61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at their desks. We're led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center here in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and our guests in the gallery are asked to join us through the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. Lee Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most kind and sovereign God, You are the author and You are the finisher of our faith. We're forever grateful and thankful this morning for Your amazing grace that You have bestowed upon us, which has granted us life and has granted us strength. God, I pray today that You would bestow Your most precious blessings upon this august Assembly. May Your blessings be upon the Speaker of this House as well as all of the Members and their families. May Your blessings be upon our Armed servicemen. I pray this day, God, that You would grant them wisdom and grant them strength to carry out the business as they deliberate throughout this day. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "U.S. Marine veteran Jerry Mitchell, would you please lead us in the Pledge."
- Mitchell, Jerry, et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost, what's the status of the GOP today?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Black, Cultra, Mulligan and Ramey are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I misspoke. Representative Black is here today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Bost. Glad Mr. Black could join us today. We'll be with the status of Democrats in just a minute. Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Brosnahan, Collins, Crespo, Froehlich, Graham, and Joyce are excused."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 107 Members are present. We have a quorum and prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports."

Speaker Lyons: "Committee Reports."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: the following Floor Amendments were recommended for adoption; Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 367; Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1030; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1089; Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1289; Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

1483; Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1579; Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1682; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1783; Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1905; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1918; Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1934; Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2057; Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2091; Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2103; and Amendment #2 Senate Bill 2252. The following Motions to Concur in Bills were Senate Amendments to House approved for consideration: Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 9; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 236; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 363; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 372; Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 496; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 547; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 562; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 613; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 628; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 648; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 684; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 723; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 740; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 756; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 881; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 921; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 926; Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 927; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 944; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 976; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1057; Senate Amendment #2 to House 1143; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1293; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2246; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2266; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2283; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2394; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2448; Senate Amendments

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2537; Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2542; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2660; Senate Amendment #1 to 2686; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3325; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3649; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3714; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3767; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3874; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3974; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3994; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3994; Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 4011; and, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4120."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, in front of you we have the memorial service that will be starting in a moment. I ask all staff to please retire from the floor. Members, please be at your desks and your chairs. Once again, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's my privilege and my honor to be able to preside at this event, one of the most solemn and dignified and wonderful things that we do once a year in honor of our veterans, our fallen veterans. So, we will start today with a presentation of a video. So, I'd ask Members please look at the boards, and we will start a short video in honor of our... our veterans.

VIEWING OF VIDEO.

Permission granted, Sir. Mr. Clerk, read the House Resolution."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 416.

WHEREAS, In accordance with House Resolution 510, offered by Representative Ron Stephens during the 94th General Assembly, it has been fitting that each year in observance of Memorial Day that the Illinois House of Representatives

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

has continued the established memorial tradition of honoring our fallen brothers and sisters by reading an annual list of all of the names of those American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from the State of Illinois that have given the ultimate sacrifice in the preceding year since the previous tribute; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that on May 26, 2009, the Illinois House of Representatives shall read the names of all of the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from each of the branches of the Unites States and Illinois military reserve and guard units, who have given their lives in the line of duty during the year since the last tribute; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the House shall, as has become tradition, preface the tributary reading of names of those fallen heroes with the reciting of a quote from President Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: "The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government

61st Legislative Day

- of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That a copy of this resolution and a copy of the ceremonial honor roll and program of the May 26, 2009 reading of names be presented to the families of those fallen heroes."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution signify by saying 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the adoption (sic-Resolution) is unanimously adopted. Mr. Clerk, would you please escort Brigadier General Ronald Marrow from the Illinois National Guard into the chamber. I would ask everyone who hears my voice to please take a moment as we roll call the members of our state who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of this country. Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Private First Class David (sic-Dawid) Pietrek.

 United States Marine Corp. Bensenville. Killed in action

 June 14, 2008."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Private First Class Willington M. Rhoads. United States

 Army Paris. Died July 16, 2008."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jefferson. Private First Class David Badie. United States Army Rockford. Killed in action August 1, 2008. Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Corporal Adam T. McKiski. United States Marine Corp. Cherry Valley. Killed in action August 7, 2008."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Washington."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Washington: "Petty Officer 2nd Class Anthony M. Carbullido.

United States Navy - Waukegan. Killed in action August 8,

2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Corporal James M. Hale. United States Army - Naperville. Killed in action August 13, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Connelly."

Connelly: "Corporal Anthony G. Mihalo. United States Marine Corp. - Naperville. Killed in action August 14, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey."

Ramey: "Private First Class Leonard J. Gulczynski. United States Army - Carol Stream. Killed in action September 17, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Sergeant Joshua W. Harris. United States Army - Romeoville. Killed in action September 17, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Staff Sergeant Jason A. Vazquez. United States Army - Chicago. Killed in action September 17, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Sergeant Daniel M. Eshbaugh. United States Army - Chicago. Killed in action September 18, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Private First Class Ja'Mel A. Bryant. United States
Army - Belleville. Died September 27, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Smith."

Smith: "Private First Class Christopher Bartkiewicz. United States Army - Dunfermline. Killed in action September 30, 2008."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Sergeant First Class Gary J. Vasquez. United States

Army - Round Lake. Killed in action September 29, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Sergeant John M. Penich. United States Army - Beach Park. Killed in action October 16, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Sergeant Kevin D. Grieco. United States Army - Bartlett. Killed in action October 27, 2008."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Staff Sergeant Roberto Andrade, Jr. United States

Army - Chicago. Killed in action January 18, 2009."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "Specialist Christopher P. Sweet. United States Army - Springfield. Died February 6, 2009."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Staff Sergeant Jason E. Burkholder. United States Army - Marshall. Killed in action February 8, 2009."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tracy. Specialist James M.

Dorsey. United States Army - Beardstown. Died February 8,

2009. Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "First Lieutenant Jared W. Southworth. United States

Army - Oakland, Illinois. Killed in action February 8,

2009."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patty Bellock."

Bellock: "Staff Sergeant Jeremy E. Bessa. United States Army - Woodridge. Killed in action February 20, 2009."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Master Sergeant David L. Hurt. United States

 Army Oak Park, Illinois. Killed in action February 20,

 2009. Representative Don Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Sergeant Schuyler B. Patch. United States Army Galva. Killed in action February 24, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Sergeant Scott B. Stream. United States Army Mattoon,
 Illinois. Killed in action February 24, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Specialist Simone A. Robinson. United States Army Robbins, Illinois. Killed in action March 1, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Sergeant Christopher P. Abeyta. United States

 Army Midlothian. Killed in action March 15, 2009.

 Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Specialist Norman L. Cain, III. United States Army Oregon. Killed in action March 15, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sandy Cole."
- Cole: "Sergeant Robert M. Weinger. United States Army Round Lake Beach. Killed in action March 15, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Corporal Jason G. Pautsch. United States Army Moline. Killed in action April 10, 2009. Representative Turner. Specialist Omar M. Albrak. United States Army Chicago, Illinois. Died May 9, 2009. Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Specialist Lukasz D. Saczek. Lake in the Hills, Illinois. Died May 10, 2009."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Specialist David A. Schaefer, Jr. Killed in action May 16, 2009."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and colleagues. I want to say a word to the families that are here that nothing we can do or say here is going to assuage the grief that you have experienced and that you will have. But if there's one thing that we all agree on, Republicans and Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, men and women doing our best to serve you, we agree that we will do everything in our power to never forget your sons and daughters, your brothers and sisters, moms and dads, Americans, everyone. And that's the purpose of this whole event. We have added your soldier, your fallen Marine, Airman, Navy, Air Force; we have added them to a perpetual list, so that in the history of Illinois, as long as it should last, they will be part of that record. It's our simple way of saying we remember you. God bless... God bless each and every one of you."

Speaker Lyons: "Color Guard. Thank you, Ladies and Gentleman.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to start the order of business today with some of the Senate Bills - Second Readings which have Amendments approved that need to be moved to Third Reading. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, on Page 7 you have Senate Bill 367. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 367, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

61st Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you. Amendment 2... Amendment 2 is a technical change in the Bill. It was an erroneous reference. The Bill itself would be a measure to make sure that people who were part of the health care program from the time the Governor disagreed with JCAR until the time we changed the law, would still be able to access state-funded health care to pay their back bills and to go forward. But the Amendment is totally technical."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Mark Beaubien, you have Senate Bill 1089. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1089, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 remains in the Rules Committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Beaubien, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beaubien on Amendment #3."
- Beaubien: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very technical Amendment. It takes the word 'knowingly' out of one Section of the sta… of the Bill. This is agreed to by all of the parties, and I would urge its adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? All those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment 3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Is Representative Will Burns on the floor? Representative Elaine Nekritz, on Page 9 of the Calendar you have Senate Bill 1579. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1579, the Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, on Floor Amendment #1."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1... Can I take this Bill out of the record? I thought we were going to do 1 and 2."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record.

 Mr. Clerk... Representative Nekritz, do you wish to move on

 Amendment #1?"
- Nekritz: "Yes. If... I'd like to move on... We're going to do both of them? Okay. Yes."
- Speaker Lyons: "On Amendment #1?"
- Nekritz: "Floor Amendment #1 is... well, the Amendments together reflect an agreement with the... with the department as to the regulation of community association managers. I move for the adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Nekritz."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "The same deal with the department."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on the same deal with the department on Senate Bill 7... 1579? All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, anything further?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Dugan, on top of page 10 you have Senate Bill 1682. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1682, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dugan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan on Floor Amendment #2."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment that does three things. It removes the definition Section of the Funeral or Burials Act from the Bill; changes it to sale of proceeds and purchase price.

61st Legislative Day

- It also changes the language concerning the Pre-Need Funeral Consumer Protection Fund and corrects an internal cross reference concerning fees. And I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment 2? Seeing none, the question is, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, is the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Anthony DeLuca, you have House... Senate Bill 1783. Status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1783, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative DeLuca, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca on Floor Amendment #3."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #3 adopts all the remaining provisions of Amendment #2, including a definition of 'criminal activity'. And it also provides that the notice specifying the alleged violations of the lease to be considered by the court is to be delivered to the lessee via certified mail and by posting a notice on the premises at issue. I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Amendment 3? Seeing none, the question is, 'should Amendment 3 be adopted?'

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'... saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Amendment 3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Dugan, you have Senate Bill 1905. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendments #1 and #2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan on the Amendment."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. House Amendment #2 requires the Chairman of the Health Facilities and Service Review Board to appoint a permanent Health Services Review Board Long Term..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan, those were adopted in committee."

Dugan: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "So you're good with 1 and 2. We need Amendment 5."

Dugan: "Oh, Amendment #5."

Speaker Lyons: "That's a Floor... Floor Amendment. We need that one explained."

