57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 9:30 having arrived, the House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Scott Field, who is with Wheatland Salem Church in Naperville. Pastor Field is the guest of Representative Senger. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Field."

Pastor Field: "Thank you. Join me in prayer. Oh God, at the beginning of this Session after consulting with and constituents conversing with colleagues, considering personal convictions, after answering e-mails, responding to letters, returning the messages, getting up and getting ready and getting here, Legislators might be overwhelmed before they begin. We all need Your help, Oh God. So, even though this is beginning of the Session we recognize already today the press of time. The Calendar is moving toward its appointed deadlines. The challenges before Illinois are daunting. The eyes and ears of millions of Illinois citizens are waiting to see and to hear word of the decisions of this legislative Assembly. Many of us are wary, some of us are dismissive, a few of us are hopeful, most of us uncertain. All of us would welcome reason to hope again. We believe there is yet another day for this great state and its people, Oh God. We readily confess that at times we squander opportunities. We give into temptations for pettiness and revenge. We are sometimes short-sighted when the long view is required. This Assembly is composed of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

men and women, just human beings, of whom more than human wisdom, patience, generosity, skill, intelligence forethought are required. The citizens of the state have elected them to positions of unusual authority and responsibility, so I pray this morning on behalf of my fellow citizens and this Assembly that You, Oh God, would grow these Legislators up to the measure of the tasks that have been placed upon their shoulders. That you would pour out wisdom upon them, a passion for justice, a sensitivity to those whose names are never recorded in the minutes of these deliberations but who are the backbone of our state and nation. Grant them discontent with small measures and incremental improvements, give them boldness and courage to lead and to legislate for the common good, protect them from the temptation to do again what we have always done Give them perseverance to guard the sacred trust that has been placed upon them to cultivate the legacy handed to them by those who have bravely lived and died in defense of our freedoms and values and give them unexpected creativity as they seek to frame into law that which You intend for all the people of this land. We all need Your help, Oh God, and since you have promised to provide Your assistance, counsel and wisdom, we are this morning bold to ask. We pray in Christ's name, Amen."

Speaker Mautino: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Osterman."

Osterman - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I have no excused absences among House Democrats to report today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bost is excused today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 Members answering the roll, a quorum is present and the House is prepared to take action. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2071. Representative Eddy. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 2095. Representative Sacia. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2095, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 2095 is an initiative of the Stevenson County Sheriff's Department. And what it does is it gives authority to wardens of county facilities to withhold monies when a prisoner is released if there are outstanding debts in that particular county. I'd be pleased to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2095. And on that, the question is, 'Shall this Bill

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2095 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2103, Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2103, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill authorizes the Illinois EPA to issue administrative citations for certain violations under the agency's used tire program. In particular, those citations would be for causing for allowing accumulation of water in stored used tires, the failure of a tire retailer to collect the tire user fee or file a return with the Illinois Department of Revenue or transporting used or waste tires in a vehicle that's not properly registered or placarded."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2103. And on that, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, I certainly can understand what you're trying to do, but I don't know how inclusive the language is, so bear with me if you will. Many people in my

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

district buy their children... oh, excuse me... they buy an old tractor tire on a... a farm implement tire which is huge and then they'll fill that tire up with sand and it makes a relatively cheap sandbox for the children to play in, but unless you put the sand all the way up to the top, water will accumulate on occasion inside that tire. I guess my question is, does this mean as few as one tire or simply applied to a storage yard of more than one tire?"

- Jakobsson: "The intent of this Bill is to look at the large stashes of tires. It's not to go into neighborhoods and look for sandboxes. Also..."
- Black: "Well, that may be the intent, but is that language clear?"
- Jakobsson: "Representative, I'm... I don't think there's anywhere in the Bill that does say it absolutely won't go into a neighborhood."
- Black: "Yeah, that's my concern, Representative. I don't think you are after somebody that has a sandbox tire in their backyard or someone that changed a tire and unfortunately, today people will drop it in the driveway or put it out in the backyard. I don't want those people treated the same as someone who has collected a thousand, in some districts, you know, a million tires. So, I'm a little concerned that the language doesn't... doesn't differentiate on that number. And then the other concern I have, what does the Bill require the owner of a tire to do? It's very hard to get rid of water in a tire. Do they require them to spray it? Are they required to spray the water or chew them up or how does that... how does that work?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Jakobsson: "I don't think this spells out how the owners should store those tires, but they should be stored in a way that they're not collecting water. And the intent is not really to make money. The intent is to make sure that we are... it's a public... it's a protection of our public health."

Black: "Well, and I can understand that and I'm not opposed to the concept of the Bill. I just have some concerns about how it's going to work in actuality. There are storage yards... I don't think in your district and I think most of them in my district have been cleaned up, there may be one left... but if an owner... remember a few years ago shredding tires was going to be a big business and they would be burned in cogeneration plants or they would be used for a recycled asphalt. That market never developed for whatever the reason and so many people are stuck today with a hundred thousand tires. What does the Bill say? How many months or what's the timeline for somebody who accumulated these tires thinking there would be a market to shred them and sell the shred that didn't fully develop? The person who still may have a hundred thousand tires in a storage yard, what does your Bill say? How long do they have to get... have to get rid of those tires or what do they have to do with those tires?"

Jakobsson: "There is an allowance in this that a violator who is presumed guilty and has to pay the fine unless he or she appeals the citation to the Illinois Pollution Control Board within 45 days. So, I... that allows the person time to clean up and make that appeal."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Black: "Okay, but 45 days would not be an excessively long period of time. There was a tire facility in my district. I think EPA now has it cleaned up, but it took about three years 'cause I think there were half a million or more tires. So, it could take a considerable period of time because you can't put them in a landfill. They must be disposed of under environmental law and that's where I'm getting a little concerned about the actual language in the Bill. But I appreciate your indulgence and perhaps there'll be some other questions that can clarify some of the concerns that I have with the Bill. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Mautino: "There are seven people seeking recognition.

 With leave of the Body, I will set the timer on... on five minutes. And our next speaker will be the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "So, the Gentleman from Vermilion gets to go on and on and I only get five minutes?"
- Speaker Mautino: "I think he was actually right around five minutes."
- Stephens: "Well, in the eyes of the beholders maybe, but...

 Representative, will the Lady yield for a question?

 Representative, your Bill says no person shall cause or allow water to accumulate in a used tire. Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "That's right."

- Stephens: "And as I understand, there's some sort of a citation involved. I didn't see that language in your Bill."
- Jakobsson: "There is a citation. Let me see if I can find it in the Bill."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Stephens: "I'm sorry, Representative. Mr. Speaker, can I have an additional five minutes?"
- Jakobsson: "Any person that violates 21(f), (g), (h), (i) of this Act or any RCRA permit or term or condition thereof, any filing requirement, regulation, or order relating to the state..."
- Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, there must be something wrong with the sound system or something."
- Jakobsson: "...shall be liable to a civil penalty of not to exceed \$2500."
- Speaker Mautino: "I would ask the… the noise level of the chamber be brought down, so that the Representative's questions can be heard and answered."
- Stephens: "So, the citation language that you just mentioned, is that new? Is that new language?"
- Jakobsson: "No. Bear with me a moment... for a moment."
- Stephens: "Okay. So, you're referring to the current citations that are allowed. What's the maximum fine under these citations?"
- Jakobsson: "The penalty for such a violation would be \$1500."
- Stephens: "Fifteen hundred dollars."
- Jakobsson: "The same for open dumping and open burning."
- Stephens: "Fifteen hundred dollars. So, there you... the citations are issued by whom?"
- Jakobsson: "EPA."
- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. These citations are going to be issued I think by EPA bureaucrats. What a great way to fund the budget. Fifteen hundred dollars because you left... Fifteen hundred dollars for a single

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

violation, a single violation, my goodness. Representative, I know that you're concerned about the financial state of our... of our budget, but my goodness, \$1500. Do you get a discount if you're a family of four? There's... evidently, there's no discount for a family of four."

Jakobsson: "Sorry about that."

Stephens: "So, you're trying to make it. You have a family of nine. My goodness. I believe that everybody should give an exemption for every child's tire swing in the backyard of your downstate home. Now, I don't know if they do it in Champaign County, but in Bond County we certainly have tire swings and they're just kind of a tradition. You might not like them. You might not... you might think we're kind of hayseeds, but we like them because of a couple reasons. We're not going to use that tire for anything else anyway. Now, the Representative's got another use for it. the financial problems of the State of Illinois because some bureaucrat wants to come through your neighborhood, Representative. You got nine children, you might have seven swings. I don't know what seven times nine is because... but it's a big number. I just think that maybe we should talk about an exemption for families who happen to have a swing or am even a decorative tire in their backyard, Representative. I hope you would take this Bill out of the record, not string out your fellow colleagues and make them vote for a Bill that's going to haunt them when they have to pay that \$1500."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Reis."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Reis: "Representative, there's been several attempts at trying to amend this legislation. Could you tell me what the current law is if this Bill fails to garner enough votes today? What's the current vio... penalty and requirements for used tires or any tire?"

Jakobsson: "There's already a law that we have on the books that discusses used tires and the use of pesticides to treat tires and so this just adds to that big..."

Reis: "What's the current law? What's the current penalties?"

Jakobsson: "Well, if you'd like to look at it, I could refer the… tell you where to find it."

Reis: "Well, but my point is, is we currently have a law for this. We have current violations and penalties spelled out and where we were wanting some exemptions is first-time offenders. I live on a farm and I have miles and miles of road ditches. If someone throws a tire in my ditch and I don't see it, it's on my property, I could be in violation of this law. Someone dumps a tire in a fence row or in a brush... a wooded area or something. I mean, we've all got these around that we do the best we can, but there is no for exemptions or reduced consequences first-time offenders. It's been discussed about playgrounds and swings and flower pots and things like that. I just think that this Bill goes way too far with way too high a penalties with no reduced consequences for first-time offenders. We do the best we can to try to get these things picked up and disposed of in a proper way. But like

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

I said, when you have miles and miles of road ditches where people just shuck these out because they don't want to pay the disposal charge when they change their tire, we're at liability. We own 'til the center of the road and technically, under your Bill, a disposed tire in the road ditch that we didn't know about, we would be in violation. This... With all due respect to the Sponsor, this is a Bill that should not become law. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield? Representative, I heard Representative Stephens' comments asking you to exempt residential properties. I asked that exact thing in committee. Are... has there been any Amendments or anything that exempt residential properties from this Bill?"
- Jakobsson: "There aren't any Amendments and when you asked that question in committee, I recall the person from EPA saying that they... their intent was not to be looking in peoples' yards and lawns for tires and swings and planters."
- Rose: "Well, that may be their intent, Representative, but I'll bet you \$1500 per swing gets their attention pretty quickly. And my point on this, Representative, is, I thought I came up with a very simple way to make you happy and make... and also, assuage the concerns of those of us who maybe aren't as trustful of the EPA by simply saying, it was a first offense and let's say the tire swing in your backyard and limit it to one swing or two swings on a residential property, not a commercial property, on a first

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

offense give the property owner the option of simply drilling holes in the tire to let the water drain out in lieu of paying the \$1500 fine. Then there's no problem. Then we don't have to worry about the EPA targeting people, but \$1500 is a lot of money, Representative, and anybody in their right mind has seen what these people do, if they've got a way to raise money, they'll raise money. How many of you remember the Bill when the State Police told us that if we passed primary enforcement of seatbelts that they'd never pull people over. Oh, we're not going to do that. That's not our intent. That Bill hadn't been law but one month and they were pulling everybody over as enforcement. If there's a way for government to make money off of the backs of people, they'll make money off the backs of people. Representative, all I ask was a simple, hey, help us fix this, make it better. Fix the problem you want to fix, Representative, which is the tires with water in them. What is wrong... and this is the question... what is wrong with simply giving residential owners the opportunity, one-time, first offense, to drill a hole in the tire and let the water drain out instead of paying \$1500. Is there any reason why we can't do that, Representative? Is that a 'no'?"

Jakobsson: "Representative, the intent of this is not to make money, but to increase the compliance..."

Rose: "That's not the question, Representative. The question is, why didn't... I made what I thought was a very reasonable suggestion. I get this. You don't want water collecting in these huge, you know, tire barns, for lack of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

a better phrase, or reclamation centers and hatching mosquitoes. I get that. I understand that. I want to help you fix that. My question is... my suggestion was, why don't we give homeowners a one-time exemption for one or two tire swings in a backyard that kids swing on, that says instead of paying \$1500 to simply drill holes in the bottom of the tire to let the water drain out. That solves your problem, Representative, and it solves the problem of those people on our side of the aisle. Why can't we do that? Let me answer for you, because we can do it. This Bill just doesn't do that. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is a flawed piece of legislation. There's something that can assure every residential homeowner in the state has got a tire swing out back for their kids that they're not going to get stuck with a \$1500 bill because they simply didn't know that they should drill holes in the bottom of it. All I'm asking..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman please bring his remarks to a close."

Rose: "All I'm asking is reasonable. It's fair. It's just. Give the residential homeowner, he's got the kids tire swing out back, the one-time chance to rather than pay \$1500 to the government, just drill holes in it. That solves your problem, Representative. Just give us that chance. I don't know why it's that hard. We asked for it in committee two weeks ago. Here we are today, it's still not fixed. Representative, until this gets fixed, frankly, this Bill ought to get century club. I'd rather see this

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Bill get century club than see anyone in my district pay \$1500 to the EPA over something like this."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson."

Watson: "To the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

Watson: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, think about what we're doing today. We have a \$12 billion deficit and we're worried about \$1500 fines for water in a tire. Now, this may or may not be a very, very important issue, but it dwarfs in comparison to what we have to deal with. You're going to go home tonight and teachers are going to say, well, are you really going to lay off 14 thousand teachers? What'd you do at work today? Oh, we addressed the water in the tire issue. Come on. Let's get down to work with what is serious and let's quit this... let's get on the main issues and get off the ten... the tangents. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."

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

Jakobsson: "Mr. Speaker, I will yield, but I would also like to thank all of you for your suggestions and I will... Mr. Rose asked to meet with you and I want to pull it out of the record for the day."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, would you take this Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 2071. Representative Eddy. Read the Bill."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2071, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2071 is a Bill that requires notification by state's attorneys to the state superintendent and school districts if there conviction on certain offenses against children and/or a teacher or certified personnel is found guilty of other ... certain crimes. At this time, this is an attempt to coordinate that notification so that that certificate can be dealt with. And again, it's after conviction and it's an effort to improve the communication that takes place between the State's Attorneys Office, the state superintendent of schools, and local districts."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2071. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2071 is declared passed. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2111. Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2111, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 2111, 2111 is... deals with title insurance. And the intent of this is to put language

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- in there to make sure that when there's a real estate transaction that the funds are deemed 'good funds' and that every... all parties acknowledge that. And I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's moved passage of Senate Bill 211. And on that, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson, Gordon, Rose, do you wish to be recorded on this Bill? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2111 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2112 appears on the Calendar, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2112, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate 2112 deals with timeshares. This will regulate the re... for resale of timeshares and such disclosure requirements for developers in connection with promotions and takes care of other foreclosure issues. And I stand before you awaiting no questions, hopefully."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved Senate Bill 2112 and his wish is granted. On that, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Senate Bill 2112, having

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

received... Mr. Clerk, take the record. Okay. As receiving... having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. The Gentleman... Representative Currie, you have Senate Bill 2119. Do you wish that Bill called? Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2119, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an effort to make sure that our public schools in Illinois are doing the best job they can do to make sure that our children learn. So, we're following along the stimulus package that was approved in the... at the Federal Government in September and we're creating a task force that is going to help us identify how we can do the intensive intervention that some of our children need, the innovation that all of us need, and the restructuring that will put us in the forefront of public education across this nation. I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2119. Any Members seeking recognition? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Does Representative Fritchey wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2119 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2125, Majority Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2125, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Currie: downstate counties people know when they pay their first property tax installment what the total is going to be. They pay half in the first installment, half in the second. Unfortunately, Cook works very differently. Instead, in Cook, you pay half of last year's bill in the first installment and then you pay whatever you really owe in the second. For many families, for many homeowners, the shock of the increased requirement in the second installment is very difficult for them to meet. So, this is a Bill that would help smooth things out, even things out, and it would say that in the first installment you pay 55 percent and the remainder in the second. This has the strong support of the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois. I would be happy to answer your questions. And I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2125. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in strong support of this legislation. If you think about all the problems people have in staying in their homes, a common denominator is the inability to pay something. If you lose your job, you don't have the income to pay a lot of various a sundrigies (sic-sundries) from food to shelter and so forth. If you get into a

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

health scare, you all of a sudden have a big payment you have to pay for and you can't afford it. Well, the same thing is with taxes and how Cook County does things. All of a sudden, you have every increase that is coming that year back-loaded and so, you could see a 2, 3 thousand dollar tax bill at the very end and you can't afford it. You start missing payments And what happens? occasionally people will lose their homes over this. This is a very good idea to help people smoothing out their tax payments. They're not paying more taxes up-front; they're just paying a little bit more of the overall burden that is already established. If you want to help people stay in their homes, please vote for this Bill. I'm in strong support of it. Thank you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't add a great deal from what Representative Sullivan has already said, but the one time my county got into this, my home county got into this problem years and years ago, the second installment can literally take you out of the ability to pay, as Representative Sullivan said. And you're not doing your constituents any favor by just saying, well, pay half of last year's. What if the second installment then is \$3 thousand higher than it was last year? You now have to come up with a significant amount of money and that's not fair to your constituents; it's not fair to the homeowner. I think the increase in the first installment is very, very

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

reasonable and I think also gives constructive notice to the homeowner, you may see in that second installment a considerable increase, and you'd better be thinking about that and perhaps budgeting for that. I think the Lady's Bill is not only reasonable; it's the right thing to do. One could make an argument that you should pay 60 percent so that you can try to avoid the shock and the resultant difficulties if the second installment is much, much higher than you anticipated. This is just a commonsense constructive notice Bill. I think it gives adequate information to the consumer, to the homeowner, and for all of the reasons Representative Sullivan clearly enumerated, this is deserving of an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Bond, Leader Stephens."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Stephens: "Oh, excuse me. I'm sorry. Leader, I'm sorry. I didn't know who was the... I looked up and saw myself and asked if he would yield. In Madison County, the powers that be there have said that rather than two installments that we would have four installments. And I thought that they did that in deference to the taxpayer to spread the burden out. When I look at your Bill, I see that it's 55 percent up-front, 45 at the other end and I understand the arguments behind it, but is that fair to the taxpayer? Wouldn't it be better to spread it out?"

