resolution 226, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 227, offered by Representative Washington.

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

House Resolution 228, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 229, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 230, offered by Representative Osterman. House Resolution 231, offered by Representative Reboletti. House Resolution 232, offered by Representative Reis. And House Resolution 234, offered by Representative Osmond."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Agreed Resolutions. The Motion to adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All those signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk? Representative Collins, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the last Bill, House Bill 594 which was a penalty enhancement, I was recorded 'aye'.

 I'd like to be recorded as 'no'. I am 'no' on all penalty enhancements."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will so reflect your wishes, Representative. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Joint Resolution 57, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 26, 2009, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, March 30, 2009 at 11:30 a.m.; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Friday, March 27, 2009, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 31, 2009, at 12:00 noon."

34th Legislative Day

3/27/2009

Speaker Lyons: "And now, seeing no further business to be conducted, the House will stand adjourned, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will stand adjourned 'till the hour of 12 noon, on Tuesday, March 31. All those in favor of adjournment, signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, 'ayes' have it and the House of Representatives adjourns to the hour of two... the hour of noon on Tuesday, March 31. Safe trip home. Have a great weekend everybody."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is Resolution 224, offered by Representative Holbrook and House Resolution 233, offered by Representative Flowers. Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 807, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 1370, offered by Representative children. Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning voter registration. Senate Bill 1413, offered by Representative Myers, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 1473, offered by Representative Myers, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 1479, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning public 1508, offered employee benefits. Senate Bill Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning education. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."