Dugan: "I'm sorry, Speaker. Amendment #5 at the reque...
eliminates the special nomination panel for the board
that's in Senate Bill 1905. So, I'd ask for the adoption."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #5 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #5 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Bob Flider, you have Senate Bill 1918. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Flider, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Emily McAsey, on the bottom of page 11 of the Calendar under Senate Bills Second Reading you have Senate Bill 1934. Read the Bill... What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning real property. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #1."
- McAsey: "Thank you. This Amendment is at the request of the Senate Sponsor. What it does is it adds a specific purpose clause to the Bill stating that the land to be conveyed would be used for purposes of constructing the Will County

61st Legislative Day

- Emergency Communications and Command Center. I would move that the Amendment be adopted."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Sid Mathias, you have Senate Bill 2057. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2057, a Bill for an Act concerning public safety. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 has already been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mathias, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias on Floor Amendment #2."
- Mathias: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 was requested by the Illinois Sheriffs' Association and removes their opposition to the Bill. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Is Representative Will Burns on the floor? Representative Burns. I thought I saw Representative Will Burns on the floor. Representative Burns, you have Senate Bill 1289. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1289, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendments #1 and #2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Burns, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burns on Floor Amendment #3."
- Burns: "Excuse me. Mr. Speaker, has Floor Amendment #5 been referred out by the Rules Committee to the floor?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5 has also been approved for consideration."
- Burns: "I'd like to table Floor Amendment #3."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman motions for the table of Floor Amendment #3. What? The Gentleman wishes to withdraw Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, status of the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Burns, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burns on Floor Amendment #5."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1289. Floor Amendment #5 addresses some current

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

concerns over the raise by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and I move to adopt Floor Amendment #5."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, your light is on. Is it in regard to Floor Amendment #5?"

Black: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Black: "The Gentleman moved that Floor Amendment #3 be tabled.

I don't think that's the proper Motion. Did you agree or did you simply withdraw Amendment #3?"

Speaker Lyons: "Be right with you, Mr. Black..."

Black: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "...on the proper Motion."

Black: "I have no opposition to what the Gentleman's doing. I just think his Motion was to table Amendment #3. If I heard you correctly, you said withdraw Amendment #3. I believe withdrawn is the proper Motion, not to table. But I could be wrong."

Speaker Lyons: "No, you're probably right, Mr. Black, but let me verify that."

Black: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "We'll get right back to you for the proper Motion."

Black: "All right."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status then of Amendment #3?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 was withdrawn."

Black: "All right. So, the Gentleman's Motion was incorrect, the Chair corrected that. One other inquiry of the Chair.

The status of Amendment #4 on the Bill."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on Amendment #4."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 remains in the Rules Committee."
- Black: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "For the record, Mr. Black, it was the assistant parliamentarian that gave me the correct terminology on the withdrawal, but thank you for bringing that up, as always, Sir. Is there any discussion on Amendment #5? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall it be adopted?' All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1289 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative LaShawn Ford, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. At this time, I would like to congratulate my Hispanic colleagues on the appointment of Sonia Sotomayor as the Nation's first Hispanic Supreme Court Justice by President Barack Obama. Congratulations."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you for that announcement. Representative David Miller, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Miller: "A point of personal privilege. Last week on Senate Bill 290, I voted 'yes'. I wish to vote 'present' on that Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative. Representative Frank Mautino, you have

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Senate Bill 2091 on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2091, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2 and #3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Mautino."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino on Floor Amendment #2."

Mautino: "Thank you. I move the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. This is the Viatical Settlement Bill in its final form, and these are the changes which I discussed within committee itself. Some technical in nature, and it'll make... makes most of the parties neutral on this Bill. We will then present the Bill and legislative intent. It should have all parties either neutral or in support."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Jim Watson on Amendment #2."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Frank, is the only opposition now... I couldn't hear what you said earlier. Is State Farm neutral?"

Mautino: "State Farm is neutral, Allstate is neutral. The life insurance companies, the ACLI will be neutral with some legislative intent that you and I are going to have to do on Third Reading of the Bill, as well as Coventry and the viatical settlement companies. So, everyone's a little displeased but they are decidedly neutral."

61st Legislative Day

- Watson: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, should Floor Amendment #2 be adopted to Senate Bill 2091? All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino on Floor Amendment #3."
- Mautino: "This is the final Amendment which we have just discussed, and this contains a few of the technical changes in the Bill itself. I'd like to put this on Third Reading. We'll debate it on Third Reading, add legislative intent, and we should have an agreed Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Dave Winters, for the point of personal privilege."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on this point of personal privilege to highlight an article that was published last week in one of our statewide newspapers. It talks about Illinois approach towards new energy sources.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

In Chicago we had a international conference where 23 thousand people showed up that were looking to invest in wind power and one of the new forms of electrical And the reason I rise is because McCormick generation. Place was almost embarrassed to be in Illinois. ranks 10th in the nation for wind capacity, but what happened is 20 other states and many foreign nations had large booths there with people who were willing to invest, attract investment into their states, and what did Illinois And this is an article written by an Illinois journalist, who said that it was first, extremely hard to even find the Illinois booth. When they did, they were able to offer three things: they had a bookmark, they had a one-sheet handout, and they had a pad of sticky notes from the Finance Authority. Now, when we see states like West Virginia, Minnesota, Michigan, trying to investment into their states; we hosted this international conference and yet, Illinois had one employee and one table with very little information. Now, the worst part of it is, and the reason I stand for this point of information is that our Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity refuses to talk to the press. When this writer asked for an interview at DCO, they were turned down. Nobody else in McCormick Place turned her down, but DCEO turned her down with the following statement: I was told by the DCEO employee representing our state at a major industry show that he could not talk to a press person for a news story until he cleared it with the agency spokesman or the reporter got direct permission from the agency spokesman.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Now, is that any way for our Department of Economic Opportunity to try to create jobs in a new economy in our Republicans have been shut out of our negotiations over the budget that hopefully will pass this week. What I implore you on the Majority side is if you're going to put a budget together, at least give the resources to our business community to create new jobs. Don't insult Illinois by not sending to our own McCormick Place the proper resources to present Illinois. We have wind manufacturers here; we have utilities that are investing in large wind farms. Why can't our administration, run by the Democratic Party, acknowledge that the old way of doing business in this state does not work? We have to invest in a new economy and support business instead of trying to tax them out of existence. Please include enhancements in the DCEO budget and a different attitude in our agencies as we pass the state budget next week. I thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bill Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish it hadn't come to this, but I had filed some time ago House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #10. And I know many of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle have... had similar pieces of legislation. I had hoped that before Session ended, this Bill would have a hearing... this Constitutional Amendment would have a hearing. It has not. So, I have filed some time ago a Motion to Discharge House

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #10, which is the Recall Amendment that many of you voted for a year ago or a few months ago. Many of you voted for it, and as you'll recall, it went over to the Senate and met an unkind fate. So, under House Rule 54(a), Section (2), I wish to discharge House JRCA 10 from House Rules, assign it to Standard Debate, and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon conclusion of the debate, I would ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49, Article IV, Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be a recorded vote whenever five Representatives shall so request. And I'm joined by at least five Members on my side of the aisle making this request. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

Black: "I... I really don't know what to say. On a Recall Amendment that I believe even the Majority Leader voted for some months ago after the unfortunate circumstances with our previous Governor, would object to this. But I can't say that I'm really shocked or surprised. You know... Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are people and I hope on both sides of the aisle that would like to speak in favor of a Recall Amendment. Have we learned nothing after all of this time? Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to the Chair that under House Rule 57(a), I would move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to

61st Legislative Day

- discharge HJRCA 10 from the House Rules Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, the Motion to Discharge fails because of the objection of Representative Currie. You have a further Motion, Representative?"
- Black: "Yes, I've already made that Motion, Mr. Speaker. Under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge HJRCA 10 from the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "So, the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' And on that question, Representative Pihos is recognized."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we come to the floor for our final week of regular Session here in Springfield, I rise in strong support of allowing this proposal for recall of elected officials to come for a full debate. I know I'm not alone in saying that I spent this past holiday weekend listening to my constituents about their thoughts on State Their words could not have been clearer. Government. People are tired, they are tired of the corruption and the perception that, no matter what happens down here, nothing changes, we don't hear. Now, more than ever, as people are staring down a massive income tax hike, unemployment, we need to send a message that government will be responsive to its citizens. This Recall Amendment to the Illinois Constitution will go a long way to restoring their trust. By allowing Illinois to join the 18 other states that allow for recall of state officials, our constituents will know that we are accountable to them

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

and that they have the ability to oust those politicians who choose not to act with their best interests in mind. Imagine what might have gone through our previous Governor's mind if he knew he could be ousted for constructing the most corrupt administration in our state's To those of you who are thinking of stifling debate on this important measure, ask yourselves, why are you opposed to making yourself accountable to the people? Why won't you give our constituents, the ones that you say you respect, the simple right to rid themselves of public officials who have betrayed the public trust? type of accountability our constituents demand and deserve, and for that reason, I ask my colleagues to allow this important piece of reform legislation to come to the floor for a full debate and a vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, also personal privilege to discuss this very, very important Recall Amendment. I join not only Representative Black, Representative Pihos, but after seven years in this Body I am still amazed, I'm astounded, I'm at a loss to understand why the Majority Leader, who I honestly believe supports this Amendment, would stand to object. The citizens of this state have spoken loudly, they have spoken clearly, they are demanding the ability to recall those of us that have, in any way, violated the trust that the citizens who sent us here have in any way dishonored. We have an obligation, Ladies and Gentlemen, as the 118 Representatives representing almost

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

13 million people who have made their wishes known so articulately, so clearly, so understandably that I am absolutely appalled to think that we would not want to vote on this, to discharge this from Rules, get it on the floor, allow us to have a Constitutional Amendment to recall those who have violated the public trust. I call upon you, Representative Currie, to withdraw your objection. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the Gentleman's Motion to override the ruling of the Chair. When it comes to recall... when we look at recall, this isn't a Republican or a Democrat issue, this isn't a red state or a blue state issue. In fact, when you look at the states that allow recall, the 18 states that use this method to empower their voters you'll find out that it's as many blue states as red states. This is something that we need in our state at this time of our history to empower voters, to give them the right to participate in recalling elected officials who have violated their trust, the public trust. This is a good government Bill. When we look at what's happened here in Illinois, not just this last four years or the last eight years, but in the last 50 years, we'll see that we've had a history of corruption with high ranking officials in the Governor's chambers. I think it's time that we do the responsible thing and give our voters the right to have recall, to give them the empowerment that they need to make decisions that we are unable to make here. So, I don't understand what the problem is.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

year Representative Frank's and I carried this Bill. We were... many of us in favor of it. So, why would we not at least bring this to a vote, let our citizens vote on it, let us amend the Constitution, and end the rhetoric about whether you support reform or not, because corruption in Illinois is a tax on every family in Illinois and we deserve better as voters and citizens. We need these types of tools like voter recall and voter initiative, so I urge you to vote to override the Chair in his ruling."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "State your point, Sir."

"Ladies and Gentleman, maybe we should stop Reboletti: rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic of the State of Illinois. While we pretend we're for reform, maybe we should file some Bills. Let these Bills out, let them be voted on. Instead we hear about, well, everybody's for reform, but it's not our fault because they're blocked in Rules, they're blocked by Leadership. That's not the case, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Body. We want an opportunity to recall all officials. Most of my friends on the other side say they're for it. I'm sure we can pass it out, probably unanimously today. All the media's here, they've been writing editorials day after day demanding reform. Have we forgotten December of 2008 when we moved to impeach and investigate a Governor? Have we forgotten that we've just removed a Governor four months ago? Is it... Is our memory that short here in this institution? The time is now. The time is today on Tuesday to begin to reform the

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

State of Illinois. Otherwise, we'll be home in a week; we'll talk about how we did wonderful things here, except reform the systemic problem of corruption in Illinois. That should start today, not next Session, not in Veto Session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor of sustaining the Chair should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 Members voting 'yes', 47 Members voting 'no', and the Chair is sustained. Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the point, I tried to get your attention to make a few closing remarks on my Motion.