Currie: "Well, in fact, if you would... if we wanted them to go to four payments across the year that might be sensible

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

too, but the problem, Representative, is that in Cook County when you pay the first installment you don't have any idea, and the people who send you that bill have no idea, what the total property tax for that year will be. So, what we find is that you pay 50 percent of last year's bill, not 50 percent of this year's bill. And what happens then is the second installment can sock it to you to the extent that you may not be able to pay that second installment because it is so high. So, this is also... just as your four installments is, this also is an effort to smooth out the problem to make sure the people are not socked with the entire increase and have to pay the full boat in the second installment of the year. But I like your idea of perhaps extending it to four installments rather than two."

Stephens: "Leader Currie, that... thank you. There is... Do you have any fear at all that if we do this in Cook County... it's not your intention, as you just alluded, it's not your intention to spread this to the rest of the state and make everybody have to pay..."

Currie: "No."

Stephens: "...more up-front when they don't have the same problems that Cook has."

Currie: "No because… because people in other parts of the state pay 50 percent of this year's bill in the first installment and in the second installment."

Stephens: "Well..."

Currie: "Unfortunately, it does not work that way in Cook."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Stephens: "Thank you, Leader. Well, to my downstate colleagues, knowing that this doesn't affect any of the counties that we represent, it seems to make sense on the surface. It makes you look... oh, my goodness, we're going to pay more up-front, but it's going to wind up being more affordable and more budget... budgetwise and it's not going to affect our counties. With that understanding, I would rise in support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Joyce: "Thank you. Leader, I am a little confused on this and I think I understand that you're trying to lessen the cliff. My concern is that we're... we in Cook County, if this Bill passes, are guaranteed a 10 percent increase in the property taxes every single year."

Currie: "No, we're not, no. What this says is that you'll pay...
we're basing that first installment on last year's taxes,
not current taxes and the problem is that we don't know,
when it's time to pay the first installment, what the total
tax bill is going to be."

Joyce: "Right."

Currie: "Usually, there's an increase and next year I am sure there will be and this is meant to say that you will have a smoother path to pay your taxes and it is in no way this has nothing to do with the actual size of the tax bill."

Joyce: "See, as you said, this has nothing to do or we have no idea what our second installment payment's going to be..."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Currie: "And that's why we..."

Joyce: "...and that's not calculated until after the money from the first installment is collected."

Currie: "That's right."

Joyce: "Okay. So, if the assessor of Cook County and the taxing bodies of Cook County decide that they can assess and tax as long as they don't go over that first installment payment for each property owner and not feel the heat, I'm afraid this makes it too easy for them to guarantee that those second installments will be the same 55 percent..."

Currie: "I... I..."

Joyce: "...of last year's payment..."

Currie: "I think... I think that's not a risk..."

Joyce: "...So the aggregate number would be at 10 percent."

Currie: "That is not a risk because the formula that defines what your individual property tax bill will be is a formula."

Joyce: "Why?"

Currie: "It is not something that they're going to be able to manipulate. So, I don't think that there's any risk that that will happen. I do think that without this Bill... I think the Taxpayers' Federation is right... that there are real problems for real people when they look at the second balloon payment that they are required to make under current law."

Joyce: "But this is really not any... it doesn't reduce property taxes at all."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Currie: "No, it does not. It doesn't raise them and it doesn't reduce them. It only says maybe we can smooth out the way in which we pay them."
- Joyce: "And it makes it... probably makes it easier for the... the shock value is lessened."
- Currie: "Somewhat diminished. Somewhat diminished."
- Joyce: "And so, it probably makes it easier for those that are mailing out the property tax bill to not feel as much heat in that second installment."
- Currie: "Oh, maybe... maybe you won't feel as much heat when your neighbor..."
- Joyce: "Or all of us from our neighbor... Yeah, I mean, and I'm concerned about it because I think it makes it very easy to justify a property tax increase and I..."
- Currie: "I... actually, I don't think that it does, but I do appreciate your point, and I think that with the city and with the Taxpayers' Federation at least this will mean the people can stay in their houses, they're not going to be driven out because of the second installment being so much higher than the first."
- Joyce: "Well, I don't know if I agree with that statement because it's... it's not reducing property taxes so it's not..."
- Currie: "No, it is not reducing..."
- Joyce: "...guaranteeing people let... can stay in their houses."
- Currie: "Right, right."
- Joyce: "But I appreciate your angle on it. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, is there anything in your Bill that says the tax bill must contain an explanation of what's happening in that particular bill when it comes? So, that when the bill comes, the first bill comes with a 55 percent that they'll be an explanation of why that's happening?"

Currie: "No, there's no explanation. There's just the question is, how do you calculate the first installment? And the effort here is to say since... right now, we base it without any idea what the actual total tax bill for that year will be in the County of Cook. We pay half of last year's; this would say let's pay a little more than half because the chances are good that the second installment is going to mean an increase and all of that increase is now paid in the second installment rather than divided between the first and the second."

Mulligan: "Well, I... I get the theory behind it and I certainly feel it's not a bad idea to help local municipalities meet their budgets in this kind of a time. I would... but there's two things: number one is an adequate explanation on the bill to the taxpayer so that they understand what's happening and I would be a lot happier if the first year this went into effect was not an election year."

Currie: "Well, I hope..."

Mulligan: "I'm always suspect of things like that. So, it makes me a little nervous, but the theory behind it is not a bad theory, because normally that second bill is the higher bill. And you don't know that it's going to be... and

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

if it was reduced, it would be nice because the second bill would then be really lower, if taxes went... right."

Currie: "Well, it would be... really just an effort to smooth out the payments schedule."

Mulligan: "So, I get the theory behind it and I don't think it's a totally bad idea, but my problem with it is the election year and what people will think about it and what can be portrayed of it and the fact of adequate notification from people so that they understand what happening, particularly ahead of time. I mean, if something like this were to pass, I think I'd certainly would try to notify the taxpayers in my district that we passed such a Bill and what the reasoning was."

Currie: "I appreciate your point. I think I would point out that the first installment usually happens after the Primary Election and the second installment, which under this Bill, would mean a lower payment..."

Mulligan: "Right. I understand that, but..."

Currie: "...happens before November. Yeah."

Mulligan: "...being here a long time I understand you can spin it however you want. So, thank you."

Currie: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2125. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representatives Brady, Cole, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 67 'yes' votes, 46 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2125 is

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

declared passed. Representative Black, on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2129. Do you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2129, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. Third Reading."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2129 permits the taking of shad and drum by means of bowfishing. This is supported by the Bowfishing Association of Illinois and the Department of Natural Resources. These two particular species are not currently in the law that allows bowfishing... bow fisher people to take fish. Currently, it's carp, buffalo, sucker, gar, and bowfin may be taken. All this Bill does is add shad and drum fish to those species that can be taken by means of bowfishing. I'll be glad to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2129. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Fritchey: "This was just a little too good just to let go.

Representative, I'm not even sure where to start. Here,
let's start with this. I'll assume that there's a
difference between shad and drum as opposed to fife and
drum."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "Yes, very definitely. Shad does not make music at all.

Let me tell you a little bit about shad. It's also called
a river herring. It's comprised of the genus Alosa, which
is fish related to herring in the family clupeidae."

Fritchey: "Well, Representative, everybody knows that."

Black: "Well, of course."

Fritchey: "What I'm getting at is what we're trying to do here.

I mean, here all kidding aside you know, is there a... is there a pent-up desire to be shad spearfishing in Vermilion County or other places here?"

Black: "Not so much in Vermilion County, but in rivers across the state and particularly in the Great Lakes. I was surprised, as I'm sure you would be. Yes, there is. Evidently these fish are wily and difficult to catch and a bowfisherman uses a bow and arrow with a special barbed tip and a line and if they can hit this fish with a bow and arrow, they then reel in the fish and I assume they cook it, but it is edible. I assume they cook it, though, before they eat it."

Fritchey: "I mean and there are few things as problematic as a wily shad and I'll give you that."

Black: "Oh. I... I would say that the wily shad is probably one of the most devious fish known to mankind."

Fritchey: "Let me... If there is a serious question in here, it may be this. If people are off in the ocean somewhere, people that are experienced with spearfishing, things along those lines, all kidding... is there a concern of having people bowfishing, spearfishing, et cetera, you know, on recreational bodies of water here where you may have, you

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

know, folks out with the rod and reel, people on their boat and you know, somebody that may not be well-versed in using a spear gun on an Illinois body of water? Are there any... and I'm asking this in all seriousness here... do we have any kinds of regulations or certification? I mean, if I get a regular fishing license, does that then allow me to go and buy a spear gun and start using a spear gun in local bodies of water down here?"

Black: "It's my understanding that it would. The Bill doesn't mention anything and I was trying to get a hold of DNR when this Bill was called. I don't think there's any training requirement, but because it is a very ancient form of hunting fish that has been used to gather food for hundreds and hundreds and hundreds, if in fact, not thousands of years, you would have to have some level of skill or you simply will not be successful."

Fritchey: "Well, then..."

Black: "And remember the... the arrow is attached to a..."

Fritchey: "To a line and..."

Black: "...a line."

Fritchey: "...the bow and arrow, I'll concede, you know, if our...
you know, if the settlers here can figure out how to do it,
I would trust that people here could. But I'm actually
more concerned about the underwater spear gun, which is
provided for. This isn't just bow and arrow; this isn't
just a pitchfork. You know, there's something inherently
problematic by us authorizing the use of spear guns to fish
in Illinois. I don't think we're allowed to use that for
other species, are we?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "Yes. That... that is already allowed for the species that I mentioned earlier. And again, spearfishing would mean that you'd be a... probably and I can't tell you this unequivocally, but would have to have a... scuba training in order to do that, you know, unless you're Superman or something and can breathe underwater."

Fritchey: "Well, I... I..."

Black: "You... you can use spearfishing..."

Fritchey: "Okay."

Black: "...in the State of Illinois, currently."

Fritchey: "Well, I... I... I'm not sure about the legislation. I will say that I... my respect for Senator Rutherford to actually show his face on the floor while this Bill is up has gone up immensely. You know, we see a lot of Bills that are apparently driven by a need somewhere, I'm not sure that this is one of them, but I wish I could find what the problem is with this thing. There's got to be one somewhere, but thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Franks: "Representative, I know that currently the pitchfork and underwater spear gun and bow and arrow are used for carp and for buffalo and suckers and those types of fish.

My question is, what does a shad look like?"

Black: "I'm glad you asked me that. The shad is one of the largest of the herring family, can get up to an average weight of six pounds, it has a very bony flesh. They

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

ascend to rivers to spawn in the spring. Water pollution and indiscriminate netting have cut down their numbers. Now, the gizzard shad, also called the dorosoma, which has been named for its mother, I think, Dora the Explorer, has a muscular gizzard... gizzard-like stomach. It is... here's to the issue... it is a swift, silvery fish up to one foot in length and it's found along the Atlantic Coast from New Jersey to Texas and up the Mississippi to the Great Lakes. And the bowfishermen think it's a... a good fish for them to hunt and DNR thinks it's a good fish for them to hunt and so that... and I'm glad you asked that because I didn't know what a shad was either and I... I feel more fulfilled as a sportsman now that I know."

Franks: "What does a drum fish look like?"

Black: "Oh, I'm glad you asked that. The drum fish is a freshwater fish. Now, this can get up to quite large in the rivers of Illinois. The world record weight for a drum fish is 54 pounds."

Franks: "Wow."

Black: "Its color is grey or silvery in turbid waters, but it takes on a bronze tint in clear water. I... It must have something to do with sunscreen. The head is somewhat darker than the rest of the body. The ventral portion of the fish, that's the body portion of the fish, is white. Its pectoral and pelvic fins are white, but the rest of the fins are very dusky. Now, it's also called sheepshead, croaker, thunderpumper, lake drum, grunt, bubbler and grinder and it is found in all of the Great Lakes. And it is also a sporting fish and one of the things that I was

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

fascinated about the drum part comes from Latin, grunniens meaning grunting. It makes its odd grunting noise, which is produced by a special set of muscles located in the body cavity and that vibrates against the swim bladder. The purpose of this noise is unknown, but we think that mature males develop that structure to attract a female drum fish, but we're not sure."

Franks: "Oh, I could see why."

Black: "Oh, yes."

Franks: "I could see why. Now, I'm looking... Representative Phelps has brought me pictures of the shad. As you said, it's an Atlantic fish. It was actually a... it's a saltwater fish and then it goes to spawn into the freshwater, much like a salmon.

Black: "Yes, yes."

Franks: "Now, I don't know if you've..."

Black: "And it does find its way to the Great Lakes."

Franks: "Oh, yeah, that's a long way to go. Now, have you seen a picture of the drum fish?"

Black: "Not since I was at the last Rolling Stones concert, and as I recall the drummer for the Rolling Stones resembled a drum fish and is probably older than any drum fish that I know."

Franks: "Yeah, yeah. Yeah, a drum fish on crack, maybe, 'cause it's... But you look at that picture. Now, does that look like any other fish that you've seen?"

Black: "You know, quite frankly, it almost looks like either a gold fish I had when I was very young or in a certain way it resembles a piranha."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Franks: "You think so... I thought it sort of looked like a walleye or a sauger."

Black: "Well, it could. It could. In fact, I see the resemblance to a walleye."

Franks: "It did... it did to me. And that's... that's my only concern with this. How do I know which fish I'm spearing?"

Black: "Well..."

Franks: "What happens if I'm wrong? Is there a penalty if I think I'm getting a shad or I'm getting the sheep head, but instead I get a crappie?"

Black: "Oh, yes. If..."

Franks: "Am I going to get in trouble?"

Black: "Yes. If you take any fish that is not on the DNR list, there is a... a serious penalty. I don't think it's a Class X felony, but I know there is a fine and you may have to go on the fish offender list for the rest of your life."

Franks: "I wasn't sure and I'm thinking if we really want to be efficient and if you see like a whole school of shad and you really want to get them, wouldn't it be just easier to use dynamite?"

Black: "Yes. And in the old days they did, but we have... we have outlawed that over the last few years..."

Franks: "All right. I'm just checking."

Black: "...and ever since a fisherman in my district did not throw properly, and the stick of dynamite went into the back of his boat."

Franks: "Well..."