 Perhaps... I'm sure there'll be another time and maybe I can do it at that time. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "My apologies, Mr. Black. You had, you know, had presented the issue, and then we had a full debate, my apologies. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's my intention to go to the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. I'll be starting on the page 3 of the Calendar, so the first that we have is Representative Danny Reitz, Senate Bill 450. Representative Reitz, you ready? Representative Reitz, Senate Bill 450? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 450 is on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for
 consideration if the Bill is returned to Second Reading."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Reitz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reitz on Floor Amendment #2."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is... initiative is sales tax exemptions for airline products for when they bring planes in, refurbish airplanes. They were able to get an exemption that we passed a few years ago. This will expand this slightly to try and keep the jobs that we have in Illinois. I have an operation in my district or actually in Representative Jackson's district that when we passed this before, had around 750 jobs and they've added around another 700. So, it's a great Bill and we'd appreciate the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 450? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair regarding Floor Amendment #3, which is still in Rules."

Speaker Lyons: "Correct, Mr..."

Black: "Does the Gentleman wish to pursue that?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, I think we're on Amendment #2."

Black: "Oh, all right."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Amendment 3?"

Black: "All right."

61st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "I believe it's in Rules as you said, Mr. Black."
- Black: "That's my understanding."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 remains in the House Rules
 Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reitz, can I ask you, what's your intention with Floor Amendment #3 before we move on Floor Amendment #2?"
- Reitz: "It can stay in Rules."
- Black: "A succinct answer. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "So, we're just working on Amendment #2, Mr. Black, if that's okay with you. And is there any further discussion on Amendment... Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 450? Seeing none, the question... All those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Floor Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk. Is it still in Rules?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor... Floor Amendment #3 remains in the Rules Committee. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you. If we could move this to Third would be fine."
- Speaker Lyons: "Okay, on the request of the Sponsor of Senate Bill 450, move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading. We'll leave it on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Reitz, we'll leave it on Third Reading.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Representative Dan Beiser, on the bottom of page 3 of the Calendar you have Senate Bill 933. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 933, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill that we debated at some length last week and there was some confusion with Representative Davis, Monique Davis. I have cleared that up, and I would like to pursue that, so I move for the passage of Senate Bill 933, as amended. Briefly this, again to recap, established a speed enforcement camera at one bridge, one bridge only, because of some serious incidents of fatalities in the last decade, but more specifically, in the last month, period between Thanksgiving and Christmas of 2008, six people lost their lives. There is no way to adequately enforce it with the State Police because of the physical configuration of the bridge, and that's why we bring this request to the Body."

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

Fritchey: "Thank you. Just a quick question so I know what we're voting on here. The Representative during the questioning last week said that this would give authority to this local board to make up... to deal with the racial profiling issue. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lyons: "I'll let Representative Beiser answer that question, Mr. Fritchey."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Beiser: "No, this is a completely a gut and replace,

Representative Fritchey. It doesn't have anything to do

with racial profiling."

Fritchey: "I had a hunch. I just wanted to clarify, just because of the question from last week. Thank you."

Beiser: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Just to ask the Body... Body's attention to this Bill, it has nothing to do with some of the previous remarks. There were questions brought by a previous Sponsor last week. This Bill simply allows the City of East St. Louis on one bridge where they have had a tremendous amount of fatalities, tragedy after tragedy. The style of the bridge is such that we can't put a median down the middle. There has to be something done. The Gentleman has come up with a great idea, and I would like as many on my side of the aisle to support his efforts as possible."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, many people are opposed to automated speed cameras of any kind because they think it's a revenue generator. This Bill, aside from the local impact on this bridge in deaths, will set up a study of will it save lives. So, you're going to get the data to show you what these actually do. They're going to get the data to say, did something change after this was put in? If nothing changed and it's just a revenue generator, well then you have the data to oppose these things. But if it then shows

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

that we actually saved lives, that's a good thing in the overall debate on what's going on with speed cameras. So, for this speed camera Bill I think we should all be on board to see what's truly going on with these. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser to close. Representative Durkin, did you have a question? Representative Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, who will be responsible for choosing the vendor to enforce these provisions?"

Beiser: "IDOT will be the chooser of the vendor."

Durkin: "Is this going to be an open bid?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Durkin: "All right. One question; on the enforcement side, will the party who is found speeding, is it going to be based on the license plate of the car or is it going to be a photograph image of the individual driving the automobile? How will they be able to establish the violation?"

Beiser: "It's my impression and my belief that it's the... strictly on the license plate."

Durkin: "So, my kid is going to speed down the highway and my...

the parent is going to be the one responsible and be on the
hook for the violation, correct?"

Beiser: "Under that scenario, I think that would be a correct assessment."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Durkin: "And my employee who takes my car or truck out on the road and speeds and they wouldn't be held responsible?

It's going to be the employer?"

Beiser: "It's my impression."

Durkin: "See, these things are all well-intentioned, but the fact is, the more and more we do these things based on the license plate, I think it's... you're creating an impossible burden for an individual to be... to rebut the fact that they were not driving these automobiles. I think this is fine that you have some type of study that's going along with this system. But this is what we have with the tollway in other areas that we're having these automatic cops in the box who are watch... who are regulating speed, and for that I just have a fundamental problem with that where we're blaming guilt and placing guilt based on a plate number as opposed to a person who was behind the wheel who is actually responsible for violating the Act. So, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, is there anything in this Bill that deals with vehicles that aren't insured as inquired by our Motor Vehicle Law?"

Beiser: "No, it's strictly speed enforcement. I would assu...

No, there isn't."

Pritchard: "So, is the provision still in this Act that the law enforcement agency can remove a vehicle from the road if they are not properly registered?"

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Beiser: "Certainly."

- Pritchard: "So, if there is that provision, why wouldn't it make sense to include the provision that if a vehicle is uninsured, it also ought to be taken off the road?"
- Beiser: "It's a different subject matter, Representative Pritchard, but I would also suggest that since this is going to be administered by a third party vendor and not law enforcement proper, I don't think we want to cross those boundaries as far as when another agency that is simply a vendor would have some type of powers like that."
- Pritchard: "Well, but if you have... if you suspend the registration of a vehicle, that then allows the law enforcement agency to remove that vehicle. So, what's the difference?"
- Beiser: "Again, I think we focused on a single subject which was speed in this case, enforcement by a third-party vendor..."
- Pritchard: "Is there any assurance in this Bill that we're going to get the numbers right and that we're going to be able to identify and ticket, if you will, the right vehicle? Because whether you look at the toll road or some of the other cameras that we have had at some of the stop and go lights, there's been a lot of confusion about the Bill and... or about the license plate and the accuracy of the film in detecting who was the right vehicle."
- Beiser: "Whereas those problems were unique to the toll highway and to those systems that you referred to, I would suggest that we have paid attention to the point that we do know there were concerns with previous programs or in... programs

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- that are currently in place. And again, for this pilot project, which is simply a pilot project, we have tried to address those as best we can. But is anything 100 percent? Very few things are in life."
- Pritchard: "So, I noticed that there are a number of groups opposing this. Have you had any conversations with any of them?"
- Beiser: "The fact that we limited this to one bridge only, should have taken care of some of those if not all those concerns. But I have not been approached by any of the groups that you refer to about any opposition. I simply have not."
- Pritchard: "Well, I know there are a number of people that are concerned about this type of photographic surveillance and the invasion of what they feel are their property and as well as the accuracy of it. I know Representative Durkin has some strong feelings in this area, but I just raise caution that, perhaps, we haven't looked at this thoroughly enough and that we don't have enough accuracy to be sure that we're ticketing the right people. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Last week there was some discussion about my not having approved the transfer of the Chief Sponsor of this Bill. After reviewing documents and talking to staff, I realized staff had come to me and they had asked me to allow Mr. Brazer... Representative Beiser to use the Bill. Now, I was a bit surprised at what they were using it for because I was not

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

told it would be used for cameras. However, Mr... Representative Beiser has my full support. He's a very honorable Gentleman, and I know that he would never do anything in which we would not be supportive of in this Body on this particular issue. And I was also advised that in this particular area there are a number of accidents that occur, and the way the road or the bridge is situated, it's difficult to have police enforcement because police have a... It's a two-lane highway. So, I do support the Bill and I do support the issue, and I don't want to see cameras all over the State of Illinois, but on this issue, I think it is the right thing to do and I do support it."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Durkin, you've already spoken to the issue."

Durkin: "Yes. My name was used in debate by Representative Pritchard..."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay."

Durkin: "And if I... have one last question. Mr. Beiser, what are the violations under this Bill for people who are found to have sped, who are found... speeding through this... this area?"

Beiser: "This would be a civil penalty, and it would not count against their driver's record or their insurance."

Durkin: "I've been... I've read through it and my understanding is; is that three violations or more subject you to a suspension of your registration. Is that correct?"

Beiser: "Yes, if they're not paid. After… after the due process works out and after it… if there has been in fact

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

three violations that have been, for a lack of a better term, upheld, and not paid."

Durkin: "So, those situations which I stated, where my child drives my car and is found to have sped through that area three times and I can't prove that it wasn't... that it wasn't me driving the automobile, me the parent is going to be held... my registration will be suspended and I will be subject to a Class A misdemeanor if I'm driving after the registration's suspended. Meaning that if I'm placed on... if I'm... if there's some type of motor vio... motor vehicle violation I've committed, I will be placed under arrest. I will be brought to the county jail, and I will be subject to... up to one year in the county jail and a \$1000 fine for moving violations that my family members and my employees have committed. So, therefore, that's another reason why I'm voting against this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. I'm still voting against this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Washington: "Representative, two questions; one, why is it so low of a return going back to the City of East St. Louis?

Why is it 10 percent? Why not 15 or 20 percent?"

Beiser: "Representative, that was... requested the Senators when it came over. Senator... Majority Leader Claiborne will be carrying this Bill when it comes back to the Senate, and that was something that was agreed upon there."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Washington: "Okay, I see and I... there's not too much I can say on that, but I think it should have been a higher percentage rate for any overfunding. The other question is; you know, I notice in the first paragraph, the House Amendment, is this going to be bidded out or do someone... does someone have a specific interest in mind to provide the camera?"

Beiser: "Anybody that provides these services could potentially bid on being the vendor."

Washington: "But I know, but Representative I'm just saying, is this going to be bidded out?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Washington: "It will be bidded out?"

Beiser: "Yes, by IDOT."

Washington: "Thank you."

Beiser: "You're welcome."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from White, Representative Brandon Phelps."

Phelps: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion... Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, there's about three things I don't understand in this Bill. I don't understand them at all. When you create the automated speed enforcement

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

fund, you're also amending the Illinois Vehicle Code that says, if you fail to pay any civil penalty due as a result of three offenses, three offenses of the automated speed enforcement system, you lose your vehicle registration. Now, as I understand that, that would be true of a violation on the tollway or any place where they have an automated red light system. Wouldn't that, in fact, be the case?"

Beiser: "No, this is specific to this program for these three violations should they be upheld, and there is no connection."

Black: "Where does it specifically say that in the Bill?"

Beiser: "It says... the wording is 'violations of the Automated Speed Enforcement Act'. So, that's where we're singling out just this program."

Black: "So, you're creating the Automated Speed Enforcement Act, and it only applies to this one bridge, correct?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. What if on the third violation, you have two camera offenses that you are appealing? What happens then? I mean, upon... upon the third one, as Representative Durkin says, upon the third violation, you're going to court, and you could go to jail under a Class A misdemeanor."

Beiser: "Right."

Black: "What if you're already appealing one or two of these automated citations?"

Beiser: "As far as for any of those three to be considered against or considered as part of the three, it would have to be... the entire process will have to have been exhausted

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

and all the due process been held and it became at that point that the apparent violation had been proven. So, to answer your question, if a third one was caught by this camera, and there re... two of them were being appealed, there is... there is no... that would be the third camera finding. But as far as the counting for the three violations, those two had not been through the process."

Black: "All right, it begs the other question, how can you...
your car being out, I guess, an exemption, this is a
speeding ticket, but it's not a moving violation. Doesn't
that sound a little strange that you amend the Vehicle
Code? The ticket is \$250. The reason it's a civil action
is your... your... your due process in court isn't as great.
But you're saying that if you're found guilty of speeding,
it isn't a moving violation under this Act. That doesn't
make a lot of sense to me, quite frankly. I mean it's
either speeding or it isn't."

Beiser: "Well, I mean, as far as the toll way reference, it's my impression that if... well, as I did last year, if I would've had to pay that for not going through the toll improperly, then that did not count towards my driving record, so I was... I think this was the same thing. It's... That precedent's been set."

Black: "But you weren't speeding, necessarily. This is... the Act says it's to catch somebody speeding, but if you are speeding, you don't get a moving violation. Well, all right. The last thing, you've got a portion in this Bill that says any police officer can remove or cause to be removed to the nearest garage or other place of safety any

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

vehicle found upon a highway when the registration plate or plates on the vehicle has been suspended, canceled, or revoked. Now that... to me, that doesn't come under the Act. That's giving the police expanded powers to take your automobile off the roadway. Is that correct?"

Beiser: "It simply says that if that... that plate has been suspended then the police do have the ability, as they do, to remove that from the road. I mean, I..."

Black: "I thought they already had that authority, quite frankly. But they don't? I mean, I... I'm not sure why that's in there. It is not part of the Act, but it gives additional powers to police officers to remove a car from the roadway. It doesn't say whether the car is stopped. So, I assume that the police officer stops you and finds that your registration plate or plates have been suspended, canceled or revoked, he will then have your car towed. And that doesn't relate to the Act, so why was that put in there?"

Beiser: "Well, the enforcement mechanism is the registration and that type of information. So I, you know, I think I take your questions in good standing here, but I simply think that it... as it... it applies to this unique situation has been our attempt to establish this pilot project. I think we've tried to take into account everything that has been discussed with other programs throughout the state, whether it's red light cameras or toll ways or anything like that, and I simply think we maybe will not be able to answer everyone's concerns."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Black: "Okay. I just... On page 20 and 21 of the Bill, it just appears that that authority to remove the vehicle is not a part of your Act. It appears to me to be an additional... an additional authority, if you will, being given to the police. But as always, Representative, I appreciate your indulgence. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Hoffman: "Yes, real briefly. With regard to the definition of where these cameras can be used is very specific that it would be on the Martin Luther King Bridge and the immediate approaches thereto. Is that correct?"

Beiser: "Yes."

Hoffman: "So, there would be... it would not be allowed on the Poplar Street Bridge or any other bridges throughout the State of Illinois?"

Beiser: "No."

Hoffman: "And with regard to the issue of immediate approaches thereto, it's your intent that it just would just be the road that leads from 55/70 or 64, whatever interstates go across the Mississippi River Bridge, to the Martin Luther King... right?"

Beiser: "Yes, it is."

Hoffman: "We don't want to expand it any further?"

Beiser: "No, that's not my intention."

Hoffman: "To the Bill. I think people on the other side of the aisle need to understand the terrible and dangerous nature of this bridge. This isn't something that I take lightly

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

because I don't believe that we... I think we need to tread very carefully with this new technology and the automated cameras. We made a decision here in the Illinois General Assembly, in areas that are ultra dangerous, we would allow these types of cameras. We do it in workplace safety We decided to do it years ago in those types of areas, because so many people were losing their lives in... while they're working and in work zones. We made that The Martin Luther King Bridge as it goes over St. Louis, year after year, month after month has terrible and tragic accidents affecting people's lives. A lot of that is due to the design of the bridge, but a lot of it also is due to speeding. So, we're just saying, in our area, this is an ultra dangerous zone. We don't want to expand it any further, but we believe that we, in order to protect the safety of the people and the motoring public in our area, we would like to see this passed in our area. There will be signage, there'll be notices. I have some issues with the high cost of the fines, but at the end of the day, there are so many accidents on this bridge, there are so many fatalities, there are so many tragic incidences of people losing their lives, we just see no other way to deal with this other than to use modern technology and save people's lives. So, I'm supporting the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, since this is a civil penalty, how would the state's attorney up in DuPage or Cook or Will,

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

how would they know that this person ran back and forth across the bridge and paid three, four, five tickets? Would they know that?"

Beiser: "Well, this is a... this information would be Freedom of Information. I mean, it's public record so as far as the mechanism, I do not know the specific answer to your question on how they would know from different State's Attorneys... different State's Attorneys Offices."

Reboletti: "And I appreciate your aspect here for public safety as Representative Hoffman just spoke to, but the part of the problem with these cameras is that none of it is ever recorded with the Secretary of State's Office. So, the person speeding back and forth and causing accidents or injuries or death that is down there on that bridge is not recorded into a statewide system, so that any prosecutor across 102 counties would be aware of what was happening. And the second part of it, Representative, is that it says there's a fine of up to \$250. Who makes the determination of how much the fine's going to be? Is \$250 the top number, and it could be \$50? Is there a hearing with an administrative hearing officer at East St. Louis? Who does the hearings? If I wanted to go to trial, who would do the hearing?"

Beiser: "It's an administrative process through IDOT that will be part of the program. In answer to your previous question, as far as there is information sharing between the vendor and the Secretary of State's Office. Now, the State's Attorneys Offices could access information through

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- the Secretary... Secretary of State for the purposes that you describe."
- Reboletti: "But part of the problem is that prosecutors across the state get their information from a Secretary of State driving history or abstract, and this wouldn't be on the abstract. Is that fair to say? I know you're not an attorney, Representative, so I don't want to put you into a tough situation, but that wouldn't be on the abstract, would it?"
- Beiser: "It's my impression it would be, but I... that's just my impression, yeah."
- Reboletti: "And then IDOT would have... be the hearing officers?

 It wouldn't be an independent hearing officer from the City of East St. Louis?"
- Beiser: "IDOT will do the administrative hearing. The vendor simply supplies the information regarding any of these violations."
- Reboletti: "And if you want to appeal that IDOT ruling, where would the appellate mechanism go to? Would it go to the circuit court? Where do you go to?"
- Beiser: "As with other programs, it's appealed through IDOT and at that... at the end of that process should anyone feel that they are still in the... they have been found to be in the wrong for not a good reason, they could take this to the courts."
- Reboletti: "And this 90 percent fee that goes to the state is that going to be used to put more troopers on the bridge to enforce the speed... speed laws?"

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Beiser: "First, it will go to pay for the program. We don't want... we want to be this... to this be cost neutral. After that, is when the 90/10 split would go into effect, after the costs associated with the program are satisfied."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jackson, Representative Thapedi and then Representative Beiser to close. Eddie Jackson."

Jackson: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in favor of the Bill. Being from the area, the Martin Luther King Bridge is a very dangerous bill... bridge, and what this Bill is doing is addressing or trying to come up with a way of trying to cut back on individual speeding and deaths on that particular bridge. We've come up with a lot of different things in terms of trying to have the State Police and other individuals, ticket and slow people on the bridge, but it hasn't worked. And, hopefully, with this initiative, we can come up with a way of cutting back or at least letting the drivers know that they're going to be ticketed if they speed on the bridge, as a means of cutting back on death on that particular bridge. And I'm in favor of this particular Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Dan Beiser to close."

Beiser: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments by the Members. I especially appreciate the comments by Representative Hoffman and Stephens and Jackson in that we have tried everything for this particular bridge, and this is simply what we have. It's a pilot project. There will be reporting back to the General Assembly every six months. If, at any point during this pilot project or at the end of

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

it we feel that it's not working for whatever reason, we have the ability to pull that project. But, again, it's an answer to a very, very tragic bridge. As far as tragedies and fatalities, where the average speed by the State Police has been established at 15 miles per hour or more. So, it's for these reasons we bring this before this Body with the cautions that have been observed and recognized, and I would ask for your 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Does Senate Bill 933 pass?'.

 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Representative Jackson, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Jackson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 41 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddie Washington, on page 4 of the Calendar you have Senate Bill 1268. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Washington. We read the Bill, Mr... Representative."
- Washington: "Mr. Speaker, would you delay this Bill, please?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Do you wish to have this taken out of the record?"

Washington: "Yes, Sir, please."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record so Mr. to disturb Washington's phone not Representative Danny Reitz, on page 4 of the Calendar, you 1483. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Jehan Gordon on the floor? Representative Jehan Gordon, not Careen. Close. Representative Jehan Gordon, you have Senate Bill 1511. Out of the record. Representative Careen Gordon, you have Senate Bill 1560. Representative Jehan Gordon, Ι'm Representative Jehan Gordon, you have Senate Bill 1560. Out of the record. Representative Bill Black, on the top of page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1906. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1906. Mr. Black, I believe there are some Amendments we have to deal with on Senate Bill 1906. You wish to bring that back to Second Reading for the purpose..."

Black: "Yes, you're correct, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. And what's the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1906, Floor Amendment #1 was referred to committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Black, has been approved for consideration. There's another Floor Amendment that was referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lyons: "So, what's the next Amendment to be dealt with here, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2 is the only Amendment approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, on Floor Amendment #2."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 becomes the Bill. It removes..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, this is... we've got... the Clerk says we have Floor Amendment #2. Mr. Clerk."
- Black: "Withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black makes a Motion to withdraw Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "...Black, you with to leave that on the Order of Second Reading?"
- Black: Yes. It's my understanding that Floor Amendment #3 was to have been adopted, but evidently my information was incorrect. Hopefully, it will and we'll move the Bill when Floor Amendment #3 is ready."
- Speaker Lyons: "Let's leave the Bill on the Order of Second...