Black: "We would..."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "In addition to the continuing education credits for your zoology and biology, can the Gentleman bring his questions to a close. Further questions? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Reboletti: "Representative Black, has anybody talked to the shad or the drum fish on this to see what their position was?"
- Black: "It's my understanding that they tried to hire a contract lobbyist, but all of them were engaged this year. I was trying to think of the guy that was on that old Sea Hunt movie, a famous actor, long since... Lloyd Bridges, of course, Lloyd Bridges. They were trying to get Lloyd Bridges to lobby for them, but found out that he had gone to that big drum fish in the sky. So..."
- Reboletti: "Is there any..."
- Black: "...they're not... and it's very unfair that they aren't represented, because I'm sure they would have a different view of this than the bowfishermen."
- Reboletti: "There isn't a \$1500 permit for these fish, are there?"
- Black: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that. I've got water in my ear."
- Reboletti: "There isn't any... there's not any \$1500, permit like with the tires?"
- Black: "Only if there's more than a thousand of them and you don't drain the water after you catch them."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Reboletti: "And did Governor Quinn's budget mention this as, I think, part of the doomsday scenario?"
- Black: "You know, I'm not sure. I didn't see that on the doomsday scenario, but I would think that this would continue, because quite frankly, shad is a commercial fish, but bowfishermen don't take the huge quantities that commercial fishermen do."
- Reboletti: "I think you're onto something, Representative.

 Thank you for your answer."

Black: "I think so."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson."

Watson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If I may close because there's been a lot of misinformation about this Bill. This simply permits the taking of shad and drum by means of bowfishing. It is obviously supported by the Bowfishing Association of Illinois and the Department of Natural Resources. It adds these two species to a list of fish that can already be taken. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're faced with a lot of serious problems in the next two weeks. I don't think we should add to our burden by denying bowfishermen the right to take these two species. This is an important Bill. I can't... I just can't overemphasize that... I mean, this Bill cleared the Senate

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

59 to 0 and you know how the Senate pays attention. I would hope that we at least equal the Senate vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2129. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives McAuliffe, Saviano, Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2129 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2145 appears on the Calendar. Representative Holbrook. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2145, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2145 is a cleanup Bill for the IEPA. It closes out a couple accounts that are either unconstitutional or unused and allows an extension for the consumer when they do alternative fuel rebates for their cars. I know of no opposition. It passed out of the Senate unanimously, out of committee unanimously, and does not affect the drum or shad population in our lakes."

Speaker Mautino: "And with that, the Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2145. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives Dunkin, Mulligan, Zalewski, do

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

you wish to be recorded on this Bill? Representative Yarbrough. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2145 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2150 appears on the Calendar. Representative Holbrook. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2150, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2150 is a Bill that expands renewable portfolio standards to the ARES, the alternative (sic-retai) electric suppliers. It also sets up some transparency on the Illinois Power Authority on its purchase of renewables for these areas. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It's the result of a negotiations that's lasted over the last two years. The Illinois Chamber is for it. The Commerce Commission is for it. The Environmental Council is for it. CUB's for it. The Power Authority is for it. All producers of electric that I know of in this state are for it. And all regulated utilities are for it. It passed out of the Senate unanimously, out of a committee unanimously, and does not affect the shad or drum population in our lakes."

Speaker Mautino: "And we are delighted about that. Senate Bill 2150 has been moved passage. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. This Bill, having received 114

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', is declared passed. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2178. Representative Wait, do you wish to call this Bill? Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2178, a Bill for an Act concerning plain language. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Wait."

Wait: "Yes. This Senate Bill here, 2178, simply would set up the task force to try to make things as clear as language as possible and make sure that everybody understands some of the things we pass down here. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2178. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; 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. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2178 is declared passed. On the Calendar, page 9, appears Senate Bill 2180. Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2180, a Bill for an Act concerning novelty lighters. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2180 addresses novelty lighters and the sale and distribution of them. The Act prohibits the sale of novelty lighters in the state. I don't know if you're familiar with what novelty lighters are, but they look like

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

toys and children think they are toys. One of the real dangers of these, if you have a lighter that... it's not one of the novelty lighters... but a regulated... however the... meets the regulations, you have to do at least two things to get the lighter to work. Well, these novelty lighters just light up on the first try. They're very dangerous and they should not be sold in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Crawford is seeking recognition, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I want to make sure I understand the offense, the penalty for this. If... if someone buys a novelty lighter, they would be fined \$500, as a penalty?"

Jakobsson: "Let me make sure it's the buyer or the seller.

Just one moment, please. It's the sale and distribution that the penalty is imposed."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the person who purchases the lighter is not guilty. It's the person who sells the lighter or distributes them."

Jakobsson: "That's right."

Eddy: "So, let's get to the definition of a 'novelty lighter' again. How... how do you... I've seen at flea markets or in other types of... let's say someone's having a garage sale at their house or a yard sale, and they're going to sell a lighter collection and one of those lighters happens to be of the definition that it is a novelty lighter. That person then is guilty of an offense that they could be fined \$500 for?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Jakobsson: "Technically, I guess, the answer to that would be 'yes'. This is really directed at the wholesale. retail distributors."

Eddy: "Well, but if it's not totally restricted to those folks and here's part of the issue. We're passing legislation here that could have the unintended consequence of making a criminal out of someone who has a yard sale. Let me ask you, Representative, and I don't think that's your intent here, but I would think that some type of a strict definition of what a retail establishment is would be a good addition to this Bill. And if you would take it out of the record and/or move it down to Second and begin to work on some type of protection for those you're not intending to be har... or to be fined, it would be... it would become a little bit better. I'm not sure why... why it's needed anyway, but we certainly don't want to hurt people that are trying to have a yard sale somewhere."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? No..."

Eddy: "Well, I just want to find out if we're going to..."

Speaker Mautino: "Continue."

Eddy: "...try to fix this thing to..."

Jakobsson: "This legislation is really very important. It causes a lot of injuries. I don't know if you've seen these novelty lighters that look like cartoon characters, toys, guns, watches. They look like musical instruments. They look like little miniature tools. And when children see these and they pick them up, and all they have to do is... if I had in my hand a needle-nose pliers, all I had to do was squeeze it and a flame shot out."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Eddy: "Well, I understand the danger and I understand what you're trying to do as far as retail and maybe there needs to be some type of legislation, but... and maybe the Bill defines 'retail' better than I'm seeing it, that only... this only applies to what is defined as 'retail'. I'm just not necessarily seeing that."

Jakobsson: "The Bill defines... does say that it's retail."

Eddy: "Okay. Let's..."

Jakobsson: "And I don't know that..."

Eddy: "Can you... can you specifically in the... I have a copy of the legislation."

Jakobsson: "Page 2, Section 15, prohibition against novelty lighters. May not sell at retail or distribute for retail sale in this state..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Jakobsson: "...a novelty lighter."

Eddy: "A person may not sell at retail. So, what you're saying, is the person then responsible? So, the clerk is responsible or the owner of the retail establishment is responsible?"

Jakobsson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear your question."

Eddy: "Well, I understand now. I think it reads that they have to be selling... the person has to be selling at a retail establishment. Is that your intent? The person has to be selling at the..."

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Eddy: "...retail establishment?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Eddy: "So, is the person then that makes the sale the responsible party for the \$500 fine or is it the retail establishment, the owner?"

Jakobsson: "It's the retail establishment."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the clerk who might be making minimum wage to sell the products and ring them up isn't responsible for this."

Jakobsson: "It's directed at the establishment."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, Representative, I... maybe there's some more clarification that'll come during the debate on the issue. I just want to make sure that this is written in a way that there aren't unintended consequences for others. I appreciate your answers."

Speaker Mautino: "Seven Members seeking... eight Members seeking recognition. I would seek leave of the Body to turn the timer on setting it the standard five minutes. Our next speaker will be Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Some of you...
or a number of you remember last year we did a Resolution
asking that we ban the sale of these look-alike toy
lighters that resemble toys that children would be
attracted to. That Resolution was urging, you know, the
U.S. Congress to ban. Clearly, these lighters have caused
many fires and injuries to children. A lighter that looks
innocent, might look like a cell phone, might look like a
calculator, it might look like a radio, it might look like
a watch, it might look like a toy gun, it might look like a
bowling pin. I had examples with me when I presented that
Resolution last year. They look like things that would

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

attract a child. These things can light on the first attempt and of course, cause a problem, could injure the child. They drop them and it starts a fire. The fire service different... the chiefs, the firefighters, I think they're all on that, very much feel this is needed to protect our children. It was written that it's banning the retail sale. The only thing if, if there's any concern I think we could even state in legislative intent... intent and we might need to pull it out to do that, but I hope that doesn't stop this from passing and meeting all time deadlines. Probably for this Session, legislative intent would be the best thing to do and if we need any further clarification, come back with language. But don't let those technicalities get in the way of trying to save lives, protect children from severe burns, and causing heavy property damage. These clearly are a hazard. They're a known hazard. They're a proven hazard. It says in the language that it does not apply to any lighter manufactured before January 1, 1980 or a lighter lacking fuel or a device necessary to produce combustion of a flame. So, any lighter that was disabled it would not apply, to which I would assume easily in a collection, in fact, they should be disabled. But if we want legislative intent to further clarify and protect an individual at a yard sale, such as been mentioned, that's fine, but don't let that stand in the way of saving lives, saving property, preventing injury to children that's happened again and People at the fire service have told us; they've been asking for this. So, if we need to do a little

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

tweaking, fine, but let's don't block it for that reason. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Dunkin: "I, too, certainly understand... see the intent of where you're trying to head with this legislation. There are a number... numerous accidents in this country with things of this nature. I just have a simple question. Of the 300 people killed annually, said 30 percent are children and almost one billion in property has been destroyed. Where are you citing that information from, Representative?"

Jakobsson: "I'm not really sure where that came from. We have people working on the research for this."

Dunkin: "Can you speak up, Representative."

Jakobsson: "I'm not really sure where that came from."

Dunkin: "Okay. All right. Okay. The Federal Consumer Protec...

Product Safety Commission has recalled thousands of these items. Do you know what year about that information came about or when they made this citation?"

Jakobsson: "No."

Dunkin: "So, they recall thousands of novelty lighters because of fire... because of danger they present... that they present to the public safety and the setting of fires. I mean, here's my concern. I have a number of small retail shops in my district in Old Town, along the Rush Street area, some downtown in the South Loop and certainly on the south side of my district as well, Chinatown, again, a number of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

small retail novelty stores, if you will. And I'm trying to make sure... I mean, to some of the questions that were asked earlier... make sure that this... the intent of the legislation doesn't, you know, have collateral damage, if you will, on some of those retailers who are doing the responsible thing and trying to make sense of it all in terms of how I should vote on this or not. Again, I respect you and this legislation, I'm just trying to really understand how we get to the best resolve of this matter."

Jakobsson: "Well, the responsible thing would be for them not to sell them."

Dunkin: "Okay. That's a short answer. But you have a number of small stores or businesses out here who may have what appears to be similar to what you are discussing here in this legislation. You have watches on here; you have musical instruments; you have vehicles; you have food; you have guns; you have cartoon characters. You have a lot of adults who participate in purchasing some of these novelty items as well. So, again, you have no idea where you got this statistic of \$1 billion in property destroyed, 30 percent of our... to whom our children and 300 people are killed. I'm trying to get a sense of tangently (sictangentially) where I can reference or some of the businesses, Representative, that I can say, look, this came from this organization, not sort of something general, but something very specific. If there has been a scientific analysis or some empirical data that I can reference."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Jakobsson: "I'm not exactly sure where that came from in doing the research for this Bill, but it is an initiative of the Illinois Fire Protection Association."

Dunkin: "And I understand that, but for this to be in a statutory form, and according to my analysis here, and I'm looking at the Bill text and us not knowing where that count came from, I mean, isn't that something..."

Jakobsson: "I thought I'd already answered you."

Dunkin: "Come again?"

Jakobsson: "I've answered you now a couple of times."

Dunkin: "Well, again, you make us... you said 300 people were killed annually, 30 percent of whom are children and almost a billion dollars in property has been destroyed. I'm saying, where can I... where's the empirical data that I can point out to the businesses in my district who may be a part of this web of good intentions, but fined up to \$500, unintentionally or directly, quite frankly."

Jakobsson: "What?"

Dunkin: "I'm trying to figure out where'd you get this information from, Representative."

Jakobsson: "We've gone over that. If that's really important to you, I will try to find out where it came from, but I can't give you anymore information than I've given you each time you've asked that."

Dunkin: "Again, my only concern is I have a number of small businesses in my..."

Speaker Mautino: "Could the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Dunkin: "Representative, I see, and understand and respect your intention of this legislation. I just think that there needs to be more clarification."

Jakobsson: "How many of those businesses sell these lighters?"

Dunkin: "I'm not sure. Again, if you go into Chinatown in my district, if you go into Old Town, if you go along the Rush Street area and some... and even on the south side of my district, you have a number of stores, dollar stores, smaller businesses that potentially or possibly sell this. As a matter of fact I've seen some of these products and I want to have an unnecessary hit unintentionally and they may have... I mean, they're not even designated as toy stores. Again, I respect and I see your intention... the intent of this law, but I'm trying to figure out where exactly this came from. You're saying you don't know where it's coming from, but yet you have it in a... the text of the Bill. It's not even in the analysis; it's in the text. So, you're making a reference and a citation that has no empirical, citational evidence of such. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Bond, Leader Stephens."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, she will."

Stephens: "Representative, in your… in your Bill it said that if there's no fuel in the lighter, it's okay to sell it.

Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "That's right."

Stephens: "So, if there's no fuel, you can sell these. How do you know if there's no fuel in it when you sell it? Do you

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

have to... Is there going to be a monitoring system? I could keep these and all there... in the... the Gentleman from Cook can keep them in his retail stores as long as there's no fuel in them. They can sell the heck out of them and they can sell a little container of butane lighter fluid at the same time. Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "Well, the Bill excludes those that were made before 1980 or those that contain no fluid."

Stephens: "Those that contain no fluid, no fuel, so you can sell them. You can still sell these. What's the point? What's the point of your legislation? You're not trying to protect anybody. You can still sell these lighters and you can still sell the fuel. You can do that at home. them together and give them to your kid. As a matter of fact, when I went out to Washington, D.C., last... just a month or so ago, I bought a little statue of one of these... these novelty lighters. It's two little statues. One is Dick Cheney and the other is Barack Obama and you pull a little lever on the Dick Cheney doll and it starts talking and whatever it says, fire then comes out of the mouth of Barack Obama. I don't know what the purpose of that is, but I bought it with no fuel. So, I'll be... I'm exempt. Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "Most of these are not sold empty. The point is, it's very important to make sure that we're protecting our children."

Stephens: "I'm exempt if there's no fuel. Is that right?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Jakobsson: "We want to make sure that we are protecting everybody and the people who already have these, when they're empty, they don't have to throw them away..."

Stephens: "You can still sell them if they're empty under your Bill. Is that right?"

Jakobsson: "That's what it says."

"Okay. You can still sell them. So, again, I ask Stephens: you the question, what's the point? Who are you trying to save us from? My one-year-old grandson was visiting this week and our house is not baby-proof. My wife happens to have a collection of stuff in the kitchen, one item after another, we're following around this little one-year-old who's just learning how to walk and he's grabbing one item after another that if we don't watch him, could be harmful. Things that he could grab, and put in his mouth and get caught in his throat. Why don't you ban those things from my wife's kitchen? Children have choked every year. I'm sure over 300 children die accidentally every year. don't we ban those things in my wife's kitchen? Well, I'll tell you why, because we ask people to be responsible for themselves. Again, I would ask the Lady, who are we trying to protect today and who are we being protected from? Under her Bill, you can still sell these lighters. So, her argument, well, I'm trying to children, is false. She's not. You can still buy butane; you can still buy the lighters, so it's a moot point. But the general message is please, America, there's something going wrong out there and government is the only solution. Is that what we've come to? Is government always the first course of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

protection? We always do it for the kids. We're going to save people from hurting themselves over and over and over. A \$1500 fine for a backyard swing. You can buy a lighter and give it your kids as long as you give them the fuel separately. That's what this Bill says. You can buy these lighters and give them to your children under this legislation, but we're doing it to protect you. This is nonsense."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Fritchey: "Thank you. Representative, I want to echo some of the previous points, but clarify the problems with this. This is a Bill that falls into that growing category of well intended, but poorly drafted Bills. Well, first, let's start with this factually. Under your findings, you talk about the fires... the growing threat of fires set by juveniles. We have no breakdown on which of those fires are set by matches, which of those fires are set by regular lighters, which of those fires are set by novelty lighters, correct? That's correct, right?"

Jakobsson: "Correct."

Fritchey: "That's... So, we have no... we have no idea if this even addresses the issue. When you look at the definition of 'novelty lighters', it talks about lighters made to resemble cartoon characters, toys, guns, watches, musical instruments, vehicles, toy animals, food, or beverages. That's correct too, right?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Jakobsson: "Correct."