 Second Reading."
- Black: "Yes, if you would, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Naomi Jakobsson, on page 5 of the Calendar you have Senate Bill 2103. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 2103?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2103 is on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. However, there's a Floor Amendment pending on that Bill that has been approved for consideration."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Now, what's the status? Which Amendment, Sir?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Jakobsson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson on Floor Amendment #1."
- Jakobsson: "Senate Bill... Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2103 was filed to address a number of the comments that were made when this was discussed before. It... the Amendment exempts the IEPA's tire violations for those used or waste tires located on a residential household with 12 or fewer used or waste tires on site."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Lady's explanation on Floor Amendment #1. Are there any questions? Seeing none, 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 be adopted to Senate Bill 2103?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Naomi Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2103 provides that the Illinois EPA... it provides them with another useful tool in its efforts to prevent the spread of the deadly West Nile virus. There were 658 mosquito batches in

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Illinois tested positive for West Nile virus last year. And, while generally the state has seen fewer reported cases of West Nile virus in humans since it first appeared in 2002, it's certainly imperative that the state keep up its efforts to reduce these cases to the maximum extent possible through these tire cleanups and enforcement of existing laws and educating the public with this Amendment exempting 12 or fewer tires on a personal property. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

"Ladies and Gentlemen, I had conversation with the Sacia: gentle Lady last week regarding her legislation. I brought with me a violation wherein I was cited this past year by the EPA at my business. I recognize that the Lady's legislation has to deal with residential property, but here's the issue. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is very, very, very important. The EPA probably has, other than the Illinois Department of Revenue, the heaviest hammer already in this state. And I'm put here to tell you these 15 or 20 pages literally scared me to no end as they go down through page after page after page, citing the violations that I was potentially facing. Here's the situation; this legislation creates a \$1,500 penalty. Why does the EPA need that hammer? They have all they need, if not more than they need, to get anyone to comply. represent the five northwestern counties of Illinois. They tell us in biblical times the most feared person was the

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

tax collector. I submit to you the citizens of Northwest Illinois fear more than anyone else the EPA inspector, and now we're going to give them \$1,500 when they walk on the property on top of the hammer that they already have. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is legislation way over the top, and the gentle Lady knows that I have profound respect for her and, I know that she feels well-intentioned with this legislation. But the EPA does not need a bigger hammer. They have all they need right now and then some, and this is highly, highly invasive legislation, and I strongly request a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Dan Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just more a point of personal privilege. I was wondering, where's Paul Revere? We're kind of waiting over here to... for somebody to tell us the Red Coats are coming."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Representative a few questions. Will she yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady yields."

Tryon: "Representative, in your Bill, it sets up a fine that could potentially be used if somebody doesn't correct the problem. But under due process the EPA would go out and do an investigation and then send them a letter of violation with a time frame in which they have to correct the problem, is that correct?"

Jakobsson: "That's correct."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Tryon: "So, the fine potential for a person who may have a thousand tires that are stored illegally, doesn't occur unless they do not react and mitigate the problem, correct?"

Jakobsson: "Correct."

Tryon: "So, nobody from the EPA is going to go out, see a thousand tires, 500 tires or 100 tires on a piece of commercial property, and then take them to court and write them a fine for \$1,500 without due process, correct?"

Jakobsson: "That's correct."

Tryon: "So, in essence, this is just a penalty if the property owner does not cooperate?"

Jakobsson: "That's right. After receiving the administrative citation..."

Tryon: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe this Bill has addressed many of the questions that were asked. It's a good environmental protection, protect us from West Nile virus possibilities, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2103 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 67 Members voting 'yes', 41 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen,

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

for the point of personal privilege, to my left and your right, not that they need any additional attention, there's a Gentleman with numerous red coats, Representative Randy Ramey for personal privilege."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Ramey: you've noticed over the last four months that every Tuesday I would wear the red jacket here on the floor, and many of you always asked what this designated. And to my honor it represents the Springfield Gentlemen's Association, and behind me are the six gentlemen who are a part of this who started this all up back in January as a fundraising mechanism for the American Cancer Society here Springfield. So, I wanted to bring them on the floor 'cause I have talked to a few of you over the last couple of weeks who have donated to their current fundraiser which was a mustache growing fundraiser. So, here they are on display. A few of them need a little work, but I'll just go through a brief introduction. We've got Shawn McGady, Jeff Scott, 'Scooter', as he's better known as. He's the guy that ate seven Coney dogs earlier this year. Mahoney, Donovan Griffith, Nathan Mansfield, and Matt Paprocki. If you could all give them a nice hand. And for the month of May, for the folks that I've talked to on the House floor, we have raised \$1,060. On their own they have gone out and raised \$1,700, so together \$2,760. With that, Ladies and Gentlemen, when we make our donation we'll be matched three times. So, overall, you're looking over at \$8,300 donated to American Cancer Society. So, I want to thank all of you who have pledged. I will be coming around

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

to collect later on this week. Hopefully, we'll be done by the end of May, we won't have to carry this on. And remember, it was per week, so it's four weeks total. I would like to thank Representative Zalewski, who out of the kindness of his heart, donated 50 bucks right off the top, no questions asked, and so I had to double him, I'm donating a \$100. So, if anybody else wants to add, on we certainly would appreciate it. Thank you again, Gentlemen... Springfield Gentlemen's Association."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Stephens: "What? Four weeks? You know, we all want to be associated with winners and those gentlemen over there, these gentlemen, the younger gentlemen, are just a fine testimony to what the American spirit is all about. That's why they're wearing the red jacket. But, Representative, I take exception, that's not why... you wear it as a fashion statement and we object. I'll give you an extra \$100 if you promise not to wear it next year."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bost, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Bost: "I was just nosey and we do appreciate what they're doing. It's a great... but I thought something a little extra after looking over there, I realize that if we can get four of them, when those mustaches grow out, to form just a barbershop quartet. That's exactly what they look like, and I think it would be wonderful, and they could actually entertain and raise money that way as well."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Fritchey: "Inquiry. I'd always presumed all these weeks that Representative Ramey was borrowing his jacket from Senator Hendon. I'm just wondering where the other gentlemen got all those other red coats."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you well know, Representative, I wear this jacket for the St. Louis Cardinals, normally. And, you know, they are... how... What place they in? Second place, ahead of the Cubs, and as we did see a few years ago, a nice World Series trophy. But I will gladly take your \$100 and let Representative Black wear my jacket from now on."
- Speaker Lyons: "Back to the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading. Representative Black, did you seek recognition before we start back on Senate Bills? Your light has been on. Representative Black.
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I heard my name used, and I don't even know what for or why."
- Speaker Lyons: "I think it was in debate that it was used, Sir."
- Black: "Was it in debate? All right. Well, all this money being bandied about on the floor, this is not the time to be bandying about money on the House Floor. We're trying to reform this system. So, when I hear some of these people owing hundreds of dollars and Representative Stephens, who has the money, that's no problem, but some of us have to dig deep. So, I don't think we should be

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

talking about money, whatever we were talking about, on the House Floor. I got a little nervous. And quite frankly, those young men in the red coats, while they're outstanding young men, reminds me of the good old days when they looked like ushers in the movie theatres, back when we had ushers. That's what I want to go back to."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mendoza, on the middle of page 5 under Senate Bills Third Reading, you have Senate Bill... Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to start with some of the concurrences on page 13 of concurrences... of nonconcurrences. Representative Eddie Jackson, yours is the first one, House Bill 85. The Gentleman has a Motion to Nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. Representative Jackson."
- Jackson: "On the… Mr. Speaker, on Senate… on House Bill 85, the nonconcurrence for the Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the nonconcurrence to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 85. Representative Black, do you have a question on the... The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 85. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 85. Representative Lang, on page 14 of the Calendar, under concurrence, you have House Bill 261. Representative Lang, Motion on House Bill 261. The Motion is to nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 261."
- Lang: "That's correct, Sir. Motion to Nonconcur on all four Amendments."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman makes the Motion to nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 261. Is there any discussion? All those in favor sig... On the question, Representative John Fritchey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, one of the Senate Amendments was requested by the liquor control inspectors to allow Department of Revenue police powers to extend to the Liquor Control Commission, the Racing Board. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That, I think, was Amendment #1."

Fritchey: "And the... is... was that the one you had a concern with?"

Lang: "I think we're concerned with all four Amendments that came out of the Senate. It looks to me like the Bill needs a little work, so we're going to send it back and work on it."

Fritchey: "Okay."

Lang: "Unless the Senate decides to recede from their Amendments; in which case that would be fine with me as well."

Fritchey: "Well, okay, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion to Nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to Senate Bill... House Bill 261. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendments are moved to nonconcur. Representative Lang, you have on page 14 of the

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Calendar under concurrence House Bill 255. House Bill 255, Lou, Senate Amendments 1 and 3."

Lang: "Bear with me a moment."

Speaker Lyons: "Fine, we'll take that Motion temporarily out of the record. Representative Mary Flowers, under the Motions of Concurrences on Page 15 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 529. House Bill 529, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with House Bill 529. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions you have in regards to the legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves to adopt... to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 529. Are there any questions? Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, can you tell us how this was changed in the Senate? Exactly what the difference is."

Flowers: "Yes, Representative. The new provision that established standards for the procedures for the reinstatement of parental rights and for the parents of the child that has been abused over the age of 13 that's still in the state's care. So that's..."

Eddy: "So, does the Senate Amendment add... was it House Bill 3706 that you sent over. I think that came out of Human Services, but it was over in the Senate. Does it just basically add the provisions of House Bill 3706 onto this Bill?"

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

- Flowers: "It is, yes, Representative, it... this is similar to the provision that was in House Bill 3706."
- Eddy: "And if I remember, that dealt with procedures regarding locating parents whose rights were terminated, to see if those parents would be able to get a second chance."
- Flowers: "Yes, Representative. Oftentimes, when the rights of the parents have been terminated through no fault of their own, they were not able to have the rights reinstated because they were not able to follow through with the various programs. Maybe the programs was not available; maybe the funding was not available. And after awhile, the child has still not been adopted and he or she is really nobody's child. And quite frankly, there was... maybe there was some harm done, maybe there wasn't, but either way there is reunification with the family and the child is old enough and the parent and the child want to be brought together again. So, this Bill, House Bill 529, would reinstate the parental rights for the parent of a child over the age of 13 that's still in the state's care."
- Eddy: "Representative, that Bill was in the House. What happened to it in the House that requires that that Bill be added in the Senate as an Amendment on a separate Bill that went out unanimously?"
- Flowers: "You know, Representative, I think we just failed to call it due to the time constraints because it passed out of committee and there was no opposition from anyone of House Bill 3706 and so, we just amended it onto an existing Bill that we had over in the Senate already."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to call your attention to as the Bills come back over... and I have not checked the Bill analysis on 3706, I take the Lady at her word. She worked Bill. She... It did come out of committee the unanimously, but for whatever reason, that Bill didn't get called in the House. Maybe it was a deadline, the deadline didn't get extended. But we need to we need to watch these Bills as they come over to make sure all of us, including the Sponsors, to make sure what the Senate has done is what we wanted done with one of our Bills, and I would just caution the Body to keep an eye on this type of legislation when it comes over. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jasper,
Representative David Reis. The Gentleman does not seek
recognition. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from
Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, as I understand it, if the parental rights have been terminated for a minimum of three years, then the biological parents can petition the court to have their parental rights reinstated. Now, that would be the minimum. Is there a maximum? If these parents... The biological parents whose rights were terminated have been absent from the child's life, say for 10 years, would your Bill still allow them to come back and petition for parental rights?"

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Flowers: "If it's amenable to the child as well as the parent, yes, it would."

Black: "All right, in the best interest of the child?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Now, forgive me, because I was trying to get through a copy of the Bill, and I didn't get this far. If that child is in a situation... Excuse me. Excuse me. Could the people in the center aisle move? Representative Coulson, staff? Representative Coulson."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the center aisle.

Representative Coulson, if you could please move, there's a discussion going on between Representative Black and Flowers. Thank you."

Black: "Okay. Yeah, thank you. What I'm not clear on, Representative, if that child is in the process of a permanent placement or in an adoption process, can those terminated parental rights under your Bill still be reinstated?"

Flowers: "Representative, the Bill clearly states that if the minor's not currently in a placement likely to achieve permanency and if the minor..."

Black: "Okay. All right."

Flowers: "...if it's in the best interests of"

Black: "Okay."

Flowers: "...the child. So..."

Black: "So, if they were in a permanent situation, a good household and the foster parents or the agency was in the process of an adoption proceeding, then I would assume that the terminated parental rights would not supersede that.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

The judge would probably say I'm sorry you've been gone for a long time. I think we have a permanent placement or an adoption proceeding pending and I will not reinstate your rights. Would that be your understanding?"

Flowers: "The court shall not grant the motion for reinstatement of parental rights unless the court finds that the motion is supported by clear and convincing evidence."

Black: "So, preponderance of evidence would be the ruling factor?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patty Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. We had quite a bit of discussion on this in the Human Service meeting the last day we were here last week, and the Representative did do what the committee had asked her to do when she brought the Bill back. And I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I think this Bill was from the Cook County State's Attorney and the Cook County Legal Guardian. And I think that the whole point is to try to keep children with their families. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall this... Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 529?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional... this Bill... does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 529. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

- 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 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: Approved for floor consideration is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 170."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Betsy Hannig, on page 19 of the Calendar you have on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 2405. Representative Betsy Hannig on Amendments... Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 2405."
- Hannig: "Senate Amendment #1 just eliminates the word 'surrender' in the Bill. So, the only method for parents is consent of the adoption of the child. That's the only change in Senate Amendment #1. This was a compromise between the Chicago Bar Association, Adoption Committee, the Cradle, which is an adoption agency. As such, the Chicago Bar Association agreed to limit the changes and taking only consent, not surrender. In Senate Amendment #2, the Adoption Act provides a mechanism for parent's

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

rights to be reinstated, including physical custody. It is intended to reduce the amount of legal orphans or children who remain in the system, often bouncing to various foster homes. Approximately 500 children are orphaned each year due to the death of their adoptive parents. Amendment #2 provides for the adoption of a minor by a former parent where the parental rights were surrendered or terminated in a proceeding of the Juvenile Court Act following an appointment of a guardian where the right to consent to adoption under the Juvenile Court Act parental rights were terminated pursuant to the Adoption In Senate Amendment #2, the child has been adopted and the adoptive parents have died or the adoptive parent is too disabled to provide care and is willing to consent to restore the former parent's rights and the former parent wishes to have their rights restored. It would... rights would be restored following a DCF investigation if the court finds that it is in the child's parents... finds in the child's parents, the birth parent's rights. The courts would be required to consider the following points. basis for the termination of the parent rights in the case history; an assessment to the former parents current ability and willingness to provide adequate care protection of the child and any other information concerning the child's safety; well-being or best interests Supporters of this Amendment include the of the child. Chicago Bar Association, Center for... I'd be glad to answer any questions."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady's explained Amendments #1 and #2. The Chair recognizes Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, again it looks as if a Bill that went out of here unanimously was amended in the Senate that now contains language on two Bills that did not receive action in the House. And I think one of them was House Bill 4055 that was introduced this Session, and it contains provisions related to that Bill. I guess my question starts with what happened with the House Bill in the House that caused it to stall and then the language for that Bill was inserted on your Bill?"

Hannig: "I believe it did stall. That Bill was Sara Feigenholtz's Bill, and I'd be glad to yield my time to her."

Eddy: "I'd appreciate that. I just... I think we need to make sure that everybody understands that when these Bills come back over with language from a different Sponsor, exactly what that language does. I'd be happy to hear from Representative Feigenholtz if it pleases the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook on the question, Representative Sara Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Eddy, I believe that the reason this Bill came back is because there were some concerns on the part of some attorneys and the language needed to be cleaned up. We ran out of time and tacked 4055 once it was agreed onto Representative

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Hannig's Bill. This is, as she said, an initiative of the Chicago Bar Association's Adoption Law Subcommittee."

Eddy: "And as agreed, is there any opposition at all? The Bar Association obviously is okay with it. All parties that were a part of the negotiations are now okay?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. This is a special circumstance adoption to transfer without... transfer a child from one parent to a birth parent if there is a relationship, upon the death of the adoptive parent. It's specific to special cases. This is a Bill that was drafted by an attorney who specifically works with mothers who die of AIDS and don't want to see their children languish in the system and want to be able to, if there are no other relatives to adopt the child, to have an opportunity to file a petition. It doesn't give them extraordinary rights of any sort; it just allows them to have their day in court."

Eddy: "Have these individuals already been adopted?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Eddy: "So we're... we're then allowing for a family member to...

through this, the way this is written to intervene in that
adoption that's already taken place?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. There's approximately 500 children in this state that are orphaned every year due to the death of an adoptive parent. They're... they become legal orphans, and this Amendment provides for the adoption of a minor by a former parent under certain circumstances."

Eddy: "And what are those circumstances?"

Feigenholtz: "So, one of the circumstances is that the adoptive parent has died or they're too disabled to provide care and

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

are willing to consent to restore the former parent's rights and former parent wishes to have their right restored. So, the adoptive parent, prior to death, consents to this. Of course, all the other things that need to occur prior to an adoption; the consideration of best interest of the child which is in the Juvenile Court Act; a DCFS investigation and complete court intervention under these circumstances."

- Eddy: "So... I don't want to put words in your mouth, but let me...

 let me see if I can capsulate what that means. If there's

 been an adoption..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy, if you could bring your remarks to a conclusion we'd appreciate it."
- Eddy: "I'll be happy to. I just... one quick question and then maybe somebody else will take this up. But if someone adopts an individual and they've been with that family for years and a relative of the individual that was adopted now seeks to intervene in that adoption, they would have an opportunity to have that adoption changed, and I guess my concern is with the original adoptive parents. I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate to see if there's any follow up on that. But that's my concern that those original adoptive parents have the kind of due process necessary. Thank you and I'll continue to listen."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, I'd be glad to answer your concerns. I think they're legitimate and I think that when we only look at a small piece of a very complicated Act, which is the Adoption Act, that the… these are children who

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

have no other relatives in their adoptive family who can take care of them, can adopt them, or want to adopt them."

Eddy: "Again, thank you. I appreciate it. I'm going to continue to listen to the debate. I understand you're trying to improve the situation. I just have a few concerns about the original adoptive parents. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Keith Sommer."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. In response to Sommer: Representative Eddy's questions, yes, this Bill initially came up in March on its own. I had raised a number of concerns, some that you have brought forward. Those were forwarded on to an attorney who I generally consult on these issues, and those concerns were then worked out with Sponsor with the Chicago Bar Association. The resultant Amendment is agreed language that those attorneys on both sides of the question have agreed to. This involves a very limited circumstance where, as Representative Feigenholtz said, an adoption has taken place within a family. adoptive parents have a biological relationship to the birth mother. This does not in any way negate any rights that a family member has. The birth parent may have had a will that designates quardians and all these procedures are outlined. This does not give the birth mother priority in petition to the court. Other people, other members of the family may also petition the court. This outlines the procedure by which the court should address the issue. in support of the Amendment and supportive of the language, and I thank the Sponsor for allowing this discussion last

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

week in committee to go on and to allow me to again contact the adoption attorney to get a final determination on these issues. So, I stand in support of the Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, on page 2 of the Amendment, on line 17, 16 and 17, a minor remained a ward of the court and was subsequently adopted by an individual or individuals who, at the time of the adoption, were biologically related to the minor as defined in subsection B. Now, what exactly does that mean? The adoptive parent was either biologically related to the child or biologically related to the parent or parents whose rights have been terminated."

Speaker Lyons: "Who wishes to respond, Representative Feigenholtz or Representative Hannig? Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "You're on page 2, lines..."

Black: "Page 2, line..."

Feigenholtz: "Section 3?"

Black: "Yes, Section 3, lines 16, 17, and 18."

Feigenholtz: "Okay, I see it. At the time of the adoption..."

Black: "I'm not sure what biologically related to the minor means."

Feigenholtz: "Well, I think... I think these are two,

Representative Black, I believe that these are two

circumstances under which this orphaned child who was

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

adopted by relatives of either the birth parent or a relative of the birth parent. Ιt depends on the circumstances. I'm assuming that when the author of the Bill drafted this she, and I'm sure you know Linda Kuhn that works with, as I said, people who are dying of AIDS and leaving children and have no other relatives in the adoptive family who can take care of them and there is a relationship with the birth family. For instance, a birth parent who may have had issues with chemical dependence, who may have gone through rehabilitation and reestablish contact with both the adoptive family and the child who they had relinquished or had their rights terminated. I would imagine that, under these circumstances, if there are no other adoptive relatives that this is a Bill that keeps that child out of the foster system and in... It's an opportunity for the birth parent to re-approach the court after having had their rights terminated to readopt or a relative of that birth parent. That's what that means."

Black: "Well, I... I find the language somewhat confusing."

Feigenholtz: "Well, this was written by lawyers,

Representative."

Black: "Well, that's why I find it confusing. Almost anything written by an attorney can be confusing. I don't know how many times we voted on a plain English Bill down here, but it never passes. As I understand this, that adoptive parent would have had to have been the brother, the sister, the aunt, the uncle, or grandparents of the adult whose parental rights were terminated. And in many cases, the brother or sister want nothing whatsoever to do with that

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

individual, that's why they adopted the child. And then along comes this Bill, I'm an adoptive parent, my child's future was defined by my last will and testament, and there was a definitive list of people who would take guardianship and custody of our child if anything happened to both my wife and I. So what happens to our last will and testament if somebody could come in who was biologically related to our adoptive child and say, well, I think we'll take him back in the family, the family who didn't want them in the first place?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I believe that if there is a will in place or parents who are or relatives of the adoptive family who are willing, that that supersedes this law. This is really for more..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, your time has expired. We'll give you another minute to conclude this questioning. Sara."

Black: "Well, thank you. I only got a chance to ask two questions. But I would believe the Lady is... the Representative is correct, that your last will and testament would certainly take precedence. I have great respect for the Sponsor and certainly great respect for Representative Sommer. But Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I find this Bill somewhat confusing. As an adoptive parent and I've said this before on this House floor, if you want to quash people's willingness and desire to adopt a child, you must protect the adoptive parent rights. I think the adoptive parent's rights should take precedent. This seems to erode that somewhat. I'm not sure that I fully understand the Bill and in technically drafted legal

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

documents, a lot of us non attorneys do have those problems. But when you terminate parental rights, and you have a family that goes through, and even when I became, my wife and I became an adoptive... adoptive parents, this was not an easy process. It took a great deal of time and energy and investigation and background and tears and stress before the... the great love of my life became our child. And I get very nervous when I find out that we want to chip away at the adoptive parents' willingness to take on this child and somehow, maybe 10 years, 12 years, 14 years, maybe I would have died, or maybe my wife would have become incapacitated and somebody shows up with a form that a lawyer signs and says, well, you know, the parental rights, even though they were terminated, they want this child back. Now, that's never happened to us. Our child knows and knew from day one about the adoptive process. This Bill may be fine. I believe in the Sponsor and it probably is, but I have to tell you, as an adoptive parent, these kinds of Bills make me extremely nervous, and I can't in good conscience support the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "I just have a quick question of the Sponsor, if you will."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose, to Sara Feigenholtz or Representative Hannig?"