Fritchey: "Representative Dunkin talked about the stores in his district in Chinatown that sell novelty lighters. If they sell a novelty lighter that is shaped like Buddha, that's not a novelty lighter under this, is it?"

Jakobsson: "These are examples."

Fritchey: "Excuse me?"

Jakobsson: "What's cited in the Bill are examples."

Fritchey: "I'm... I'm sorry. I can't... I can't hear you. I'm not being funny. As I said, I can't hear you."

Jakobsson: "The Bill cites examples."

Fritchey: "Wait, were those..."

Jakobsson: "It's got to be your interpretation of whether that particular one is a toy or whether it's a sacred..."

Fritchey: "Okay. What is wrong here? Un... un... under your interpretation, would a lighter... would a lighter designed to look like Buddha fall under any of these definitions?"

Jakobsson: "It's probably up to an individual discretion."

Fritchey: "No... no, it's not. Buddha's a religious thing. How about a lighter shaped... how about a lighter designed in Jesus Christ? Does that fall under this definition?"

Jakobsson: "No. I haven't seen any like that."

Fritchey: "Just because you... you haven't seen a lot of these. Would that fall under... that... Here, let me rephrase... that would not fall under this definition. How about a lighter... how about a lighter which I have seen that looks like Elvis Presley? Now, I don't think Elvis Presley falls under cartoon character, toy, toy animal, food or beverage, correct? And as a matter of fact, a lighter that is in the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

design of a cat or a dog or a real animal. This doesn't ban lighters that look like real animals. This bans lighters that look like toy animals and..."

Jakobsson: "These are examples. It doesn't limit."

Fritchey: "Oh, no, no, no. You're right. It includes but is not limited to. So, are we now going to allow who will make the determination then of what is a novelty lighter? Because, you're right, under the language of this Bill, you specify these but it's not limited. So, who then gets to decide whether or not the Elvis Presley lighter is a toy lighter or the Buddha lighter is a toy lighter or a Chinese dragon lighter is a novelty lighter? The idea here is to keep these out of the hands of children, correct?"

Jakobsson: "The idea is to keep them out of the hands of children and protect all of us from unwanted fires."

Fritchey: "I'm a 45-year-old man. Do you think I need protection and somebody telling me that I can't buy a lighter in the shape of a watch or in the shape of a guitar or in the shape of Scooby Doo or take your pick? All right. Who are... who are you protecting? Ru oh. And Representative, I am not making light of you, I am not making light of your intentions, but more here... Let's do this. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, throughout this Session and maybe the longer I've been here, especially this time of year, we let a lot of well-intentioned, poorly drafted Bills go through. This is a Bill that has a bad definition that would allow something like Representative Stephens said, you could sell an empty lighter and give

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

somebody a free can of butane to go along with it and not violate this. It penalizes, not the retailer, like the… like the Sponsor said, but the individual that sold it \$500 a day for selling a lighter that may not think… that they may not realize it is a novelty lighter. This is a poorly drafted Bill. It does not do what it's intended to do. It does not further a public policy. It is a bad piece of legislation. We are all too eager, all too often, to let poorly drafted Bills go by because they have a nice Sponsor like this one does, because they sound harmless enough like this one may. It's a bad law. It's a bad policy. It's a bad precedent. Speaker, I'm reluctant to do this, but nevertheless, should…"

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Fritchey: "as I said and with all due reluctance and with respect to the time of this Body, should this Bill somehow get the requisite votes, I will request a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "Your request has been acknowledged."

Fritchey: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jakobsson is seeking recognition."

Jakobsson: "Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of the concerns. I realize that a lot of people are confused and I would like to help you with your confusion. I will pull it out of the record and try to clarify so that it's very clear to you what a novelty lighter is. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, at the request of the Sponsor, please take this Bill from the record. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: on the Order of Concurrence 'recommends be adopted' are Motions to Concur on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 10, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 22, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 37, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 47, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 85, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 379, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 418, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 437, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 467, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 811, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 964, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill... I'm sorry. Correction. House Bill 1329, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2280, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 22... 2331, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2388, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2450, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2547, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 25... 2651, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2642, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3863, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3878, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3950, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4054, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4237 and Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4241."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, is seeking recognition. Mr. Clerk, on page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2184. Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2184, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2184 amends the Water Use Act to require the reporting of large water users throughout the state to the Illinois State Water Survey. Most of our surrounding states have mandatory reporting and Illinois is one of the few that do not. This will give our Regional Water Supply Planning Committees created under are there pri... an Executive Order better information so that they can develop programs and track program implementation for water supply planning and management. And I ask for your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2184. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2184 is declared passed. Mr. Pritchard, on the Calendar, page 9, appears Senate Bill 2214. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2217. Representative Kosel. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2217, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill would create an enhanced skill driving school. An enhanced skill driving school means a school

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

that would teach advanced driving skills such as emergency braking, crashing, avoiding, defensive driving techniques to licensed drivers and it establishes the regulations that would be needed to establish these throughout the state. It also adds to an approved driving education course, courses given by the Department of Defense. Those would be students that serve abroad... whose families are serving abroad and take driver's ed in a foreign country in a course that is administered by the Department of Defense and would allow those students when they return here to get an Illinois license. I will gladly answer any questions and ask for your approval. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2217. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representatives Phelps, Reitz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2217 is declared passed. Representative Senger, you have on the Calendar Senate Bill 2224. Do you wish this called? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2224, a Bill for an Act concerning aging. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Senate Bill 2224 basically prohibits any person from charging a senior fee for helping to fill out a Circuit Breaker application. This legislation was received from

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

the state Sponsor because some local community centers were charging fees ranging from \$5 to \$20 for assistance in this Circuit Breaker application. So, basically, this Bill is just saying that that can't be done. There's plenty assistance that is provided right now for the form that needs to be filled out. So, I ask for your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2224. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Thapedi."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Thapedi: "Representative, the Circuit Breaker program provides grants to senior citizens and persons with disabilities to help them reduce the impact of taxes and prescription medications on their lives. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "And when the cost of property taxes and prescription medications begins to overload our seniors and persons with disabilities, the program steps in to help just as a circuit breaker helps prevent overloads in an electrical system hence the name Circuit Breaker program. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "Now, the purpose here and your intent here is to protect those seniors and also those persons with disabilities who have limited income and are attempting to obtain either (a) a grant for property tax relief or (b) a grant for their medications. Is that correct?"

Senger: "That's right."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Thapedi: "This is a very good Bill. Thank you."

Senger: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 2224.

And further questions? No one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative DeLuca, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2224 is declared passed. Representative Mitchell is seeking recognition, the Gentleman from Macon."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Mitchell, B.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, right above...
in the Republication side of the aisle, I would intro... like
to introduce the Harristown Elementary fourth graders.
They have been here under Mr. Jeff Deremiah. They've come
to the Capitol and for the last 39 years and met with the
Governor. And so, this is for tradition that we... I
certainly appreciate and want to salute Mr. Deremiah and
the faculty who made this possible. Let's give a big
Springfield welcome to the Harristown fourth graders."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from White County, Representative Phelps, is seeking recognition."

Phelps: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen on the aisle, on the Democrat side, I would like for my colleagues to join me in welcoming to Springfield from Goreville, Illinois, Boy Scout Troop 58 and Ben Edwards. Guys, want to stand. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk, page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2258. Representative Ryg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2258, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Ryg."
- Ryg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A recent court case decided that health care surrogates and other advance directive forms are only legally recognized when the patient is residing at one facility. As soon as that patient is transferred to another facility, the directives lose their legal status. So, Senate Bill 2258 seeks to correct that oversight and makes the forms durable during transitions to and from health care facilities. I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 2258.

 No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; 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 Yarbrough, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2258 is declared passed. On

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

the Calendar appears 2270. Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2270, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2270 is a transparency Bill. It amends the School Code to require school districts to post on their Internet Web sites an itemized salary compensation report for every employee in the district holding a Type 75 administrative certificate and working in an administrative position. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2270. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks is seeking recognition."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Franks: "Representative, I agree with your legislation. My... my question is, would there be any problem on how this should... if this were to become law, and how would it be implemented concerning... concerning Mr. Tryon's Bill, House Bill 35, which is a... the transparency portal? Is there any problem with them both... with both Bills? Would one supersede the other? And I'm wondering whether there could be some negation for... for not going far enough if we pass your Bill. And I don't if anyone's talked to you about this."

Pihos: "I guess I'm viewing them as companion Bills. We might find that there's another Bill, another House Bill also, that had these postings on the State Board of Education Web

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

site. So, I think these are companion Bills and we may just find that this information is posted in different ways in more than one place."

Franks: "Well, for legislative intent let's just make it clear that if, for instance, the Governor signs Representative Tryon's Bill that that would not then negate the fact that this Bill would also have to be implemented and that the local school districts would have to still do this, even though the information may be discoverable in another locale."

Pihos: "Thank you for helping me establish that legislative intent, yes."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, is seeking recognition."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just... Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I think one of the differences is the contract itself, with all language in the contract is actually on the Internet site. It's there; it's transparent. And if someone is receiving, for example, compensation in the form of a car, travel allowance, or whatever type of additional benefit that they've written into the contract, the intent is that information is plainly stated on that Web site as part of the written contract."

Pihos: "That is correct. We know that some of these contracts are complicated with a lot of nuances and sometimes we just find the base of the… the base salary on there and not the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

nuances as well. So, this legislation is an attempt to make it transparent to the taxpayers and to the public all of those nuances so the…"

Eddy: "This goes beyond what would be..."

Pihos: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...required by Representative Tryon's legislation, doesn't
 it?"

Pihos: "That's correct."

Eddy: "This gets specific to the actual contract and the language."

Pihos: "It's very specific."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I think... I think if this type of transparency is important, I think it's needed. I support the legislation. And again, I want to reiterate your comment regarding the Type 75 certificate. If a school business official is covered by this, an assistant principal is covered by this, a principal, a superintendant, an assistant superintendent, anyone working at administrative capacity and a Type 75 certificate, but if a teacher holds a Type 75 certificate, but is not actively in an administrative position, this does not cover them."

Pihos: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

Pihos: "This would not cover them."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2270. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

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

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, where are you? Ah, there you are. I was just wondering if you had checked with Representative Bassi to see if this would go on her list of mandates."

Pihos: "School districts are already mandated to display their budget, et cetera, on the Internet. So, I'm thinking that this would just be an extension of what they're already doing."

Lang: "Is that what Representative Bassi thinks?"

Pihos: "I don't know. Shall we ask her to comment?"

Lang: "She, as you know, is our resident expert on mandates. I've enjoyed over the years listening to her read that list to all of us. Perhaps she will do it again and perhaps she would give us the benefit of her wisdom as to whether or not this is a mandate we should oppose. So, I... I... it's not up to me to ask her to stand... rise and speak on this Bill, but we definitely hope that Representative Bassi will do that. Have I mentioned your name enough times in debate so you think she'll do that?"

Pihos: "You have... you have..."

Lang: "All right."

Pihos: "...and actually I asked her that question after we voted on it in committee and she said, in her opinion, this was not a mandate because we were already posting the information of the budget already mandated to do that on the Internet."

Lang: "Oh, that would be interesting to know. So, Representative Bassi voted for this in committee?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Pihos: "I asked her opinion on that question."

Lang: "I see. All right."

Pihos: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2270. And on that question, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; 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. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', 2270, Senate Bill, is declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia, on the Calendar, on page 10 appears Senate Bill 2270. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. I made... Mr. Clerk, place 2272 on the board. Representative Chapa LaVia. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2272, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendment becomes the Bill and provides that a municipality outside Cook County may regulate but not prohibit the keeping of carrier, hobby, racing, or show pigeons. The underlying Bill allows a municipality to regulate or prohibit the keeping of these pigeons. This issue become pretty perm... prevalent in my district in Aurora where people were just keeping pigeons and the droppings and things like that in close proximity to the next door neighbor was really a bad thing. So, this just gives the municipalities tool to regulate that. And in it's... all the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

sporting associations are for this, 'cause I've been working with them on it. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2272. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2272 is declared passed. Representative Biggins, on page 10 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2277. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2277, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2277 as amended this... has the State Board of Education implementing a pilot program subject to appropriation to test digital technologies in three geographical diverse school districts in the State of Illinois on or before July 1, 2011. The pilot program shall examine the development of alternative textbooks' formats, including digital formats and any possible adaptation of existing standard print textbooks this... that would be beneficial to the health and achievement of students. Basically, the books are getting heavier and heavier and we're trying to find another way to get the children to do homework and be able to get back and

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- forth in a lighter load on their backs. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 2277. And on that question, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2277 is declared passed. Representative Coulson, on page 10 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2289. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2289, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Coulson."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2289 eliminates the Debt Collection Board. Basically, this is an unnecessary board since the Department of Revenue is doing all the debt collection. And we'd like to take this off the books. And I can answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 2289. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2289 is declared passed. Representative Holbrook, Senate Bill 2338. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2338, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Senate Bill 2338 is identical to House Bill 2527 we passed out of here with a 113 'yes' and 0 'no' votes. It's an initiative for single payer for gas, just like we do for electric. It passed out of the Senate unanimously and passed out of committee unanimously. Glad to take any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage for Senate Bill 2338. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Does Representative Osterman wish to be... Delighted. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2338 is declared passed. We've completed the list of Third Readings and the intent of the Chair to return to the beginning of the three... of the Third Readings you'll find on page 3 of your Calendar and continue in order. The first Bill will be Senate Bill 38, Representative Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 38, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. I simply request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 38. No one seeking recognition, the question is,

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Atta boy. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Representative Cultra, Representative Schmitz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 97 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 38 is declared passed. Representative Davis, Senate Bill 47 is on the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, there was an Amendment to this Bill." Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status?"

Davis, W.: "It was an Amendment that was filed, I should say."

Speaker Mautino: "Would you move this Bill from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of Amendment."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Davis, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 47 was an... is an effort by the Comptroller's Office so that on the Web site... on their Web site that they would provide information... they will provide information that would identify the per unit cost of something that was contractually purchased here in the State of Illinois. It's designed to provide very specific information as well as to provide... possibly even to foster competition as organizations who are interested in doing business with the state, to provide goods and services or products, can look to see how the pa... what past

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

performances were, and how other things were contracted here in the State of Illinois. So, the Amendment is to just further clarify the ability to do that. And I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 47. No Members seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Move the Bill to Third Reading. Mr. Clerk... The next Bill on the Calendar is Senate Bill 63. Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 63, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 0063 is an initiative of the Centers for Independent Living. Basically, this Bill is more of a support service for individuals that come into nursing homes. Currently, they're doing a pilot project of the Illinois Department of Human Services to demonstrate that with appropriate support and services, individuals with physical disabilities, individuals with mental illness, and individuals age 65 and older who need a short-term placement of six months or less in a nursing facility can successfully return to the community without institutionalization. This initial pilot

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

program must be initiated in fiscal year 2009, the current budget year, and must be expanded to other sites as funding becomes available. I'll be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Vermilion is seeking recognition, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, let's make one thing very clear, I...
fortunately or unfortunately, depending upon your view.
The Bill, Senate Bill 63, because of your Amendment, no longer deals with the Compensation Review Board at all."

Golar: "Correct."

Black: "So, I wish it did in some respect, but there's... there's nothing in here about the Compensation Review Board. It's simply a pilot program dealing with reintegration programs of people who were in nursing homes for a short period of time who will be back in the community. That's... that's basic..."

Golar: "That is correct."

Black: "...a three-year pilot program."

Golar: "Yes."

Black: "A pilot program statewide or is it limited geographically?"

Golar: "Statewide."

Black: "Statewide. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 63.