Rose: "Representative Feigenholtz, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Is it on the Amendment? Maybe Representative Feigenholtz..."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Rose: "It's on the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Rose: "I have a quick question. Help me understand. I listened to Representative Sommer's comments, so I think I'm okay with this. But why are we allowing attorneys to be the witnesses to these papers?"

Feigenholtz: "Could you repeat that?"

Rose: "Sure. The analysis indicates that... that we are going to go away from having to have the presiding judge be the person who signs the paperwork to now on a consent or surrender, to now any other judge, which I don't have a problem with. But it also goes on to say that 'consents or surrender of signer in front of any judge of Illinois or any state or an attorney', and I have a little bit of a concern about the out of court nature of that."

Feigenholtz: "That's Amendment #1, is that right?"

Rose: "I don't know, yes."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Lyons, could you turn Representative Hannig's speak light on?"

Speaker Lyons: "We'll redirect that question to Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "The original Bill did allow someone that the court appointed to take the consent. It also allowed for electronic means that was to help people that were detained in a facility but wanted to place their child up for adoption."

Rose: "Okay, but is it still... as I understand it in the Amendment, it's still allowing an attorney to sign off on the consents, which that seemed a little bit of a departure

61st Legislative Day

- from how we normally do things. Not a little bit, it's a lot of a departure."
- Hannig: "It's someone that the court... or someone that the court appoints, or it could be a social service person or even electronically and that was in the original Bill."
- Rose: "How would the electronically work? I mean could you e-mail your consent?"
- Hannig: "No. It sounds like it's a... someone is sent to the facility and it's video recorded, I believe."
- Rose: "Does the court have... okay, this is a critical question.

 Does the court have to appoint the attorney to handle the consent?"
- Hannig: "Yes. The person that's taking the consent must be approved by the court."
- Rose: "Where does it say that, 'cause we can't find that? Like a line and a page number would be..."
- Hannig: "We'll be happy to get back to you. We're looking for that right now. We can take the next question."
- Rose: "That's... I mean that's my entirety of my question. If we're just going to allow attorneys to do this in their office, I have a real concern about that. If the court is involved and has then dictated the ability, it doesn't bother me, 'cause presumably someone is going to report back to the court."
- Hannig: "Yes, we believe that the court is involved, and we're looking for that line in the Bill."
- Rose: "Well, Representative, I mean can't… we're looking for it on our side of the aisle, too and I don't want to belabor the point and take up more of the Body's time, but this is…

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

this is a pretty important thing. I mean, this is someone's parental rights. I don't think we should be allowing it to go... people to go outside the court system to terminate or surrender if... I'm about to... I'm going to run out of time in 40 seconds here, too, so... I mean, we don't see that and... Do you have a page number?"

Hannig: "The Bill clarifies that the consent can be acknowledged by someone appointed by the court; an agency representative, or someone the court appoints acknowledging. The person does not have to be in the court when the petition is filed. If the person is incarcerated or detained in the facility and wishes to consent adoption, the adop..."

Rose: "What page is that?"

Speaker Lyons: "We'll extend this for another minute so you can answer this question."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. What page are you reading for... from, Representative?"

Hannig: "It's in the original Bill, in House Bill 2405."

Rose: "Okay."

Hannig: "It's not in either of the Amendments. The question you were talking..."

Rose: "Okay, and what page number? I've got the original Bill up. What page number?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Rose, maybe I can illuminate something from the analysis that we have here about the underlying Bill, Amendment #1. It seems as though there are circumstances where a parent is unable, for some

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

reason, to not appear in court for health reasons or some other problem, a disability perhaps, and this is a Bill that gives the court the ability to acknowledge this consent via telecommunication or through an agent. The attorney being that agent and that attorney being appointed specifically to take that consent, or surrender, I'm sorry, by the court; supervised by the court and charged by the court."

- Rose: "And I think that I've... looking on page 12 of the underlying Bill, I do... I see there's a comma delineated sub-sentence here that says, 'other than the attorney for the prospective adoptive parents'. So, I think it does make sense, and I appreciate both you, Representative Feigenholtz and also Representative Hannig for indulging me as we got to the answers. So, thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cole. Representative Sandy Cole."
- Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for Representative Feigenholtz in her..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Cole: "Thank you. Representative Feigenholtz, you stated that no other adoptive parents would... relatives, I'm sorry; no other adoptive relatives were available. I can't find that provision in the Bill. Could you tell me where that is?"
- Feigenholtz: "It's not in this Bill, Representative Cole. I believe that it, you know, it's in general law. But I do want to, just for the record, clarify that this is a piece of legislation that merely changes one provision and that is allowing this particular person, this birth parent or

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

relative of a birth parent, to be able to petition the court. This does not give that person any special rights. It allows them an opportunity to petition the court. Until this... until now, this person is only allowed to be a guardian."

Cole: "Mr. Sponsor (sic-Speaker), to the Bill. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Cole: "Here's my concern about what we're doing. We're taking a Bill that dealt with incarcerated parents, birth parents or adoptive parents, and now we've turned it into including another issue regarding adoption. And here's my concern as an adoptive relative. I have an adoptive brother who is 10 years younger than me and 12 years younger than my older sister. Had my mom and dad, without a will, been killed in a car crash or a plane crash or something of that nature and not left a will, I'm concerned that as a 25-, 26-, 27year-old sibling that now I would have to... my brother who is 15 years old, would be subject to going through proceedings by which we have to find out whether his birth mother or father wants him. As a sibling, I'm concerned about that. He's my brother. He's not my adopted brother. He's my brother. And to go through a process, and I look at this as a real circumstance 'cause it, you know, it nearly happened for my sister and I who are adults and who are married and have stable family circumstances, to have to hunt down my brother's birth mother or father and say, gee, do you want them or have to even give them consideration. He's my brother. He's my sibling. I can't

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

imagine after losing parents I would have to go through a process of fighting to keep my brother in the family. So, I'm concerned about this Bill, 'cause I don't think it's narrowly defined. I understand the passion of the Sponsor in trying to deal with an issue where a child may be adopted as an older adoptee, but I don't fee... I don't see this Bill being so narrowly defined, and it concerns me as a sister of a brother who just happened to be adopted, me, having to go through a process by which he would have to be... go to a foster home 'til they decide whether his birth mother wants him back. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "I yield to Sara."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Cole, on page 2 of this legislation, just on Senate Amendment #2, Section 3, page 2, Section 3, line 21, it says 'and no standby guardian or standby adoptive parent has been appointed for the minor and no guardian has been appointed by the adoptive parent for the minor through a will'. So, I think you have legitimate concerns about your family, but un... but those circumstances don't actually fit under the circumstances in this law. The children that this Bill addresses are children who are orphans. They don't have siblings who... or other family members who want to adopt them. I just want, for the record, to be very clear that there is on page 24 of this Amendment, acknowledgement of a will."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2405?' All those

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 78 Members voting 'yes', 32 Members voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill... to House Bill 2405. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On the Motion to Discharge committee we have filed a Motion to discharge House Bill 4448 from the House Rules Committee. Under all the applicable House Rules, these Motions should be assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I would ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Section... Article IV, Section 8 of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be by recorded methodology whenever five Representatives so request, and I'm joined by five Members on my side of the aisle to request House Bill 4448 be discharged from the House Rules Committee and assigned Standard Debate status on the Calendar."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As we begin to run out of time, I'm not sure what reform measures of the

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Collins' Commission we are willing to take up and debate - evidently not very many. At the applicable time, Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a), I would move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 4448 from the House Rules Committee. And I would ask that we be allowed to debate our Motion."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Black, your original Motion, of course, because it did not have unanimous decision, has failed and the Gentleman now wishes to appeal the ruling of the Chair. On that Motion, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Will, Representative Renée Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was walking through my district this weekend and talking with people, one of the things that they talked about was the tremendous length of the election process and what the people go through as we go through the election process. There is a tremendous, a tremendous amount of enthusiasm over shortening that process, and this piece of legislation, should we get a chance to vote on it, would shorten that election process. I think it's something that every citizen in the State of Illinois would love to see. We need the enthusiasm back in the process, but with the length of the process we go through, it literally kills that enthusiasm. Let's get the people back involved, let's get them excited about what happens in our government, and let's do that by shortening the election cycle. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "On the question, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. As we look to how we might reform our primary, we need to look at how the country has been handling this question of primary. Going back even before the Illinois Reform Commission issued its report, I worked in a bipartisan manner with Representative Franks. We filed House Bill 1285 and suggested that 10 weeks would be sufficient to operate a primary. Now, if you look at the calendar over the last two election cycles, in 2006, the last off-year election cycle, what you'll see is that there were two states that held their primaries for their statewide and legislative and congressional races in March. Just two of the 50; 10 more in May; there were 13 in June and over half the states held their primaries after that, recognizing that you don't have to have this lengthy process to get the information the people need to make an informed decision, to keep it tight. In 2008, situation was very similar. Obviously, we had moved earlier and a couple other states did too, but still, 24 of the states did find holding their primary on the date that is proposed in House Bill 4448 or later. I think that this is the kind of Bill that we need to debate. We've now had the information from the report. We've heard from our constituents, and we have a chance to fully debate this Bill and give it the vote after the deliberation that it deserves. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Frank Mautino in the Chair."

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

Mautino in the Chair."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No one else seeking recognition but my poor old broken down self? That's it?

I.m. is there one more?"

Speaker Mautino: "Well, since you're calling for them..."

Black: "I would just simply like to close."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Brady is..."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Okay."

Black: "I'd just like to simply close on the... my Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "Certainly. The Gentleman from McLean is seeking recognition, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I, too, just want to support Representative Black's request to have discharged House Bill 4448 from Rules so that we may have a proper debate on the merit of change in our primary election system here in the State of Illinois, the election to June. You know, having the ability to debate this issue on behalf of the people of Illinois, I'm really puzzled, little perplexed, actually to see what the problem would be since we're all representative of the people to be able to actually have the opportunity to fairly and openly debate the issue. So, I would support the Representative's request and would certainly ask that you do the same. Thank you."

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

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker, very quickly to the Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, here we are, the final week of Session and we have not begun to debate the essential

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

issues related to reforming the tremendous problems we have in Illinois related to corruption in government, to the fact that there's a stranglehold on the power that directs We haven't even begun to debate our State Government. openly the major recommendations of the commission that was set up to examine what Illinois should do to move forward. Not only have we not begun to debate, every time we talk about bringing out one of those essential issues so that elected Representatives on the House Floor can discuss those, it's as simple as someone standing up and objecting. One person, it takes one person to stop open debate in this state. This is exactly what we're talking about. why we need change in government because one person can stand up and stop elected Representatives from debating issues that are obviously important to everyone. We're not talking about passing the Bill. Do you get it on the other side of the aisle? Do you even understand we're not talking about passing the Bill, we're talking about an open debate about a concept about of how to change Illinois government, and you're going to sit there and you're going to blindly, like a bunch of lemmings, you're going to blindly push the button you're told to push. What you need to do is have a mind of your own. You need to have courage and make a vote for the people of the State of Illinois and not just simply because you're told to vote a certain way because somebody objects. That's the problem here. That's the problem here. This is an opportunity to bring to the floor and debate one of the most serious issues that we face. Everybody lined up in December. Everybody wanted to

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

do something. Everybody was serious. Everybody was serious in January. Everybody was serious in February. Nobody's serious now. We're in the last few days, we're bringing issues to the floor and no one's paying attention. People of the State of Illinois, I hope, are paying attention. We should have an open debate on this issue because it's important. I urge you to show courage and vote for open government and allow us... allow us to bring this Bill to the floor where it can be fully debated."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't do this because I have nothing else to do. Like all of us, I have more than enough work to do in this last week and I don't ask you to take these votes for some ulterior, political motive. I'm too tired. I don't feel good. I... If I'd listened to my doctor I shouldn't even be here this week. And I know it's not easy to go against the established political power on either side of the aisle. I know it's not easy. I've done it. I've been there. I know what it's like to not be invited to caucus, to go down to the Rathskeller and have something to eat and your fellow caucus members leave, won't sit with you, but I'm still And sometimes I don't follow the Party line. Sometimes, I do what I think is either best for my district or best for the body politic as a whole or best for the State of Illinois. I think it's ludicrous that we are inaugurated in January and six and a half months later we are circulating petitions for... for possible reelection.