No one else seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Burns, Mr. Smith, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 63 is declared passed. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 65, Representative Bradley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 69, Representative Miller. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 69, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Leader Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 69 is similar to House Bill 496. It's dealing with the issue concerning fee splitting. Currently, Illinois law allows physicians to split fees with partners in a content of a corporate entity or among physicians who are providing services concurrently. What this language does is it helps clarify on a based of court action that... that arrangement can be made. When this Bill was brought up last week, my colleague questioned whether the realtors were still... had concerns about it. An Amendment in the Senate has eliminated that fact. addition to... there is no intention to change any splitting provisions in any other Practice Act or their health care professionals, such as... for example: the Nurse Practice Act, Occupational Therapy Practice Acts, Physical Therapists Practice Act or the Perfunctionists (sic-Perfusionists) Act. These Acts are not being amended

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

expressly or by implication in this Act. I ask for favorable consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 69. And on that, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. With 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 69 is declared passed. Representative Gordon, Senate Bill 89 appears on the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, would you bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. On Floor Amendment #2, Representative Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor #2 provides that the settlement... this Amendment regarding property taxes with large... large companies, petrochemical companies, plastics companies. There are several in my district and they enter into agreements about what their property taxes are going to be with our taxing bodies so that nobody's going to go fight about it, nobody's going to appeal. And what House Amendment #2 does is that it's retroactive and so that there's one specific company that's been in a fight with one of the taxing bodies and it goes back to 2003 and they feel that their specific type of company needs to be named for them to enter into this agreement so that they can end this and everyone will be happy and this won't go on. So, that's what House Amendment #2 does. And I would ask for the

57th Legislative Day

- Body... for it to be adopted and so that everyone can get along and they can stop fighting and move forward."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And no one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment 2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 99, Representative Osterman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 99, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 99 permits food waste to be commercially composted in Illinois. It exempts such composting facilities so the pollution control permitting process. Legislation also puts the permitting process with the Illinois EPA. It creates standards for notification of the permit application and where these can be located. It's supported by the Illinois Restaurant Association, Illinois Environmental Council, and a host of other organizations. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 99. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, one question because I don't think either one of us wants to deal with this in our district. While it exempts from local siting approval, composting for food scrap and uncontaminated wood waste or paper waste, it also exempts from local siting approval livestock waste. Would this create the ability for... you know, composting of manure or whatever it may be without local siting, so somebody could just set this up wherever?"

Osterman: "It would have to go through the Illinois permitting process and the reason that the livestock waste is included is that in some of these composting plans or businesses, they include that with the other food scrap and other biodegradable wastes. So, there is kind of... you know, a large amounts that would be included or could go up to. That was an issue that came up in committee. But I would go to the fact that under local ordinances they would have ability to protect themselves regarding the establishment of this. And any plan that would go to Illinois EPA would include what they wanted to include at this specific facility. So, again, in my conversations with the people that have... pushed this and the Senate Sponsor is that it would not be solely a livestock waste, but that would be included in kind of the overall mix of composting."

Fritchey: "All right. Let..."

Osterman: "And it would also have to go through,

Representative, I pointed out. There's a notification

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

process where people could file complaints and look at that application prior to it being granted by Illinois EPA."

Fritchey: "I... I appreciate the answer. Let me just clarify one thing, I guess, for myself. Livestock waste, I mean, is that... are we... and I'm serious, are we talking about animal... like discarded animal parts? Are you talking about manure? I mean, what's livestock waste?"

"I would... I would, you know, all the time that I Osterman: spent on the farm, Representative, I think livestock waste is manure, and I think that that's the intention of this. I also want to point out that the transportation and the dealing with livestock waste is also regulated by the Illinois Department of Agriculture and their statutes as well. So, I think that those people that want to go into the composting business of food scrap could also have the ability to compost certain wood products, biodegradable things, and livestock waste. And that would all go into a plan and have to be approved by Illinois EPA. I think they'd be very sensitive to opinions of local... what the local community thinks."

Fritchey: "Sounds good. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. I think... To the Bill. I think the last Spon... the last speaker's comments were... initial comments were apropos in the sense that this removes the local siting component. If I recall from committee, the amount of waste that's allowed to be composted... and we're talking about livestock waste... and we asked the question, you know,

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

how much waste are we talking about here? And it was truckloads of livestock waste, was the answer that was given, semitruck loads of livestock waste. I voted against this in committee. I'm not sure how I would be able to explain to my constituents if one of these shows up in your backyard, why it is I voted to let that come into my... my area without allowing the local folks to go through the normal siting process. So, I would intend to vote 'no' again, and I would urge all my colleagues to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Lady from Lake, Representative Cole."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to this most awful environmentally unfriendly Bill. This Bill calls for the... the ability for a land... landfill... to expand a landfill without a local siting. Representing a district that has two landfills, one active and one not active, bringing in 4 thousand truckloads a day of animal manure, in most cases these truckloads of animal manure don't even have to come from the State of Illinois. They can be shipped in from Wisconsin. They can be shipped in from Iowa, who are having... those two particular states don't allow that kind of composting in their area, so all of that can come to ... and in my case, a landfill in Lake County. I don't think this is specific to Lake County, I think it's specific to the rest of the state where 40 percent of the material that normally goes into a landfill, which would be yard waste, animal manure, paper products, cardboard, food scrap, takes up about 40 percent of the landfill. This allows them

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

their for an expansion of an existing landfill, so that 40 percent of their waste can go into a different location of the site without any kind of local siting. Local siting does two things: it's regional planning. This isn't about local zoning; it's not about a municipality being able to say, do I want this or not, this is about a regional planning process. I mean, municipality might put this on the border of another municipality. It might be close to a residential area of another municipality, without any kind of local siting process. In local siting, counties have the ability to receive from the petitioner funds so that they can hire landscape architects; they can hire pest control engineers, groundwater control engineers, and all the other kind of scientific evidence that would go into, why don't you want to put 4 thousand truckloads of cow manure near your well. Forty percent of my district is on Lake Michigan water, 60 percent uses well water in order to provide drinking water for their homes. When you site a landfill, like this, the only thing that's missing from this landfill are the little tykes plastic stuff, and the things you probably get in your Happy Meals. Forty percent of that landfill now is going to be unregulated with groundwater, unregulated with air control, unregulated with animal control on a regional basis. If we approve this Bill, the EPA cannot turn down a permit as long as it meets the requirements of this legislation. With a local siting, county can refuse a permit based on the engineering testimony provided at a local siting hearing. A lot of municipalities do not have the experts available

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

to them to make sure a site like this is put in the proper location at the proper time with the proper controls. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. It's not an environmental Bill. This is a Bill that was written by a very dirty industry that wants us all to think it's an environmental Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 99. No one seeking further questions, we will go to Representative Osterman to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Osterman: To answer a few of the issues that came up. This is absolutely an environmental Bill. Today, businesses in our state that want to compost food scraps: restaurants, schools, other businesses, have to send that food scrap and waste outside of this state. This is a business that can grow in our State of Illinois. How many times on this floor have we talked about sending business elsewhere? There are businesses that want to do business in the State of Illinois with composting. Right now one-third of our landfills is filled with food scrap and could be used for composting. So, we want to make sure that those landfills get that food out of there and this food can be reused in compost... can be composted and reused. As someone who has supported legislation to protect the water of our state, there are protections in this regarding where these can be located to protect the water. Illinois EPA will take into consideration not just local counties but anyone that has a complaint about where this would be located. And that's something that we, as a General Assembly, can monitor and

57th Legislative Day

- as Members of the General Assembly we get notification of. This is a good Bill. This will create jobs. It will help Illinois compost more, reduce the waste that's in our landfill. And I strongly ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 99. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 78 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 99 is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 104. Representative Burns. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 104, a Bill for an Act concerning juveniles. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burns."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 104 is exactly the same as House Bill 682, which we passed earlier in the Session. In the Senate, some new language was put on to the House Bill that we sent over effectively deleting the underlying Bill. So, Senate Bill 104 will be sent over to the Governor so we can deal with this issue. What the Bill does is it permits the Independent Police Review Authority in the City of Chicago access to juvenile records when conducting investigations regarding law enforcement. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate
Bill 104. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Durkin and Representative Turner in the
Chair."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Durkin: "Representative Burns, what safeguards are in place to ensure that these records are going to be private and that they will not inadvertently or intentionally be disclosed or copied upon review?"

Burns: "In the Bill itself, there's language that prohibits disclosure of these records to the public."

Durkin: "To the public. How about outside the commission who is going to be... I'm sorry."

Burns: "The only time these records can be... the Review Authority can get access to these records is in the course of an investigation and once... and they're not allowed to disclose those records to anyone else."

Durkin: "Are they..."

Burns: "Those records are only supposed to be used by the folks who are doing the investigation with the Independent Police Review Authority."

Durkin: "Would it just be the actual original records or would it be photocopies? 'Cause I just want to make sure that whatever they review is... if it's the original documents, it's for review and then it will be brought back for safekeeping, but if they're going to be photocopied and... Are they going to be required to be destroyed after they've completed their use?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Burns: "I'm looking to see in the language if it says anything about the..."

Durkin: "I guess the point is, I just want to make sure they're very sensitive about the fact that these are, you know, juvenile records and we want to make sure that they are... that protections are in place to ensure the privacy of them and that they're not going to be used anywhere outside the scope of what we are doing in this Bill."

Burns: "That what the Bill does."

Durkin: "Very good. Thank you."

Burns: "Thank you, Representative."

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

Burns: "I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 104?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Winters. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 109 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no', and 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Graham, we have Senate Bill 133 on page 4 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 133, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House... Senate Bill 133 is an agreed piece of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

legislation in regarding to the posting of the American Disabilities Act coordinator and the posting of grievance procedures. I'll answer any questions at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 133?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Graham, we have Senate Bill 134. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 134, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Graham."

Graham: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an agreed piece of legislation as well. It's in regards to a person leaving a nursing home, that they will be provided with information about alternative placement, the coordinator for that particular facility or income guidelines for alternative placement outside of a nursing home. Again, this is an agreed piece of legislation. I'll take any questions at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 134?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this

57th Legislative Day

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Froehlich, Senate Bill 148. Representative Mathias, Senate Bill 148. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 148, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."
- Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 148 is an initiative of the Village of Elmwood Park. The Bill would allow the Illinois Commerce Commission in cooperation with local law enforcement groups, agencies, to establish in any county or municipality, that so chooses, a system for automated enforcement of railroad crossing violations only at those intersections with a crossing gate. The local authorities must initiate the process; it's voluntary on their part. By enacting a local ordinance, creating the creation of a system, the local authorities must agree to a plan for funding. And the reason for initiating this legislation, on Thanksgiving eve in 2005, there was a terrible accident in the City of ... in the Village of Elmwood Park involving a train and 17 passenger vehicles. Two of those vehicles were stopped on the track and this is another tool for law enforcement who can't be everywhere to make sure that we catch those violations, for example, people going around the gates. So, I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose, for what reason do you rise?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Rose: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "...Bill."

Rose: "I don't know... every year we get these cop-in-a-box Bills and you know, we're just on the heels of a tollway authority issuing hundreds of thousands of citations from four and five years ago. I got a guy in Arcola, Illinois, who routinely gets a ticket because of some scofflaw, has an environmental plate 22 and he's state plate 22 or whatever it is, but he keeps getting the ticket. This is a \$500 fine. How many of you are sick and tired of getting phone calls from constituents getting... getting wrongfully ticketed by these damn cop-in-a-boxes? How many more of these are we going to put up... how many more are we going to put up? How many more phone calls are we going to get from constituents mad because state plate 22 got the ticket when it should have gone to environmental plate 22 or Iowa plate 22 or Texas plate 22? In all due respect to the Sponsor, I do respect the Sponsor, these cameras don't work. How many mistakes are we going to put up with? There is a point in time where the onus, the burden of proof, used to be on the state. It used to be on the state. Five hundred bucks is a lot of money. Yeah, we're wil... we're sending these tickets out willy-nilly, willy-nilly. Well, when willy and nilly call me with the wrong ticket, I'm going to send them to Sid Mathias's. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Eddy: "Representative, I want to… want to just follow up just a little bit on Representative Rose's questions because the due process involved in this is an important consideration. If someone is photographed after the local municipality or governing authority has, on their own, right, I mean, decided that they… they're going to put this camera up. This isn't… this is made by a local ordinance decision."

Mathias: "Yes."

Eddy: "And after..."

Mathias: "The ICC... you have to get permission from the ICC."

Eddy: "Okay. So, let's say someone goes around the crossing gate, their photo is taken and they want to fight the penalty... the fine. First of all, is it prosecuted through the local traffic court?"

Mathias: "No, it's not. It's done through administrative hearings."

Eddy: "It's administrative. So, how would they have their 'due
 process'?"

Mathias: "They would request a hearing, and obviously, there would be a hearing officer. They would have to present their evidence and a decision is made just like it would be in traffic court."

Eddy: "So, would the hearing take place locally? Because sometimes I do have constituents that will call; they've got a photo of their license from a tollway authority and the way the due process works they have to travel four or five hours just to attempt to tell their side of the story. Is that... is it a local hearing?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Mathias: "I believe there is provision in the statute... I'm just looking it up... that you can actually contest it through the mail."

Eddy: "Okay. So, you could contest it through the mail or have a hearing where you can basically, try to disprove that that's your vehicle or that you were driving that vehicle. I recently had an individual in a tollway situation sell a truck as part of a bankruptcy and the plate and registration stayed with him during the adjudication of the bankruptcy and the person who bought the truck blew a bunch of tolls and in order for him to get out of the toll, he would have had to travel to Chicago area and he lived four hours away. So... so, I just wanted to make sure that due process is easy for those individuals who want to fight."

Mathias: "It... it... I just looked it up and it can be done through the mail."

Eddy: "Okay. It can be done through the mail. And obviously, there are rural crossings, some in my area, who... gates near grain elevators and in many cases, those grain elevators will run the trains back and forth for long periods of time, the gates are triggered, they stay down, but even in some cases the individuals that work at the grain elevators are out there directing people to come around the gates, because it's going to be 15 minutes while the cars are loaded with grain and they know that traffic is backing up, but the gates are still down. In that situation, if... what you're basically saying, I guess, is the local authorities would not have to put a camera there, so it shouldn't affect them. Is that..."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Mathias: "That's correct because this is still at the discretion of the local authorities. Obviously, the local municipalities or the counties would be sensitive to the needs at any particular intersection and I'm sure maybe the traffic wouldn't be there anyway for them to justify putting a camera in that location. They still have to justify the costs and if there's a local issue, I would hope that the local authorities would be responsive and just say we're not going to put it there. Just like even up here, I know, with the red light cameras, there were intersections where I think it was in the Village of Schaumburg where they actually, after trying it, realized that at a particular intersection it wasn't working, they took it down. So, that's really why we want local control."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the local control that consists of if inside a municipality, the city council, if inside a county in a rural area, a county board."

Mathias: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "...Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, you are, I take it, aware of the current law. If a flashing light on a railroad crossing is working... and in my district, that can be some pretty rural crossings where you can see a mile and a half down the track in each direction. Doesn't the current law say, even

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

though I look both ways, I get out and I obviously can tell that the light is malfunctioning, but if I cross that track against that light, I'm fined now, aren't I? If I'm seen doing it."

Mathias: "You were talking about a gated or ungated intersection?"

Black: "Gated or just traffic light signals."

Mathias: "Well, just to clarify, this Bill only applies to gated intersections, but in your example, if the gates were down and you went around the gates and a police officer viewed it, of course, see, would he... he would have the discretion of whether or not to issue a ticket."

Black: "Right. I think that's the point. There is a current fine that goes back, I think, 12... more than 12 years ago that this Body passed in law. If you go across a gated or signalized crossing, even though in my rural area where there may not be a thing that you can see for miles, if you go across that at the same time a deputy sheriff comes around the corner and you go through that signalized crossing, no train, that's a \$500 fine, 500 bucks. Now, let me tell you what happened in my hometown when this law was passed years ago and I didn't vote for it. My fire chief and my police chief insisted that I get the ICC people over to visit the City of Danville and we're bisected by railroad tracks. The fire chief, who has subsequently retired, and I'll never forget this said, now, let me get this straight, I come up... my firetruck's on the way to a fire. We come up to a gated crossing on Vermilion Street, which is our main street, the gates are down, the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

lights are running. We've always had instructions, get one of the people in the truck to go out, look down the tracks, if there is no train, we'll go around the gate, because we're on our way to a fire. Is it my understanding that if we do that, we're subject to a \$500 fine? I'll never forget the answer because the answer was yes, yes. city police officer sees a fire truck going around that gate, you're going to be fined \$500. If a city police car would go around, in route to a robbery call, \$500. citizen could make arrest. the I understand the Gentleman's Bill. He is from a different area than mine: congested crossings, high rate of trains. He has had accidents and deaths, as do we all, but not to the extent that he probably does. I respect his Bill, but the original law didn't work very well. I've gone through I bet all of you have. I just don't like Big Brother. I... It's not that the Representative doesn't have a reasonable solution to what's going on in his district and I respect that, but at some point we're going to have so many cameras and so many technological advances I begin to wonder whether we'll even need police officers. All I can tell you is that about 20 percent of my district office workload is dealing with Illinois tollway violations where the cameras... you can't read it. I'm having some luck getting most of those dismissed, but I'm just telling you, that this is going to create as many problems as it solves. And it's interesting, if you follow some legal cases, there is a judge in the State of Arizona now... remember, this has no impact on Illinois and it hasn't gone through the total

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

court system in Arizona, but there was a lower court judge that simply ruled these cameras were unconstitutional because of equal protection, it wasn't at every intersection, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I respect the Representative, nobody works any harder than he does. I understand his area has a little different problem than mine does, but I just have a deep philosophical objection to more of this technology, more of this cop-in-a-box, if you will, because I just don't think up to this point they work very well and given what I've seen in my district I simply can't vote for the Gentleman's Bill."

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

Mathias: "And I appreciate all of the comments that were made, but I think we have to get down to the issue and the reason we're doing this if for safety. And we need safety at our intersections to dissuade people from crossing around gates, for violating the law. Policemen can't everywhere. And I think the major point and my colleagues who have talked have some good points and I would hope that if it's not an issue in those communities, that the ... since this is at the discretion of the local authorities, they won't put the ... these mecha ... these automated traffic control devices at those intersections... at those railroad crossings if it's not necessary. But where it is necessary up here and we... we unfortunately have too many accidents and in fact in DuPage County there was a study done some years ago at three different intersections and there's a report that I could share with anybody who wants to see it, that says

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

that it works, that it does reduce the number of violations. And when you reduce the number of violations, you do make, you know, at least try to reduce the number of accidents and that's the main thing that no one is seriously hurt or killed. So, I do ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 148?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce some guests in the gallery."

Speaker Turner: "State your privilege."

Biggins: "Thank you. I'd like to... the Illinois House to you a nice welcome to several people here from Brookfield Zoo in the western suburbs, the world famous Brookfield Zoo. Dr. Stuart Strahl is the president of the zoo and lives in Representative Bellock's district. Up in the gallery, right above... above my head here, if they could please get up as I say their names. Thank you, Stuart. And then, also joined by some volunteers: Debra Kutska, who lives in Representative Crespo's district; Ryan Herrick, who is represented by Representative Al Riley; Racquel Ardbana, she is a constituent of Representative Latasha... LaShawn...

57th Legislative Day

- sorry, LaShawn Ford. So, please, give a warm welcome to the Brookfield Zooians."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Zalewski, for what reason do you rise?"
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "...your point."
- Zalewski: "I also would like to extend a warm welcome to the folks from the Brookfield Zoo. They are a neighbor of my district on the southwest side and near western suburbs and they're a great economic engine for my community. And I welcome them to Springfield and thank them for taking the time to visit us today."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome, again. On page 4 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 149, Representative Pihos. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 149, a Bill for Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 149 is the culmination of many months of work and negotiations between all the stakeholders that are impacted by this Bill. Let me first clarify that this Bill does not affect the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago has a different elevator safety board that conducts regulations for that city. But basically, what Senate Bill 149 does is it gives more control to local units of government to run their own local elevator programs and

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

make decisions on variances to the code which are specific to their community. It also enables local building departments to more closely monitor the elevators in their community for safety issues. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates she will."

Franks: "Has this Bill been amended?"

Pihos: "Amended? Yes. We heard the Amendment yesterday. It was just a technical Amendment from the architects changing the word 'certification' to 'seal'."

Franks: "Now, would this Bill exempt certifications for residential elevators?"

Pihos: "No. And the architects were for elevators in buildings where elevators were being replaced. This Bill mostly addresses the compliance with the safety rules for elevator safety."

Franks: "But there's no exemption, for instance, for a personal residence?"

Pihos: "Oh, yes, personal residences, yes."

Franks: "Now, why would we exempt a personal residence from safety requirements?"

Pihos: "In terms of lifts, et cetera, actually, nobody has raised that question before, but I know that I've had the question raised when people put in staircase lifts, et cetera, are those exempt and I am told that those are exempt."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Franks: "There's been a large growth in elevators in personal residences. I'm not talking about the staircase lifts which is basically attached and it goes..."

Pihos: "Right."

Franks: "...up the wall. I'm talking about hydraulic units or pneumatic units that are installed in the home, which are much like the ones you'd see in any other type of building. Why... I just don't understand why we would have an exemption for residences if we're concerned about safety with these types of machines."

Pihos: "Representative, you know, that's something moving forward. We're trying to address a more immediate problem and that's something moving forward that we can certainly look at, but I would hope that that would not, you know, get in the way of us passing this Bill today, which really does address an immediate problem that we have."

Franks: "Well, I know we do have a problem, but this is... okay."

Pihos: "I think that they were exempted in the original Bill and so, we didn't put them back into this Bill."

Franks: "When you say the original Bill, you mean..."

Pihos: "The one in 2003."

Franks: "I know. And I'm thinking since then there's been a lot more use of personal residences... elevators in personal residences. And I'd like to... I'm not sure we have time to amend this to include that. I just... I'm concerned that we're leaving a gaping loophole if we're... if our real issue here is security with these types of machines."

Pihos: "I would hope this perhaps that's something we could sit at the table and discuss into the future, but I think we're

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

leaving a gaping loophole if we don't pass this legislation out of here, because right now and I'm sure many of you read the article on Chicago which isn't included in this Bill, but there is a real shortage of elevator safety inspectors in accordance with how the 2003 Bill was written because they come out of the elevator safety board. So, if we put this back in the hands of local control, I actually think we're making local elevators more safe because there's more authority to go in and evaluate them."

Franks: "No, and I agree with you. I just... perhaps we need a trailer Bill because I've seen just a huge influx of these as Americans are aging and they want to stay in their own home,. I'm sin..."

Pihos: "And I'd be very happy to work with you on that."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

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

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to commend Representative Pihos for all the work that she has done on this Bill. I and several of the other Legislators started getting calls last summer regarding this issue in the local municipalities and wanting to keep the local control. She has worked extremely hard on this issue. It saves a lot of small buildings from increasing their costs, up to a hundred thousand dollars a building. And so, I strongly support the Bill and ask you to support it also. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 149?' All those in favor

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Beaubien, we have House Bill 188. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 188, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien."
- Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the virtual representation section of the Trust and Trustees Act to extend to the benefit of more trusts. This is a Bill that was initiated by the State Bar Association and is supported by the State Attorney General. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 188?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, we have Senate Bill 209. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 209, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

57th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake... the Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 209 amends the Mental Health Code. And what it does is it says that a person may be voluntarily admitted into a mental health facility if the director of that facility deems that that person is clinically suitable and has the capacity to consent to that admission. They must understand the specified reasons and it also says that a guardian may not admit a ward to a mental health facility except at the ward's request and consent. This Bill was done by the Illinois State Bar Association and agreed upon by the Psychiatric Association and it's in reaction to a Supreme Court decision. And the whole point of the Bill is to protect individuals who want to voluntarily commit themselves to a mental health facility."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 209?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pritchard, we have Senate Bill 214. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 214, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."

57th Legislative Day

- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill adds another group of individuals to a list of exemptions... or qualifications that we have for state employees to qualify for pension payments. This Bill would include those members who have rendered full-time contractual services to an Illinois veterans' home operated by the Department of Veterans' Affairs to establish service credit for up to eight years of service by making the specified contributions plus interest. And this would allow the window to be open for six months following the signing of this Bill. I would be happy to answer questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 214?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reitz, we have Senate Bill 246. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 246, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 246 allows public water district trustee salary to move from \$600 to \$1200 a year. There aren't many water districts in this statute

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

that hasn't been changed in 20 or 30 years, it's my understanding. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 246?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Winters. Ryg. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 53 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Biggins, we have Senate Bill 271. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 271, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 271, actually this Bill was previously introduced in the General Assembly a few years ago, but it con... conferring the state's safe... concerns the state's sales tax exemption in Senate Bill 735... Another Bill, okay. Becomes the law and would provide for the Municipal Code under the state sales tax status as is customary. As a result of this placement, the examp... the exemption is not incorporated by reference into the local occupation taxes and these items remain fully taxable at the local level. The Bill provides the exemption on the local level as well. It's an initiative of the Department of Revenue. The Illinois Municipal

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

League supports it and the Taxpayers' Federation does not. Be happy to answer any questions anybody's got."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 271?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, we have Senate Bill 266. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Senate Bill along with the House Amendment will provide that Public Interest Attorney Assistance Act which would require that the Illinois Student Assistance Commission provide loan assistance... repayment assistance subject to the... our appropriations to practicing Public Interest Attorneys, which would include prosecutors, public defenders, legal aide, et cetera, and a participant can receive a maximum \$6 thousand per year with a total maximum of \$30 thousand. This is subject to appropriations. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Thapedi, for what reason do you rise?"
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Representative, I'm looking at the language in the Bill and it discusses the advisory committee that will be involved in this program and I do have some concerns about the makeup of the advisory committee because of the dearth of minority lawyers in the State's Attorneys Office, the Attorney General's Office. Why does the Cook County Bar Association or the Hispanic Lawyers Association or the Black Women Lawyers Association not have a seat on the advisory committee?"

"It's my understanding, Representative, language which is now contained in House Amendment #1, changes the language that was in the original Bill. original Bill, as it came from the Senate, indicated that the representatives from the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois Bar Association would make up the advisory committee. That was the Senate's version. The Speaker's Office does not look favorably, in my understanding, on naming specific associations in Bills. So, the language regarding the current Amendment, which now has be... becomes the Bill, indicates that in the Illinois Metropolitan Bar Association and in Illinois Statewide Bar Association may each appoint one representative to the advisory committee created in the Bill. I don't have any problem with your intent and if you would work with me, I would make sure that the Metropolitan Bar Association, which I believe will be the Chicago Bar Association and the Illinois State Bar Association would appoint people that would represent the minority communities."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Thapedi: "I would greatly appreciate that because the concept here is excellent. There's no question about that that there is a great need for attorneys in the public interest field. But again, as I said before, because of the so few number of minority lawyers in those particular offices, I would like to see that adequately addressed. And I'm more than happy to work with you on that and I support your Bill."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

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

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Durkin: "Now, Representative, I want to make it perfectly clear that what you're doing, you're creating an advisory committee or under this Bill, what... what are you doing?"

Hoffman: "No. This would sub... the main provisions of this Bill are subject to appropriations and it provides for loan repayment assistance so that we can entice and keep people practicing in public interest law, like prosecutors, public defenders, legal aid, et cetera. And a participant can receive up to \$6 thousand per year and a total maximum loan repayment of \$30 thousand."

Durkin: "All right. What's the point of the advisory committee, then?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that with the assistance of the advisory committee, ISAC will create rules, policies, and procedures for the program."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Durkin: "How much money are we talking about? I know it's subject to appropriation, but I think, Jay, both of us know that... both of us come from public service, both at the county levels and we got to do everything we can to help these folks out, but we also don't want to mislead them and think that when this legislation's passed all of a sudden their... law school debt's going to be wiped off the... wiped off the books. So, I'd like to know exactly how much is... what the numbers have been crunched to see what it would take to be able to accommodate this Bill if an appropriation is set aside."

Hoffman: "I don't believe that ISAC has develop the numbers for us. But what we did do is we limited per participant or potential participant. The other problem is, is you would only receive this six... up to \$6 thousand if you remain in the public interest type law work. Once you leave, once..."

Durkin: "How many years must you serve? If you do qualify and you are given this money, how many years must you continue in the public sector?"

Hoffman: "Well, what the legislation indicates, it would be a maximum 6 thousand per year up to \$30 thousand. So, if you were to serve five years and we were given the maximum amount, then you would get your maximum of \$30 thousand; however, subject to availability of money, ISAC will as well as the advisory committee may decide we're going to provide loan assistance for payment \$3 thousand per year which would then make it a 10-year commitment."

Durkin: "All right."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Hoffman: "That... that remains to be seen based on the amount of money."

Durkin: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For many years, we have been working, I and others including Representative Durkin, have been working to provide assistance and to provide an incentive for people to remain in the public sector law so they will have experienced prosecutors, public defenders, guardians, as well as, legal aid lawyers. This would help do that, although we do need to appropriate the money and I understand, it's tough economic times, that we'll have to work to get the proper appropriations. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "No further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 266?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kosel. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 105 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAsey. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, House Bill... Senate Bill 310."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 310, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

57th Legislative Day

- McAsey: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 310 is an Amendment to the Unemployment Insurance Act. Essentially, what this legislation does is require that the director of Employment Security make available to the State Police, the county sheriff's office, or any municipal police department information concerning the current address and place of employment or former places of employment to anyone who is currently required to register as a sex offender. And right now, the current law, that information is available only to the State Police. So, this would make this important information available to other law enforcement agencies. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 310?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Eddy. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fortner, we have Senate Bill 340. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 340, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 340 will require the state through DCFS to conduct

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

annual credit checks on those wards in its care who are 12 years old and older to make sure that they have not become victims of identity theft or other types of financial abuse. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Franks: "Can I get a little bit of background on this, Representative? I'm wondering why would we do credit checks on 12-year-olds."

Fortner: "Well, this came about because of a case up in Lake County. One of the assistants who were working with the children had identified that, in fact, this had happened to one of our DCFS wards where, in this case, a biological parent had sold that child's identity. And right now, there was no... neither a or mechanism to have DCFS conduct those credit checks nor make sure that it's reported to the appropriate law enforcement agencies. This legislation would correct both those counts."

Franks: "And this legislation would require that wards of the state would have an annual credit check from age 12..."

Fortner: "Yes, starting at the age of 12 and the reason we picked the age of 12, that's plenty of time to make sure that if there's been something, we could get that cleared before they're likely to really start entering the workforce perhaps with part-time work when they're 16 or so."

57th Legislative Day

- Franks: "Have we encouraged the state to take advantage of the annual free credit report that one can get on each individual..."
- Fortner: "That, in fact, was... has been encouraged to do that. Probably, however, in order to be more efficient at the state's end, we'll have... work with the credit reporting agencies, identify who the state is guardian of and bundle those together in single electronic format files. It'll be a lot easier for the state to work with that way."
- Franks: "My point is, I'm trying to make sure it doesn't cost the state anything, because right now there's a way to do this where the individual is requesting a credit report, there's no cost. Will that still be given to the state, as well?"
- Fortner: "It could be, but as I say, in all honesty, it actually may cost the state less in terms of time and effort of processing all the many different reports, in fact, ask those agencies, would you please put them all in a bundle that we can then process them more efficiently than trying to do them all individually. So, I don't want to say it's no cost because we would take advantage of that because in discussions between DCFS and the credit reporting agencies, we actually may have more efficiency in our overall use of state time to do it the other way."
- Franks: "Well, what I'd like to see then is maybe a year from now if we can bring them to a committee to have them answer the questions on the efficiencies and how to save some money because as you know, we've got this budget... little budget issue we've been talking about once in a while, not

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

enough in my opinion. But I see a way here and I understand the ideas of the efficiencies for the time, but it may be as simple as setting up on the birthday of each child, having something set up and sent electronically."

Fortner: "It may well be, and I think that's something that DCFS, working with the credit reporting agencies, can see what's the best way they can set that up. And I certainly welcome the idea of having DCFS, sometime after they've had some time, beyond the effective date, to see how this starts to roll out to answer exactly the question you raise."

Franks: "Well, let's encourage that and perhaps after we send this Bill to the Governor..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Finished."

Speaker Turner: "You are."

Franks: "My point is, once we send this to the Governor's desk perhaps you and I can meet with DCFS and explain our concerns to make sure that this is done in an efficient manner. I'd be happy to do that with you this week."

Fortner: "Sounds like a great idea."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 340?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? McAuliffe. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 115 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having

57th Legislative Day

- received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Joyce on Senate Bill 543. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 543, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Joyce."
- Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 543 is an initiative of the Illinois Homebuilders Association. It would allow for the assessed valuation of subdivided property that is not inhabited so developed land... vacant land that is not developed yet to be... go on the tax rolls as such so that there could be further development of that property. I know of no opposition to this Bill. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 543?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Winters. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', O 'noes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Senger, we have Senate Bill 574. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 574, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Senger, the Lady from DuPage."

57th Legislative Day

- Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 574 basically is asking that board of health facilities do not discourage the use of locally grown food. And where this basically came from to begin with, the Senator had a situation in his district where a restaurant was buying local produce and the health department was questioning... wasn't questioning, but was basically interfering saying that they had to have a certificate and somewhat discouraging the restaurant from using the local foods. So, this has an Amendment that basically says, except, you know, if there's a situation where people's health is at risk, but it's just to say that you can't intentionally discourage the use of locally grown produce."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 574?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reitz, Phelps. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, we have Senate Bill 583. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 583, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 583 simply amends the Illinois

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Municipal Code by adding that a municipality may enter into voluntary agreements with the owners of property within the municipality provide for contractual assessments to finance the installation of distribution generation renewable energy sources or energy efficiency improvements that are permanently fixed to their property. This, I believe, is a unique approach to making sure that we become energy independent and provide efficiency improvements to... in local municipalities. This can only be done voluntarily with the owners of the property."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. Are we on a special order of call? We haven't had that for more than 15 years, but it seems to me that we might be on a special order of call, the Order of Hoffman. I mean, he's presented two or three Bills here in the last few minutes. That's more Bills than he's presented in the last three months."

Speaker Turner: "Let me say, Representative, and I think you...

you were busy doing some negotiations earlier, but we also
had the Order of Representative Black, too."

Black: "Well..."

Speaker Turner: "And so, as soon as we finish..."

Black: "...I mean..."

Speaker Turner: "...this Hoffman, we're going to go back to the Order of Black."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "...let me tell you, when you're... when you're dealing with a bowfishing Bill, I... we should have called that days ago, that delay. Well, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "...Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, the Municipal League hasn't weighed in on this Bill. Is that unusual? I mean, they don't have any problems with the Bill?"

Hoffman: "I have on the analysis that they have no position, so..."

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...I guess they have weighed in. They are not taking a position."

Black: "What... If I understand this correctly, you're allowing municipalities to front, for lack of a better word, front money for renewable energy projects and the property owner will pay back the municipality. Is that... that basically what this is doing?"

Hoffman: "It's my understanding that... and your esteemed Senator was the Senate Sponsor and as we all know, he is a very forward-thinking individual and I think that this is a concept that is unique in that you're correct, a municipality doesn't have to do this. This will simply give them the option of being able to enter into agreements with owners of property to have a contractual assessment, to finance the efficient improvements of installing specific projects such as energy efficient windows, doors, roofs and heating and cooling equipment, 'cause in today's economy, you know, it's very difficult to find financing. A municipality doesn't have to do this. They could do it..."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...and they could only do it if it's voluntarily done between the owner of the premises and the municipality."

Black: "Would it include something like a solar panel, a green roof, or a wind turbine?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it could."

Black: "Okay. What happens if the property owner doesn't pay back? What... does the municipality then own the improvement..."

Hoffman: "Like any..."

Black: "...or could they take the building on a lien?"

Hoffman: "I assume, like any assessment... any property tax assessment, what would happen is you then could... you would have a lien..."

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...and you could then act on that lien, whether it be foreclosure or taking over the property or something else."

Black: "Okay. So, this is... this is completely permissive."

Hoffman: "Totally..."

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...for not only the municipality..."

Black: "Okay."

Hoffman: "...but the property owner."

Black: "All right. Did the… since staff handed you a piece of paper, is there anything on there you need to illuminate or…"

Hoffman: "The... the staff must have been hiding this from me."

Black: "Ah hah."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Hoffman: "And I would like to make sure that I share it with you. It says, municipalities would have the flexibility to establish their own terms for payback of the contractual assessment by the homeowner."

Black: "Well..."

Hoffman: "So, it would be up to the municipality."

Black: "Well, that answers all the questions. I don't know why you saved that until the very end. That... that answers all my questions."

Hoffman: "I wish I would have said it at the beginning."

Black: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "I should have started the Order of Hoffman with that."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 583?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Boone, Representative Wait, for what reason do you rise?"

Wait: "A personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your personal privilege."

Wait: "Yes. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to take the opportunity to represent a good friend and a fellow colleague of mine who served down in the House before he moved on to bigger and better things and became

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

an Appellate Court judge and that is Kent Slater. Kent Slater is in the crowd. Could we give him an applause, please. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome, Representative Slater. On page 5 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 318. Representative Saviano. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 318, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate 318 is an initiative of the Illinois Chiropractic Association and we have worked on this thing through the House Bill and now through the Senate Bill. Everybody is in agreement. The last ones that were opposed was the Illinois Massage Therapists and they have since worked things out and came up neutral on the Bill. This would dictate or at least codify the relationship between a chiropractor and who he could delegate certain duties within his office to for different procedures. It also would set up training standards and in some cases, certain certifications for those underlings that they delegate. And I would ask for its approval. Thank you."

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

Coulson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Coulson: "Representative, I just have a few questions related to some of the Amendments to see how this is affecting

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

training and et cetera. So, I'd like to just ask, can you tell me how that they define the appropriate training for the unlicensed personnel?"

Saviano: "Did you see it in the Bill anywhere?"

Coulson: "I did not."

Saviano: "It might... my laptop is in the..."

Coulson: "And that's why I'm a little concerned. What... what was the agreement, I guess I should ask, 'cause what was the agreement then with, for example, the massage therapists and other licensed personnel on what was going to happen related to unlicensed personnel?"

Saviano: "Well, I pretty much left it up to the Chiropractor Association and the Massage Therapists Association, but the Amendment did a couple different things: number one, it clarified something for the department on a JCAR matter. And they had a sit-down and gave the… gave the Massage Therapy Association a comfort level on what procedures they would delegate and what training would be given in… in the office to that individual. Now, if there's a problem with that, I would probably address it in JCAR to clarify that relationship, but up to now, all I can tell you is that the Massage Therapy Association must had a comfort level 'cause they have filed neutral on that. I have to look to them as far as their involvement with their industry and how it would affect them."

Coulson: "All right. Then the other questions are on liability. Who is liable for an unlicensed person to provide a service in the… for example, the chiropractor's office?"

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Saviano: "Well, as you well… as you well know, it's always the primary person, whether it's a doctor's office, it would be a physician. If it's a chiropractor's office, it's the chiropractor. If it's a dentist, it's a dentist. Whoever they delegate to their office alternately they're the responsible one. They're the one who have to cover… carry the insurance policy. So, in that respect, everybody's protected."

Coulson: "So, essentially, the... the chiropractors are going to need to decide whether or not they're willing to train someone to do something that a licensed person could do and they... but they will then have to take the responsibility?"

Saviano: "I don't think that is the case here."

Coulson: "Okay."

Saviano: "I think it's more that the chiropractor who is the licensed professional just like a, you know, in any other respect where it's a nurse or a physical therapist or an occupational therapist, if they delegate something to an underling, it's... they're the responsible party. They're the one that's licensed and should have the proper judgment on what they can delegate. Now, I... I've heard all the stories about this Bill and I don't think that a chiropractor's going to sit there and delegate someone in their office to give a full body massage in their office. It... it... some of the procedures that were explained to me where very abbreviated no... noninvasivement... noninvasive procedures, so we had a... we had a comfort level with that."

Coulson: "Oh, and I guess my concern is that sometimes things are billed for as a particular type of service, like a

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

massage and insurance will probably not cover an unlicensed person doing that. So, my concern is that we're not... I don't want to make it... To the Bill. I respect the Sponsor for having tried to address the issues for many licensed personnel. I just hope that the intent of this legislation is not to have unlicensed people doing what a licensed professional should be doing. I'd like to make sure that as we move on in the rules and regulations that we look at that issue. The reason we have licenses in this state is to protect the public. And I'm hoping that... that with this Bill we are continuing to protect the public in those areas, such as massage and other areas that we have licenses. And I... I hope that's the intent of the Sponsor."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Brauer: "I, like the previous Representative, have some concerns with this that we take somebody that's licensed and then put them under the direct supervision of somebody that really has no training with massage therapy. Can you tell me what kind of training..."

Saviano: "Yeah."

Brauer: "...that a massage therapist receives..."

Saviano: "Yes."

Brauer: "...as opposed to a chiropractor?"

Saviano: "Let... let me tell you what the genesis of this Bill was 'cause everybody's got the wrong idea. Currently, they are delegating all unlicensed people; we can't regulate

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Okay. This Bill puts the thumb on it and we're making the call like we're watching you. You better be using trained people. You better used... be using certified people. You better not be substituting full services that a massage therapist or an occupational therapist could provide to that patient and you doing it with unlicensed. Currently, the law does not even address that and they're The purpose of this was to get some definition and some communication on what they could do and what they can't do. The department is working with us. We will fully investigate anything that we feel is beyond the scope of what they're able to deleget... delegate. This is a step, like Representative Coulson said, it's a step forward to try to get a handle on this. So, that... I, in the long run, we're protecting the consumers best as we can and we're limiting, so we're not stepping on other turfs of other licensed professionals."

Brauer: "But... but those limits are put forth in this Bill, what they can do under a chiropractor?"

Saviano: "No, because ultimately a chiropractor could... a chiropractor, a doctor, a dentist could do... delegate whatever they want, because it's un... they are the licensed professional. They are the top dog. And we wanted... we wanted to get involved with that. We did it with dentists a couple years ago on the anesthesia issue. We made sure that we went in there and put the... put the dentist on notice that you can't delegate, you know, an anesthesia role to a dental assistant who's been on the job two years. This... this is what we're trying to do. We're trying to get

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

in there and see what the... what the trends are and put them on notice. Don't overextend your delegation power."

Brauer: "Okay. Well, I know that I have a... some people in my district and they have some real concerns and I guess my question is, why is the university has pawned massage therapists against this Bill?"

Saviano: "I think they're kind of saying the sky is falling and it isn't. They're afraid that all of a sudden chiropractors are going to be delegating full body massages or whatever they... whatever they do. This is not going to be the case. This still is delegated to a... a person and it says right here, 'delegations are probably only if the task and duties within the education training or experience of the delegated physician and within the context of the physician-patient relationship.' So, you've got people in there that have to be trained. You also have people in there that are not going to be providing wholesale other services outside of what a chiropractor normally does."

Brauer: "Okay. I guess, I'm... I'm still a little concerned. I have all the respect for you 'cause certainly the work you've done with professional regulation, but I guess I have a little trouble when I think about a massage therapist that is untrained going into a chiropractic office and then having the leeway to provide those serv..."

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

Brauer: "Okay. Well, I... again, I have all the respect for Representative Saviano. He certainly has done a lot of work in this field, but I still have some concerns and just hopefully, we can get those worked out."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Thapedi: "Representative, just a question with respect to potential allegations of negligence. Who would be responsible in a situation which negligence or malpractice is alleged by the person who had been delegated that particular task? Who would be responsible in that case?"

Saviano: "Well, Representative, with all due respect, that question was already asked. It's by the licensed professional, whether it would be the chiropractor in that setting, or a doctor in another setting or a dentist in another setting. Ultimately, they are the responsible party and they have to cover all liability issues in that setting."

Thapedi: "So, we're not talking about joint and several liability; it would go to the delegating physician or the delegating chiropractor. Is that correct? Because that question wasn't asked."

Saviano: "No, correct. That's... that's standard language in every practice Act."

Thapedi: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Tracy: "Representative Saviano, I, like Representative Brauer, had had a lot of massage therapists contact me in concern

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

about this Bill. Is it possible… because it says that… my question is, is the chiropractor authorized to do full therapy massage?"

Saviano: "They could do whatever they want under the scope of their... their licensure and that probably would be one of them."

Tracy: "It occurred to me when I was going over that because that's... I was reading the exact language of the Bill to the massage therapy people, because you know they're quite concerned 'cause they... they study for quite a length of time and get certified and the like, if language could be in there except for services of a licensed massage therapist."

"Well, Saviano: you can't... you can't do that 'cause chiropractors themselves can do that. We're... we don't want them delegating those full massage tasks. I don't know how much more I can explain this, but the bottom line is massage therapists are not going to lose any work on this... out of this Bill. I... Trust me on this one. Chiropractors do not... they're capable of offering a massage, but they don't do it. They... they... that is not primarily their function, so... and they're certainly not going to be able to delegate that sort of function to an underling which would... which would substitute for a licensed massage therapist, just wouldn't happen. It isn't happening now, and you know what, this Bill brings it to another... like I told Representative Brauer... this Bill attempts us to get a finger on it, because right now there's no limitations what they could do. We required some training and certification

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

in this Bill. What... right now there's no law that does that. So, a 'no' vote on this would be anticonsumer, bottom line. It may not go far enough yet, but we have to get a handle on what is going on out there, but it brings us a little closer."

Tracy: "Thank you."

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

Reitz: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think the Sponsor's done a great job by working on this Bill. I know as it started out in committee, there are a number of different groups that were interested in this and helped craft this Bill. And I think at the end of the day, we had virtually from all the organizations that are represented up here had no opposition. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "And the Gentleman from White, Representative Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question.

That Motion's not necessary. No one else is seeking recognition. Representative Saviano to close."

Saviano: "I would appreciate a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "No further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 318?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'.

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Black, we have Senate Bill 260 on page 4 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 260, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "From Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, to present Senate Bill 260 sponsored by my Senator, Michael Frerichs in the Got out of the Senate with 58 votes; got out of committee here in the House with no negative votes. Ιt simply increases the bond limit from the current thousand to \$450 thousand for any one agricultural borrower through the Illinois Finance Authority; ...provides that the amount shall be increased annually according to the federal farm inflation rate. This is an initiative of the Illinois Farm Bureau trying to help the first family program... First Farmer program, excuse me. You simply can no longer get into the farming business with a single loan of \$250 thousand. That's the reason for the increase. Be glad to answer any questions you have."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 260?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, we have Senate Bill 587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 587, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion..."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. As amended, this Bill came over from the Senate. It provides that if the county attempts to impose a sales tax for a public facility purpose, such as a museum, a nursing home, et cetera, the name of the project may be included in the referendum required to collect the sales tax. It is purely permissive. example, the referendum may state that the tax will be used for the XXX nursing home or the YY museum, no opposition to that. The other Amendment is... provides that in a county of less than a hundred thousand people where a public building commission is organized by the county seat of the county, the county may cause to be erected or caused to be maintained suitable facilities to house students in its postsecondary education at an academic institution located within that county. This was brought to me by the Building Trades Labor Council in my home county, has the support of all of organized labor, the support of the Vermilion County Board, and the support of the community college in my district. Be glad to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 587?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 100 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, we have Senate Bill 349. Out of the record. We have Senate Bill 2121. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2121, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is language, which is identical to a Bill which passed out of the House, and it deals with the Environmental Protection Act and the imposition of the NPDES fees, the payment... initial annual fee of \$500 before 2010 or 750 after January 1 of 2010. Currently, now, the NPDES construction storm water permits are \$500 initially. This would actually be a two-year... a two-year permit. And I know of no opposition. It passed this chamber unanimously in its House Bill form."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2121?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

57th Legislative Day

- declared passed. On page 4 of Calendar, we have Senate Bill 206, Representative Riley. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 206..."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 206?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 206 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor requests that you bring the Bill back to Second. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Riley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley on Amendment #1."
- Riley: "Amendment #1 just establishes a home, if you will, for the task force and that is Central Management Services."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 206. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 206, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."

57th Legislative Day

- Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 206 basically establishes a task force. This task force would develop an appropriate percentage of state expenditures to be awarded to qualified SDVOBs and what that is, is service-related disabled veterans-owned businesses. And this is a great Bill. And I'll answer any questions you may have."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 206?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard, we have Senate Bill 613. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 613, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 613 would create the Children's Low-cost Laptop Act. It would create a pilot program administered by the State Department of Education to provide low-cost laptops to each student in grades third through eight and the relevant administrators in the participating schools. It would be ISBE, the Illinois State Board of Education, that would consider the schools in all areas of the state and would issue the grants based on the school's need determined by the number

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

of students that are eligible for free and reduced-priced lunches. This project would be repealed on August 31, 2012 and is subject to appropriations. I will answer questions at this time."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 613?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sommer. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, we have House Bill 1282. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1282, page 5 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1282, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

 Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate

 Bill 1282 is a Bill that came out of the Senate

 unanimously. It is a technical Bill that deals with the

 Beer Industry Fair Dealing Act. And I don't think there

 are any current opponents to the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1282?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

declared passed. Representative Osterman, we have Senate Bill... Out of the record. Representative Stephens. Representative Tracy, we have Senate Bill 1379. Representative Fritchey, we have 1390. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1390, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

"Thank you, Speaker. The proponents of this Bill Fritchey: have so much faith in my oratory that they actually gave me some comments that they would like read into the record This legislation is the work product of association of attorneys in this state who represent numerous not-forprofit organizations. It represents 18 to 24 month's work of study and redrafting of the Illinois Not-for-Profit Act. In short, it updates and revises the current statute to reflect what is actually happening in the marketplace to make electronic communications, which are a cost-saving technique, easier to use and to update the Act to reflect current best practices. We have consulted with many organizations over this past year and a half including the Institute of Illinois Business Laws, which is primarily involved in the drafting of the present statute and amended in 1980s. All individuals or organizations have agreed upon this language as presented in the Bill and we know of no opposition. For purposes of creating a record of legislative intent behind certain provisions of this legislation, I offer the following comments: with respect

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

to Section 107.10, the Amendments of this Section provide organizations with the opportunity to conduct voting on all matters coming before the voting members of organization by mail, e-mail, or other electronic means. With respect to Section 101.80 (g)4, the Amendments of this Section are... allow organizations to provide notice to the e-mail address, fax number, or other contact information for members appearing on the records of the organization or such other type of contact information as may be approved in the organization's Articles or bylaws. And with respect to Section 108.60, Section e is being added to this Section in order to clarify that a transaction involving a grant or contribution between two organizations may not challenged because the decision-making process for that transaction involved a director that was appointed to sit on the board of directors by a organization that might be the recipient of a grant or contribution made without consideration. I request your support and 'yes' vote for the passage of this Bill. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1390?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Burke, we have Senate Bill 1408. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1408, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 1408 is an agreed Bill; there is no opposition to this matter, and deals with the control of carnival workers. We passed legislation last year that was identical to this and it got held up with some rulemaking, but we will, in this legislation, address some logistical problems carnival owners are having in doing required background checks on employees by allowing professional security companies to perform the checks as well as the State Police. The Bill would also leave the background check of volunteers up to the discretion of local law And finally, the Bill also has language enforcement. requested by the Department of Labor to put fines in place for carnival owners operating without a permit. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1408?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 1379."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy, the Lady from Brown."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Current allow... current law allows townships with less than 15 thousand population... it allows their highway... township highway commissioners to have a pecuniary interest in lease contracts if the aggregate total of the amount of the contract is less than \$1 thousand. This Bill allows that limit to be raised to \$2 thousand. That is... that's... all the change that is in this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "See..."

Tracy: "So, I would welcome any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1379?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Beaubien, we have Senate Bill 1255. 1255. Out of the record. Representative Colvin, Senate Bill 1412. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1412, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "...from Cook, Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1412 is extra initiative that we passed last year. It's identical to House Bill 5038 from the 95th General Assembly. It simply seeks to increase the funds targeted to children 0 to 3 as

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

part of their early childhood education funding. What's important to point out here: number one, is that this is no new money. This Bill simply creates a formula for a setaside of funds that are already allocated to early childhood education, so that a specific amount of those funds would go to 0 to 3 education. This Bill passed unanimously in the House and the Senate last year. There's no known opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1412?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. There are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Burke, we have Senate Bill 1444. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1444, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1444 would amend the Acupuncture Practice Act and it allows an invited guest acupuncturist from another state or country to engage in professional education if he or she is currently licensed in another state or country and has an active undisciplined license or if they are currently certified in good standing as an

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

acupuncturist by the National Certification Commission or the Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine instead of it requiring both components. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1444?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Colvin, we have Senate Bill 1448. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1448, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1448 is a very important initiative. It's an initiative that will keep jobs in the State of Illinois. It deals with a steel fabrication company on the north side of Chicago, which has outgrown its current location where it's landlocked in the Lincoln Park community. It's the company Finkl Steel, which is re... looking to relocate to the south side of Chicago, specifically near 93rd and Stony Island in the 33rd Representative District. The Bill simply does one thing. It creates a new qualification for qualify... for the eligibility of an energy tax credit of \$8.7 million. Finkl Steel is one of the largest consumers of electricity in the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

City of Chicago. In fact, it's the second largest consumer of electricity. This Bill, which is part of a package of incentives to keep Finkl Steel in the United States. Their second option of relocation was where their... their sister company in Quebec, Canada. This is part of a negotiated package through the State of Illinois and the City of Chicago to keep 300 jobs in the City of Chicago many of which are high-paying, skilled labor jobs and also creates opportunities for them to expand and add more employees. There's no known opposition. I'd be happy to answer any of the questions about the specifics of the energy tax credit."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1448?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. There are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reitz, we have Senate Bill 1467. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 14..."

Speaker Turner: "Out of the… out of the record. Representative Reitz, we have Senate Bill 1483. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1483, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

57th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Reitz, the Gentleman from Randolph. Dan. Out of the record? Out of the record. Representative Zalewski, 1493, Senate Bill 1493. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1493, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1493 is a Bill which would offer families of Gold Star and fallen heroes families the ability to communicate more effectively with the Illinois Court of Claims. I respectively ask for an 'aye' vote from the Body."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1493?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pihos, we have Senate Bill 1508. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1508, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman (sic-Lady) from DuPage,
 Representative Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 Senate Bill 1508 amends the Illinois School... the Student

 Records Act to add social workers, school counselors,

57th Legislative Day

- psychologists, and interns under existing language that provides protection for confidential communication. It also provides the confidential communications are currently protected by law or applicable standards of professional responsibilities. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1508?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, we have Senate Bill 1510. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from White, Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This amends the Downstate Police Article to allow payments for dependent beneficiaries to be received by or paid to a trust established for the dependent beneficiary. This passed the Senate 57-0. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 1510?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bassi. Sommer. The Clerk shall take the record.

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

On this question, there are 116 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 Bill, 'presents'. And this having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to change the order of business. We're going to move to the Order of Second Readings on page 10 of the Calendar. And we will go ... we're going to go down the Calendar in the order that the Bills are presented. Please be prepared to move your legislation. And on that order on page 10 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 39. Representative Froehlich. Representative Froehlich. Out of the record. Representative Washington, Eddie Washington on Senate Bill 80. Move the Bill... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Mathias, we have... Representative Verschoore, we have Senate Bill 138.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 138, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Mathias, we have Senate Bill 146. Out of the record. Representative Reitz, Dan Reitz, we have Senate Bill 290. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

57th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 290, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Reitz, on that Bill, 290, you have two Amendments that's been referred to committee. Shall we hold it on Second Reading? Hold the Bill on Second Reading at the Sponsor's request. House Bill 290 shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Burke, we have Senate Bill 351. Out of the record. Representative Nekritz, we have Senate Bill 577. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 577, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration. The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz on Amendment #1."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a piece of legislation to require Metra to take... to allow purchase of tickets by credit card. I did say in committee that I would take the Bill back to... the Amendment back to committee. Rules actually released it to the floor. I've spoken with several Members on both sides of the aisle to make sure that that's... that it's okay that we consider this as a Floor Amendment and that didn't seem to be a problem. The Amendment was actually drafted by Metra and is their

57th Legislative Day

- version of what their... of their proposal as to the acceptance of credit cards."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 577?'

 All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, we have Senate Bill 807. Understand there's a Floor Amendment on this Bill that's in committee. So, the Bill shall remain on Second Reading. Representative Burke, we have Senate Bill 1267. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Eddie Washington, we have Senate Bill 1268. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Will Burns. Representative McCarthy, we have Senate Bill 1292. Out of the record. Representative Ken Dunkin, we have Senate Bill 1348. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Dunkin, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin on Amendment #1. Representative Dunkin moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #... Representative Eddy. Representative Eddy has a question for you, Representative Dunkin."
- Eddy: "I think he's working on my question right now to find out if it's an agreed... if this is the agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Turner: "Put the camera on the center aisle."
- Eddy: "The question is, and while he's walking over I'll ask it, is DHS had opposition and does Floor Amendment #1 remove that opposition and satisfy the concerns of DHS?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

- Eddy: "Okay. No further questions. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1348?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Brosnahan, Senate Bill 1422.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1422, a Bill for an Act concerning financial regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

57th Legislative Day

- No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley, we have Senate Bill 1477. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1477, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley, we have Senate Bill 1587. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Dugan, we have 6... Senate Bill 1682. Dugan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1682, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Jakobsson, we have Senate Bill 1690. I'm sorry. Representative... Mr. Clerk, Representative Dugan asked that the Bill remain on Second Reading, Senate Bill 1682. She would like for that Bill to remain on Second Reading. Representative Jakobsson on Senate Bill 1690. Out of the record. Representative Dunkin, we have Senate Bill 1917. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1917, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No

57th Legislative Day

- Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative May, Karen May, we have Senate Bill 1919. Out of the record. Representative Acevedo, we have Senate Bill 1930. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act concerning..."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, I'm sorry, he says out of the record. Representative Bradley, we have Senate Bill 1975.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1975, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Chapa LaVia, we have Senate Bill 1995. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration, but Floor Amendment #2 has been referred to committee."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady asks leave to leave the Bill on Second Reading. The Bill shall remain on Second. Representative Osterman we have Senate Bill 2043, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Representative Hamos, we have Senate Bill 2116. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2116, a Bill for an Act concerning..."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, I apologize. The Lady would like to leave the Bill... take the Bill out of the record.

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Representative Thapedi, we have Senate Bill 2256. Out of the record. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting for requirement so that House Bills 4453 thru 4552 may be heard in the House Executive Committee."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie, asks leave that the following Bills 4453 thru 4552 can be heard in Executive Committee. And on that question, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Thank you, Rep... Leader Currie, could you give us an indication... are these mare these Bills similar in nature or are they all..."

Currie: "Yeah, they are pretty much identical. They're all shell Bills."

Eddy: "And the... the intended purpose of the shell..."

Currie: "They're all appropriation shell Bills. And we would like them heard at some point in the near future in the House Executive Committee."

Eddy: "Okay. So... so your request is that we suspend the posting requirements in order that... 4453 thru 4552. Did I get those numbers correct?"

Currie: "I believe you did."

Eddy: "That they could be heard for the purposes of appropriation... use of appropriation Bills. I'm assuming for the budget that's upcoming."

Currie: "For... yes, for funding State Government, perhaps."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Eddy: "And at this point, we really don't have any specific Bill number for any specific department or appropriation, but those will be assigned later as we move though the process. Is that the intent?"

Currie: "That is exac... and there are certainly are plenty of them on my list."

Eddy: "Yeah, I saw there's a couple..."

Currie: "A wealth of opportunity, Representative..."

Eddy: "...it looks like there's a lot of place that titles can be inserted and appropriations and it'll take quite a little bit of..."

Currie: "...Absolutely right."

Eddy: "...of watching to check on that. Well, thank you for...
thank for the explanation, Leader."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "These Bills appear on the Calendar?"

Speaker Turner: "The Motion is on the Calendar."

Black: "Do the Bills themselves appear on the Calendar? So the Bills in question have been assigned to committee?"

Speaker Turner: "The Motion and... on the Calendar is to suspend the posting requirements so that these Bills can be assigned to the Executive Committee, Representative. So they have not been assigned thus far."

Black: "I... these are... I think they have been."

Speaker Turner: "All right. I'm corrected."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "Otherwise the rules would work to are benefit."

Speaker Turner: "They have been. You're absolutely right."

Black: "That is what I thought. I was going to say, it's not like... it's not like your side of the aisle to overlook a little detail like that. These are... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, these are individual appropriation Bills. Will they be used for budgetary matters or for individual appropriation desires?"

Currie: "I believe these will be used for appropriations purposes for funding Illinois State Government."

Black: "Okay. All right. Was... was there a reason that you had to seek a suspension of the posting requirement? These weren't done in a timely fashion or..."

Currie: "Yes, Representative, we're running out of time."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "These are House Bills in the House and if we want to get them to the Senate in a timely fashion, it's a good idea not to wait 'til next week."

Black: "I can understand that. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object to the suspension..."

Currie: "All right."

Black: "...but because of the way this Motion is carried on the Calendar in May, I think it's just a matter of a simple vote. Assuming that you have 60 votes here, you can move to suspend that with 60 votes. That's my understanding. But I would... I would object to the suspension of the

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

posting requirement and would ask that you take a record vote on that."

Speaker Turner: "Your objection will be noted. Representative Currie, the Lady from Cook, for what reason do you rise?"

Currie: "Yes. Just to... just to state the Motion. The Motion is to suspend the posting requirements so that these Bills, the Bills I mentioned, can be heard in the Executive Committee and I believe that the former speaker is accurate, it takes 60 votes to do so. So, I invite at least 59 of my colleagues to join me in voting 'yes' on this important Motion."

Speaker Turner: "And the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."

Black: "I would... I could move for a verification of the vote.

I assume that you have the call out to get people on the floor?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, they're here. They're at..."

Black: "I'm not sure they're all here, but I've learned that when I see the monitors out in the hall, I know you know where they are. Just one further inquiry of the Chair for my own edification and perhaps satisfaction. Is there any chance I've misinterpreted the rule and this requires unanimous consent so that therefore I could object?"

Speaker Turner: "You've been around here a while and you're pretty good with your interpretations. It hasn't changed, Representative."

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Black: "Oh, all right. Let's vote. I won't... I won't ask for the verification. I assume you're all here."

Speaker Turner: "So, the question before us is, 'Will the Lady have leave to suspend the posting requirements on the aforementioned Bills that came earlier in the discussion?' All those in favor of suspending the posting requirements should vote 'yes'; all those opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? This Motion will require 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the Motion carries. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin, for what reason do you rise? Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet at 2 p.m. today: the Executive Committee will meet in Room 114, the State Government Administration Committee will meet in Room C-1, the Revenue & Finance Committee will meet in Room 122B, the Prison Reform Committee will meet in Room 115, the Appropriations-Public Safety Committee will meet in Room D-1, and the Appropriations-Human Services Committee will meet in Room 118. The following committees will meet at 3 p.m.: Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education will meet in Room C-1, Appropriations-General Services will meet in Room 122B, and Appropriations-Higher Education will meet in Room 118. The following committee will meet at 4 p.m. this afternoon: the Labor Committee will meet at 4 p.m. in Room 118. One correction relating to Prison Reform Committee. The Prison Reform Committee previously

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- scheduled for 2 p.m. will now meet at 3 p.m. in a different location in Room D-1. Prison Reform will meet at 3 p.m. in Room D-1 Stratton."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative... Representative Osterman for an announcement."
- Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those that are interested in practicing in the… for the softball game tomorrow evening, we will be meeting at Washington Park… not Washington Park… Griffin High School park at 4:30 today. So, please join us."
- Speaker Turner: "It's at Amos and Washington Street."
- Osterman: "That's correct. Amos and Washington Street, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "4:30, softball practice. The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry."
- Reis: "I know that times are tough, but we used to get sheets at the end of each day with Committee Reports and assignments. We don't get those anymore?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis, it's on the sheet. I don't know which sheet you're looking for, but it's..."
- Reis: "Is that the sheet from yesterday? Everything's the same."
- Speaker Turner: "It's on the yellow sheet. There's only one change, if I heard him correctly and that is that the Prison Reform Committee will meet at 3:00 in Room D-1. Other than that, the committee announcements on that yellow

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

- sheet that you see on your desk or passed around has the committee schedule."
- Reis: "Okay. Two other questions. Will we have anymore Session today, after committees?"
- Speaker Turner: "Softball session. Softball practice session after committee."
- Reis: "And then tomorrow, what time do we come in? Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "As soon as you... as soon as you're through answering... asking questions, I'll tell you. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 414, offered by Representative Joyce. House Resolution 415, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. And House Resolution 419, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Seeing no further announcements, Representative Reis moves that the House stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 20, at the hour of 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 20, at the hour of 10 a.m. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until Wednesday, May 20,

at the hour of 10 a.m. The House is adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 413, offered by Representative Jehan Gordon. House Resolution 416, offered by Representative Watson. House Resolution 417, offered by Representative David Reis. House Resolution

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

418, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell. House Resolution 420, offered by Representative Winters. House Resolution 421, offered by Representative Moffitt. Resolutions are automatically referred to the House Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass Short Debate' for Senate Bill Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for House Bill 2129. Representative Soto, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for House Bill 2132. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1906; and 'do pass Short Debate' for Senate Bill 420. Representative Joyce, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass amended Short Debate' for House Bill 2145. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for House Bill 2194. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 2252; 'do pass Short Debate' for Senate Bill 1739. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 122, Senate Bill 367, Senate Bill 933 and Senate Bill 1384 and Senate Bill 1938; 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1920 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2091. Representative Yarbrough, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety, to which the following measure/s was/were referred, action taken on May 19, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for House Bill 2206. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4564, offered by Representative Gordon, Jehan, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. First Reading of this House

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Bill. Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 451, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 941, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning First Reading of these Senate Bills. transportation. Second Reading of House Bills on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, Bills to be held on the Order of Second House Bill 1910, offered by Representative Reading. Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2129, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Bill 2132, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2145, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2194, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 2206, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. Second Reading of Senate Bills on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 43, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 44, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 82, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 253, a Bill for an Act concerning property. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 283, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of Senate Bill 326, a Bill for an Act this Senate Bill. concerning aging. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 328, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 351, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 367, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 397, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 414, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 420, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 600, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 658, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 933, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1089, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1265, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1289, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1298, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning intermodal facilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1369, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1384, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1430, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1602, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1607, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Senate Bill 1690, a Bill for an Act concerning environmental safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act concerning development. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1919, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law.

57th Legislative Day

5/19/2009

Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1925, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1938, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1955, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1984, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Senate Bill 2043, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2091, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2116, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2148, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2252, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. And Senate Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."