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

It's an incumbency protection program, I'll give you that. And then we file our petitions and we start the process of over a year to campaign. And who finances most of the campaigns? Us? If you're lucky. Most of our campaigns are financed by the two Legislative Leaders. If you're every going to enable you to be empowered, if you're really interested in reforming the process, if you've ever been out as I have trying to pound campaign signs into the ground in January, late January or early February or try to go door to door in those months, why not move the primary back to June? It would give us more time. shorten the actual campaign season. I think it would make for more competitive elections, but maybe that's not what we want. Maybe that's not what we want. I think we say it is, but maybe it isn't. So sometimes you do things just because the current situation doesn't make any sense. Ι don't think anybody's happy with this inauguration in January and passing petitions in August. But if you're not willing to debate it, I don't know that it would pass. I'm not... I don't know how the House Republican Leadership would come down on this. I think Leader Cross is in favor of it, he sponsored the Bill. But I don't know if it would pass. But certainly it's worth a debate and worth a vote. the only way we'll do it is if we decide to take back the process to some extent by each individual measure. I would move that we overrule the Chair simply because House Bill 4448 would allow us to debate a Bill to move the Primary to June rather than February. It's a good reform measure. It

61st Legislative Day

- makes imminent good sense. I would ask you to vote to overrule the Chair on this... on this Motion."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Vermilion has filed a Motion in writing to discharge committee House Bill 4448. The question is... and has moved to overrule the Chair. The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' 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. 62 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the Chair is sustained. The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I wanted to remind the Members of the Body that tomorrow morning between 7:30 and 9:00 there will be a presentation on Rich State (sic-States) Poor State (sic-States) by the author of that Book, Jonathan Williams. There's no more appropriate time for us to listen to that presentation as we go through this final budget and the decisions that are ahead. So, please, the Sangamo Club tomorrow morning between 7:30 and 9:00 for breakfast, Jonathan Williams, author of <u>Rich States</u>, <u>Poor States</u>. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 235, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 235 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, place House Joint Resolution 51 on the board and read the Resolution."

61st Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 51 creates the Interstate Gun Trafficking Task Force within the Illinois State Police. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Thapedi, has been approved for consideration on this Resolution."
- Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record. Now... Representative Turner, on page 6 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 235. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 235, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Senate Bill 235 is an initiative of the Chicago Public Schools. It was back in 1980 we created the School Finance Authority, which was an authority that was created because of problems that school districts have locally and this was an answer to dealing with those financial problems, so we created the Chicago Public School Finance Authority. In the year 2003, they had taken care of all of their financial obligations and the education oversight powers were made permanent in 2003. And since 1985... since 1995, the School Finance Authority has focused on paying off the debts that were issued prior to that. All those debts are currently paid and this... the intent of this Bill is to dissolve the School Finance Authority as of June 10... no, June 1, 2010. The last debt service payment will be made on June 1, 2009 and I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 235."

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 235. And on that, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Eddy: "Representative, does this Bill have anything to do with the School Code and Principal Programs?"

Turner: "No, it doesn't."

Eddy: "...as amended? So, the underlying Bill that dealt with changes to the School Principal Program is not addressed by this legislation any longer?"

Turner: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So, the Amendment that went through, I think it went through Executive Committee, basically allows for the \$24 million that the Chicago School Finance Authority is... has... or the Finance Authority has \$24 million, that is transferred, isn't it, under this?"

Turner: "The... So all the rights and properties will be vested...

that was vested with the Chicago Board will now go to the state."

Eddy: "So, the School Finance Authority is it scheduled to be abolished next year?"

Turner: "That's correct. June..."

Eddy: "That's just based on its life span?"

Turner: "That's right, June 1, 2010 and our last debt service payment will be made on June 1 of this year."

Eddy: "Okay. So there will be remaining money in that fund as a result of interest accumulated on the debt service over that period of years?"

61st Legislative Day

- Turner: "Whatever's left in the fund when the authority is abolished, after all its obligations have been paid, all it's rights and properties will then be passed and vested to the State of Illinois. Now, the dollar amount, I don't know what that is specifically."
- Eddy: "Okay, and I understand that. Basically, this authority is going to be out of existence and it has money left. Now the question is, where that \$24 million or estimated \$24 million at the time this is abolished, where that money should go. My question is why shouldn't that go back to the taxpayers of Illinois?"
- Turner: "If it goes back to the General Fund, isn't that the taxpayers of Illinois?"
- Eddy: "Right. Why isn't it going in there? My understanding is it's going... the way this legislation's written, Chicago Public Schools will receive the \$24 million."
- Turner: "That's your understanding, it goes back to the Chicago Public Schools?"
- Eddy: "Yeah, the money would be going to the Chicago Public Schools."
- Turner: "Where did the money come from, Representative? I think the money was raised via the taxes of the people in the City of Chicago, if I'm not mistaken."
- Eddy: "Well, that's what I'm asking and Representative, that could be the case and if the case is that the property taxes in the City of Chicago created that money, then it should go back. My question is basically, regarding the taxpayers in the State of Illinois, whether they're...

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

they're into this fund at all, if they made investments in this fund or if it's all the City of Chicago?"

Turner: "This is all City of Chicago."

Eddy: "Okay, so it's..."

Turner: "And we... and..."

Eddy: "...collected property taxes..."

Turner: "That's right."

Eddy: "...and it's just going back to the City of Chicago Public School System, and there's... I think that's normal practice for funds that are being abolished for school districts as well, Representative. I appreciate the answer to your question."

Turner: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? Representative Monique Davis, the Lady from Cook."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Turner: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Does the Principal Association agree with this?"

Turner: "Representative, this Bill now has been amended and if I'm not mistaken, it only deals with the School Finance Authority."

Davis, M.: "Okay. So, it does have absolutely nothing to do with how principals are chosen or selected and what the responsibilities of the principals are?"

Turner: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "And how the LSC continues to select them?"

61st Legislative Day

- Turner: "It's my understanding this is still strictly with the School Finance Authority."
- Davis, M.: "It is your understanding from reading the text of the Bill?"
- Turner: "That's correct."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. I support your Bill and thanks for your answers."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Senate Bill 235. 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. 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 235, having received the Constitution Majority, is declared passed. On page 25 of your Calendar appears House Joint Resolution 55, Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 55 resolves that the State of Illinois establish an affordable Alzheimer's Housing with Services Program that builds off of both the Supportive Living Facilities and the Comprehensive Community Residential Settings Programs."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 55 calls to establish an affordable Alzheimer's housing which serves program where we've been working with the Governor's office trying to build off the existing assisted living center type programs and make sure that they work for

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

Alzheimer patients and try to secure Medicare funding. We held a series of hearings in the Metro East and have heard from a number of families that are having to move people out from Alzheimer units to nursing homes and we think this will help."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of House Joint Resolution 55. On that question, no one seeking recognition. 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. 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Joint Resolution 55, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared adopted. Majority Leader Currie for a Motion. The Lady from Cook, Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bills 52, 262, 265, 321, 451, 1433, 1466, 1609, 1825, 1846, 1959, 2052, 2168, and 2218 can be heard in the Committee on the Executive, and Senate Bills 256, 1623, and 1691 in Revenue. I know of no objections to the Motion. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens, is seeking recognition."
- Stephens: "In the spirit of reform, in the spirit of a new Illinois that is transparent, clean and uncomplicated with all those things that happened in the recent past, we concur."
- Speaker Mautino: "I'd like to thank the Gentleman from Bond.

 The Lady has moved the... moved to suspend the posting

61st Legislative Day

- requirements. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, and the posting requirements are suspended. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 455, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolutions 457, 458, and 459, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 460, offered by Representative Hoffman. And House Resolution 461, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie now moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "The committee schedule has been distributed.

 Please note that committees will be meeting this afternoon."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons, for an announcement."
- Lyons: "And now for something completely different. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the few and the proud, the White Sox fans caucus and to my dear friends who are Cub and Cardinal fans, it's with the greatest regret that we found out on Friday afternoon that the White Sox game scheduled for tonight was going to be put on WCIU, which is not available down here. So, being quick on our feet, Friday we put out to all your secretaries, hopefully, that we changed the date until tomorrow night. So, the White Sox caucus will meet at the same place, over at the Alamo. They have a beer garden. The White Sox game will be on tomorrow night at 9:00, so White Sox fans gather, unite. Cub, Cardinal fans behave yourselves, which you're also welcome to come

61st Legislative Day

- over and watch the Sox game at the Alamo. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke for announcement."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Democrats will be meeting immediately at adjournment in Room 114."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond. Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to caucus in Room 118."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118 on adjournment; Democrats in Room 114. Any further announcements? Representative Currie now moves the House now stand adjourned until Wednesday, May 27, at the hour of 11:00 a.m. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourned. Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Speaker, committees were supposed to start at 5:00 p.m., but now both sides are going to caucus. Is there a change in the time for committees?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Yes, the committees will meet after caucuses.

 It is now 3:45."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you."
- Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports: Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

and 3 to House Bill 470; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3658; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3991; and, 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 1556 and Senate Bill Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions, to which the following measures were referred, action taken May 26, 2009, reported with the following recommendations: same back recommends 'be adopted' Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 519. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate' for Senate Bill 612; and recommends 'be adopted' in Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2625; and Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 2675. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Standard Debate' for Senate Bill 1928; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 314; and recommends 'approve' Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 436; and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3922. Representative Ryg, Chairperson from the Committee on Disability Services, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26,

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 751. Representative Brosnahan, Chairperson from the Committee on Telecommunications, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 1421. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill Representative May, Chairperson from Committee Environmental Health, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1919. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business and Occupational Licenses, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1925; and recommends 'be adopted' Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 786; and Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 880. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 2115; recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 563; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1119; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2440; and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2443. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Youth and Family, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended Short Debate' for Senate Bill 1716. Representative Mendoza, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2172. Representative McAuliffe, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to which the following measures were referred, action taken on May 26, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: recommends 'be adopted' Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3970. Introduction and First Reading of Senate Bills: Senate Bill 611, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act

61st Legislative Day

5/26/2009

concerning education. First Reading of this Senate Bill. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills: House Bill 4569, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning disclosure of personnel recommendations. House Bill 4570, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. First Reading of these House Bills. Second Reading of Senate Bills to be read and held on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading: Bill 1421, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 2115, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1716, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 612, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1928, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1556, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned."