64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 65,

 offered by Representative McCarthy, is referred to the

 House Committee on Rules."
- Speaker Mautino: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Matthew Armstrong, who is with New Hope Community in Streamwood, Illinois. Reverend Armstrong is the guest of Representative Crespo."
- Reverend Armstrong: "Good morning. Would you, please, join me in prayer? Oh God, our help in ages past, You are our hope for years to come. You know the tremendous challenges before the women and men in this House today. And Lord, in these times of corruption and deceit and economic crisis, we remember that not a sparrow falls to the ground, but that You notice it. And we know that You are intimately concerned with all the details of our lives, our families, our communities, our state, our nation, and this world. You made us, and You set us in relationship with one another. You love us, and You want to the best for us, so we acknowledge You here this morning. We asks that You would reveal Yourself in new and fresh ways to each person in this room. May it be that today, You will use these women and men to accomplish Your purposes for the State of Illinois. May they make laws that are just and fair, which promote honesty and hard work, laws that provide care for the poor, and provide opportunity for all. God, I thank You for each Representative here today. They've worked hard and sacrificed much to be here and to represent the people of our state. So please honor them as they honor

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- You. Bless them as they bless the people of Illinois. Be with them and give them great wisdom at a time of great testing. Grant them, we pray, foresight to understand how decisions made today will impact people's lives for years to come. I believe that You have a plan and a purpose for Illinois that is greater than anything we in this room can imagine, so I ask that this plan be realized, and that You would use these Representatives to do so. Be with them today. May they feel Your presence, encouraging, guiding, supporting, and sustaining them in their important work here. May they always act justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You, for Your glory, Amen."
- Speaker Mautino: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Washington."
- Washington et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that we have no excused absences among House Democrats to report."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 having answered the Roll, a quorum is present, and the House is prepared to do its business. Mr. Clerk."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on May 29, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for consideration' is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 80 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 321. Also, 'approved for consideration' is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1327. Representative Burke, Chairperson for the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 7. Representative Collins, Chairperson for the Committee on Public Utilities, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative Osterman, Chairperson from the 658. Committee on Labor, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' Floor Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 2116 and Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments...

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 177. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 480, offered by Representative Ryg. And House Joint Resolution 64, offered by Representative Bellock. These Resolutions were referred to the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons, is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Lyons: "I didn't get a chance to announce yesterday, Ladies and Gentlemen, but the White Sox Caucus had an absolutely wonderful event on... on Wednesday night. We had over 150 people that stopped over. It's just an opportunity to get together and enjoy ourselves. And to all the good... goodnatured Cardinal and Cub fans for joining us, it was a pleasure to have you. And I also want to let you know that we're going to have an outing again. It's just a good time outing in... in Apr... on August 17. We've got a couple hundred tickets out in left field for a White Sox game. They're playing the Kansas City Royals. If you're interested in getting tickets, please let myself know, or we have a Web site that we'll get a flyer out before the weekend's over. We had a great time just being with each other, watching the ball game. Hope you can join us again in August. So thank you, Members, and thank you everybody who participated."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1579. Representative Nekritz. Read the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1579, a Bill for an Act concerning professions and occupations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1579 is comparable to what we passed in House Bill 271 that passed pretty overwhelmingly out of this chamber earlier this year. It establishes a licensing program for condominium and other community association managers. There are tens of thousands of those types of units in this state, and we don't have any control over the folks that are holding the money. And so this is... and... and we've now reached out and we've reached an agreement with the Department of Professional Regu... Professional and Financial Regulation as well on this. So, I'm not aware of any opposition."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1579, and on that question, the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Reis: "Okay. Representative, you said this is similar to House Bill 271, which passed earlier in the year?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Reis: "That Bill came out of the House with a 74-41 vote. Is there any fees or anything involved with your legislation here today, with Senate Bill 1579?"

Nekritz: "I... I thin... I believe it's similar to anyone that licensed through the Department of Professional Financial

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Regulation. They all pay a fee in order to get the license. So, yes, there is a fee associated with that."

Reis: "Okay. So, I guess... and there's people on both sides of the aisle that probably need to be aware of that. So, if people want to take a look at House Bill 271 and take a look at the voting history on that, it might give you some idea on how to vote for this. But it's exactly the same?"

Nekritz: "It is not exactly the same, because the... the Bill... we have been trying for, literally, almost a year to the department to give us comments on the legislation. And so we had drafted it the way... the advocates had drafted it the way they felt it was appropriate, and then about, I don't know, two weeks ago, after a year of trying to get the department's comments, they came... they came in and said this is the typical form in Illinois Statute as to how these licensing statutes work, so we reconfigured it to put it in the form, that... so that it would be comparable to other licensing statutes."

Reis: "Okay. And the realtors association and the Association of Town Home and Homeowners Association are all in favor?"

Nekritz: "That's my understanding."

Reis: "All right. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 1579, and the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 71 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1579 has received the Constitutional Majority and is

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 268. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 268, a Bill for an Act concerning foreclosure. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Farnham, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Farnham on Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 268. Mr. Clerk, take this Bill out of the record. Mr. Clerk, page 11 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1691, Representative Mathias. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Walker, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Walker on Floor Amendment #3."

 Walker: "Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the House. Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1691 is a continuation of business incentive programs for jobs in the State of Illinois. It extends the sunset dates to 2014, of... dates of three programs that would expire this year: One manufacturer's purchase credit, one for graphic arts machinery exemption, and one for replacement tax credit. These are good programs for business and we should keep them."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #3. No one's seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. Amendment 3 has been adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Walker did an excellent job of describing the Amendment. The Amendment became the Bill, and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1691. No one seeking recognition... excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy, is seeking recognition."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and sorry for being late.
Will the Gentleman yield?"

Mautino: "He indicates he will."

McCarthy: "Representative, the Bill analysis states that the Illinois Statewide School Management Alliance is an opponent. Was that corrected by the Amendment we just added?"

Mathias: "Let me just look. When it was in committee yesterday, no one, I believe, no one slipped in opposition to it. There was no opposition heard. I... let me look and see if that was to... 'cause there was several Amendments to this Bill, and I believe they were an Amen... they were, I believe, opponents to the underlying Bill, which is no longer the... the Bill. This is, obviously, becomes the Bill, and my understanding here, by looking at the com... my comments, but I believe they were opposed to the original Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- McCarthy: "Okay, and would you... do you believe the same is true for the Taxpayers Federation?"
- Mathias: "Yeah, I believe... just in my opinion, no one has contacted me, and looking at my analysis, I believe, that... that they were objecting to the original Bill, which had to deal with the senior freeze."
- McCarthy: "Okay. Well, I thank you for your honesty, and if I...
 if I don't hear a comment from Representative Smith then
 I'll imagine that the Statewide School Management Alliance
 is not against the Bill any further. So, thank you."

Mathias: "Thank you."

- Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Senate Bill 1691. No one else seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, Representative Lang, Representative Burns, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1691, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1846, Representative Burns. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1846 has been a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Rea... Third Reading. Mr. Burns. Read the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burns."

Burns: "If you could bear with us for one second, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Hold that Bill on Third Reading."

Burns: "Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "Senate Bill 1909 appears on page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Holbrook. Out of the record. Page 13 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2148. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 20... 226, Representative Ryg. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 226 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments, but notes have been requested and not yet received on the Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Take that out of the record. Page 10 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1381. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act concerning alternative treatment for serious diseases causing chronic pain and debilitating conditions."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 39, Representative Bost. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits, has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Amendments 3 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost. Excuse me. Floor Amendment #3, Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. This would allow for payment of a widow if it was under 50 years old to get back on the pension system."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 39. Seeing no questions, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment is... 3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Smith. Correction. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Smith."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Schmitz. Representative Smith on Floor Amendment #4."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is language that the Personnel & Pensions Committee had approved earlier this year and unfortunately, we weren't able to... to send it over to the Senate before the deadline. This addresses one employee for the Village of Bartonville in my district. This individual is retired under the downstate police article of the Pension Code. He would like to... or is currently working as a code enforcement officer for the Village of Bartonville, has no intention to receive any pension benefits, and the only way the village can hire him currently is to do so contractually through a private

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

investigative firm. This legislation would allow him to go to work for the village and do so without collecting any pension benefits. I know of no opposition to the Bill. Again, as I said, it applies only to this one particular case, and I thank the Sponsor for accommodating us and placing this Amendment. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 39. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCarthy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

McCarthy: "Representative, as was stated in committee, there is no cost to the system, whatsoever, by adding this Amendment."

Smith: "That is correct."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking recognition, all in favor of adoption of Floor Amendment #4 say 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, would you return that Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any pending Motions?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5 was referred to the House Committee on Rules, but has not been approved for consideration."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, would you take this Bill from the record. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 80, Representative Washington. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 80, would you move this Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Mr. read... Yes, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On Senate Bill 80, Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Washington, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Washington, on Floor Amendment #2."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 80... and the Floor Amendment, it incorporates the language of House Amendment #1, which becomes the Bill. The second Amendment adds a provision to the Municipal Code indicating that any reference to maximum signatures existing in the Municipal Code shall be invalid and unenforceable. And while the Municipal Code makes no specific reference to the maximum signatures required, it does contain cross references to the Election Code, which this Amendment would invalidate. And I ask for favorable consideration of 'aye' on this Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that, the Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Mr. Speaker, I could not hear one word that he said."
- Speaker Mautino: "Will the Members of the House bring the level of noise down so we may hear the debate in process?

 Representative Kosel."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Kosel: "Could..."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Washington, would you restate what the Amendment does?"

Kosel: "Thank you."

Washington: "I just say to the Representative, that's a first, that I couldn't be heard. House Amendment #2, it incorporates the language of House Amendment #1. It becomes the Bill. The second Amendment adds a provision to the Municipal Code indicating that any reference to maximum signatures existing in a Municipal Code shall be invalid and unenforceable. While the Municipal Code makes no specific references to maximum signature requirement, it does contain cross-references to the Election Code, which this Amendment would invalidate. And I ask for favorable acceptance of House Amendment #2."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has explained Floor Amendment #2. And on that question, the Lady from Lake, Representative Cole."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. The municipal elections are the only elections in the State of Illinois, notwithstanding county, state, government elections that have a ceiling on the number of signatures they can get when they're trying to run for office. Representative Washington originally came with this Bill, making sure that independent candidates had the ability to compete with a... with a political party as Democrat, Green, or Republican. But in this particular case, removing the ceiling on municipal elections means that there's always a maximum number of signatures required, but there's no

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

ceiling by which you can be removed from the ballot, because you just received too many proper signatures. So, I... I think it's one of those anomalies that probably made a lot of sense 50 years ago, and I... I believe it really makes the code more fair amongst all elected candidates."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Washington. Read... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my colleagues on the other aisle and for us being able to work together to make the agreed changes. The basic thing was to remove any penalties that would be inflicted on anybody running for state office, and if... and if there was a requirement of maximum signatures that a person would not be penalized for getting more than enough, but definitely penalized for not having enough. And I ask for an 'aye' vote and approval of Senate Bill #80."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 80. And on that question, Representative Fritchey."

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

Representative, with the din in here, it was a little

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

difficult to hear. So, is the gist of what this Bill does, to remove signature cap requirements for any races?"

Washington: "Yes, Sir. It does take the cap off as far as the maximum."

Fritchey: "Correct."

Washington: "Yes, Sir."

Fritchey: "Now, that... that's for statewide, local, and municipal races?"

Washington: "Independent."

Fritchey: "Would this apply to Cook County and City of Chicago?"

Washington: "No... Yes, it does."

Fritchey: "Can you double check that, please?"

Washington: "I'm sorry, Representative, it does not."

Fritchey: "Okay, so let's clarify that. It does not apply, correct?"

Washington: "That's correct, Sir."

Fritchey: "All right. Thank you very much. I have no further questions."

Washington: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 80. All in favor vote 'yes; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady and Winters, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 80, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Gentleman from Vermilion is seeking recognition, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm invoking House Rule 18(g). I move for the discharge of House Bill 24 from the House Rules Committee. We are given this opportunity under the House Rules. There are at least five Members on my side of the aisle that would want a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge the measure from House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "I object."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Black, there has been an... a... an objection to your Motion."

Black: "That's... when you get a chance, Majority Leader Currie's voice is much lower than I remember it, but... Well, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, this Bill does have significant campaign finance reforms in it. I... I wish we could debate it. No Bill is perfect, but I think this one is much better than the one we'll probably be asked to discuss later on today. So, under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair. There'll be no recorded vote to discharge House Bill 24 from the Rules Committee, and Mr. Speaker, as I mo... as I mentioned to you, we would like the ability to debate our Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Mautino: "Because of the objection, the discharge Motion has failed, and you have a new Motion, Sir. Mr. Black, could you re..."

Black: "Yes, I've already made it, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Mautino: "...restate your Motion, please?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Black: "...under House Rule 57(a), I move to repeal the ruling of the Chair. We would desire a recorded vote on our Motion to Discharge, and we would also like to discuss our rationale for our Motion to appeal the Chair."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Motion will be the… 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' Mr. Black. Would you like to discuss the Motion, Sir? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong the Gentleman's Motion to override support of objection. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're within a very few precious days of adjourning, hopefully, for this This piece of legislations has... has the support of 50 cosponsors. This... House Bill 24... you might want to take a look at your analysis. Your name actually may be listed as one of the cosponsors. Now, I can't imagine a scenario where you would put your name on a Bill to support a Sponsor to bring legislation to the House Floor to debate in an open forum regarding the issue that is supposedly one of the seminal issues of this Session. And then objecting to that Bill coming out. If your name is on there as a cosponsor, and you vote against the Gentleman's Motion to Override the Chair, you're voting to bottle up legislation that you support. You're voting to allow reforms related to a number of issues that have been the subject of... of debate and intense public scrutiny over the last several months to remain in committee, rather than have its day on the House Floor. And remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're not talking about a vote on the Bill, we're talking about a

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

vote to allow debate on the issue of transparency and other reforms in government. You know, we talk a lot on the House Floor about transparency and about good government and trying to make changes and getting... getting Illinois back on the right track, but every time it comes to the point where you have to push a button to support whether or not you truly are ready to debate real reform, somebody stands up and objects to the Bill coming to the House Floor. And then we go through this parliamentary procedure whereby the objection is upheld and the legislation that we're discussing isn't even brought out for a vote. Ladies and Gentlemen, take a look at the legislation; it has 50 cosponsors. If you're a cosponsor of this legislation, you are either for it or you're against it. We're going to find out here in a minute depending on how you vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, every day on this House Floor, I've risen to talk about reform. We've talked about real time reporting so that the people of the great State of Illinois would know where the contributions were coming from, how much the contributions were, and they could look at it on Board of Election Web site. Now, we have an the opportunity to mirror system that the Federal Government uses by placing caps on contributions by individuals, by contributions from PACs , by Leadership, at

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

\$2400 from the average citizen. That's what the Federal Government uses, and from state party committees, 425 thousand. We look at the different cycles, we reduce the amount of campaign donations. How much longer will it take us to figure out that the money in politics has made this state the most corrupt state in the nation? Well, you know what, nobody on that side of the aisle really cares about We have tried to move the Illinois Reform Commission and their findings to this floor for a vote when all it takes is one person to stop it. So, when I was on a phone back to my district with my good Representative Coladipietro, we were on the phone with over 4000 households, and they demanded that the Illinois Reform Commission's finding come to a vote. What am I supposed to tell them that one of my Democratic friends stepped up and said, no, we're not going to debate the issue. that's wrong. The people in the State of Illinois have had enough. They want reform. We're five months away from removing a Governor... from impeaching a Governor. That's all been lost on everybody right now. Nobody seems to care about reform. We have real reform here. We demand a vote. There are Democratic cosponsors of this Bill; there's bipartisan support. Let's get this Bill to the floor. Let's move it over to the Senate. Let's get it to the Governor's desk and begin reform today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Fritchey: "Out of the record. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Well, this is a rather interesting Motion. The Republicans asking to discharge a Democrat Bill. Democrat Bill that does more for campaign finance reform than House Bill 7, which just came out the Executive Committee. You know, this is the time you get to vote to decide if you want to stop pay-to-play politics, because House Bill 7's going to allow pay-to-play pol... politics. You'd think when you go back to your districts every Illinoisan isn't embarrassed because pay-to-play politics was trying to sell a Senate seat. Well, this is our chance to have campaign contribution limits that are in this Bill, that far exceed what's in House Bill 7. And with the 50 cosponsors on this Bill, many of you on that side of the aisle, I would hope that you would join with Republicans and stand for real campaign finance reform, instead of a shell game that let's you set up multiple committees and take \$90 thousand a committee from the state Party or from a HRO PAC or a House Democrat Organization and funnel it into one campaign. How is the House Bill 7 going to stop pay-to-play politics? Let's go for some real limits here. Let's discharge Representative Osterman's Bill. Let's have a debate. Let's see where we all stand on trying to put an end to pay-to-play politics, because this is your chance to record your vote to be for real reform. So, I hope you'll support us. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Harry Osterman."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I'm flattered and honored that my colleagues on the other side are taking this opportunity to support this In all seriousness, I want to say that this legislation has had bipartisan support throughout this year with Members adding on as a cosponsor, and people in this Body believing that this is the right thing to do. legislation that I have sponsored not just this year, but in previous years, prior to December 9 of this last year. The people that I believe that are signed on as cosponsors of this Bill, did so and believe so, because they think it's the right thing to do, not for political gamesmanship. Oftentimes that the... not the support of their leadership. This Motion right now, while I support it, I don't know there's a necessary thing to advance what we're trying to There's going to be significant debate on this Bill. We have two days to go in this Session. Whether this Bill will be called in the House or the Senate is still an open We need to reduce the influence of campaign question. dollars in our state. That's why I sponsor this Bill. That's why I sponsor this... I don't think that we should take this opportunity to look for gamesmanship on the political side. So, thank you."

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

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, do I understand we are debating the Motion to Sustain the Chair?"

Speaker Mautino: "That is correct, Sir."

Stephens: "I would ask for a verification should it receive the requisite number. Have... have I been acknowledged?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Stephens, yes. I'll acknowledge your request."

Stephens: "I appreciate the Chief of Staff's acknowledgment."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. Inquiry of the Clerk.

This Bill is on First Reading in... in the Rules Committee,

correct?"

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 24 was referred to the House Committee on Rules."

Fritchey: "What day was it referred to the Rules Committee?"

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "January 14, 2009."

Fritchey: "Ah, but it was re-referred, I believe, in March. Is that correct?"

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "It's re-referred on March 13, of 2009."

Fritchey: "March 13, 2009. Over two months ago, yet the Gentleman bring this Motion with two days left in Session. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill's on First Reading. Pursuant to the Illinois Constitution, the applicable laws, this law would... this Bill would need to be read on three consecutive days in each chamber. Session ends in two days, and you stand here as if you have some sincerity on the issue by trying to discharge a Motion that can not get through the process in the time left in Session. You want to talk about gamesmanship with reform. You want to talk about transparency in government. The only transparency here, is the transparency of the politics involved in this

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Motion. This Motion to Discharge is a meaningless charade to try to cover up for the fact that they don't know how to move forward with financial reform. They use Representative Osterman's Bill as a vehicle here to advance a political agenda, whether than work on the policy issues that we should be facing in the two days that are left here. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a meaningless Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Republican Leader
Tom Cross."

Cross: "I find it almost amusing that the suggestion has been made that we're playing games. We have been trying for the last two months, three months, four months, several years to get numerous Bills called dealing with the issue of ethics. And we will have an Ethics Bill presented to this House later today that fails the people of this state miserably. We've had a reform commission working for the last few months. The head of that commission spoke in opposition to the Bill we're going to see today that I think one newspaper said or one State Senator said, even a two-year-old could figure out what this is all about. does absolutely nothing. I've seen... I view the Bill you call reform nothing more than a Democrat protection act. It does nothing to change the culture of ethics in the State of Illinois. And if you're at all concerned about how sincere we are, I would urge you to consider the following Bills that have been in place for most of the Session if not close to that. The changing of a primary date, filed by this side several weeks, if not months ago,

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

has been buried in Rules. The idea of redistricting... Bill Black, Suzy Bassi have had these ideas for years. are they? Buried in Rules Committee. Real time reporting: the concept of saying every time you get a contribution of whatever amount we decide on, you've got to report that to the State Board of Elections on an annual basis, ongoing Everybody complained on the Impeachment Committee that we couldn't even decide or find out who was giving money to Rod Blagojevich up until the time of his criminal charge. Those numbers and records had to be subpoenaed. Real time reporting would allow us to track contributions at the same time Bills are filed, the same time Bills are sent to a committee, the time... same time Bills are voted on, the time Bills get out of the House, the time a Governor signs it. You... you let nothing happen on real time reporting. Special elections: a Bill that we thought made some sense, you did at one point, and then abruptly changed your minds. Oh, you let that one come up for a vote and in a parliamentary move or a House Rule move, I would say, you moved not to discharge. We have asked repeatedly to move forward on a Motion and a Resolution to urge Roland Burris to resign. You have killed that. then today, we're also going to vote on a recall concept. It's not a recall Bill in any way that will allow for citizens to drive the process. It requires General Assembly action: 10 Republicans in the House, 10 Democrats in the House, 5 Republicans in the Senate, 5 Democrats in the Senate. And what that mean is, any caucus can shut down, when they want to, the concept of recall. So, for

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

anybody to sit on the other side of the aisle and say we're not sincere that we don't care about ethics reform, I find that offensive. Beth Coulson has been a Leader in this caucus and in this chamber and in this state on ethics reform from day one. Renée Kosel and Jim Durkin have joined her on the reform... the reform panel that you put together that I would suggest has done very little in real ethics reform in the waning days of this Session. think it's time to put up or shut up. There are a lot of you on House Bill 24 that say you're for ethics reform that say we've got to do caps, real caps, who say we're got to do real time reporting, who say we need to change the primary date, who say I'm for special elections, who say I'm for this, who say I'm for that. But then, when the time comes to vote, you sit there and do absolutely nothing about it. Now, you're either for reform, you're really for ethics change, or you're not. And this is your opportunity to say to your Leadership, this is a good Bill, it's a good concept, it's a bipartisan effort, where a lot of people have put time and energy into House Bill 24 and believe this will change the culture in the State of Illinois. Not the Bill we're going to see this afternoon. That does nothing. That's a joke and everybody in this chamber knows that. This is the Bill that deserves a vote. It's a Bill that deserves an opportunity to be debated. Every group in this state that's been advocating for real ethics change says the Bill we're going to see today, later, does nothing. They're all opposed to it. This is the Bill. This is the real thing. This is what we need. And if we

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

are going to make this state really different, really improve it, really care about what people think about the culture in Springfield, this is the Bill we're going to do. If you're serious though, play the same old game, follow the same old line, let the same old culture stay in place, and follow along and do what you're told. But if you really believe, if you really believe in changing what this State is all about, you'll join us in moving House Bill 24 forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Hamos."

Hamos: "Thank you. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have had a series of these Motions to Discharge Rules Committee over the past number of years, and we are always expected to answer this question, 'Shall the Chair be sustained in the affirmative?' on our side. We're expected to just follow along like lemmings and basically... and basically, take a loyalty test over and over. I maintain to you today that this particular question today is not a loyalty test, it's about whether we believe in the underlying issue, which is House Bill 24. And although I certainly heard what Representative Fritchey said about this being the First Reading and this is whatever, I think that what he pointed out is actually the main problem, which is that this was referred... this was filed very early in January. We were never able to get it out of Rules. We... it was re-referred to Rules, we were never be able to get it out of that Rules, and in six months, five months, we have not been able to fully debate the underlying issue here. many of us in our districts, campaign finance reform has

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

become the key issue among all of the ethics proposals that we are considering, and House Bill 24, for... for those of us who are cosponsors, presented a reasonable approach. We were never allowed to debate it, and what we have now, near the end of this Session is a take it or leave it on a totally other campaign finance package that doesn't at all reflect what many of us wanted. Our public is looking to us right now to take pay-to-play out of politics, to really enact meaningful reform, and House Bill 24 is the approach to get us there. And I should... I would urge people on my side of the aisle, not to just follow along and think of this as a loyalty test, but instead to consider what we're voting on, and if you were a cosponsor of House Bill 24 in the first place, I believe it's incumbent on you to vote 'no' on this Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "We've had a great amount of debate on the Motion for the shall... the 'Shall the Chair be sustained.'

Mr. Black to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At last a breath of fresh air in this chamber, long overdue. And I thank you to Representative Hamos. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, reform never starts from the top and dribbles down. Those at the top have a vested interested in what got them to the top and what keeps them at the top. If you really want reform, it has to start from the bottom and work its way up and this is our opportunity. And by the way, this Session doesn't end until January, 2011. So, this Bill has plenty of legs and plenty of life. I've been here a long time. I've been called a mushroom. I've been called a

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

lemming. At last... at last we have an opportunity to have the individual Member exert the authority by which you were elected and the Constitution that you swore to uphold. It's time for the bottom to say, enough is enough. It's time for reform. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained'. All those 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. The Chair is sustained. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, to... to clarify for my own information, how many votes were there in the affirmative?"

Speaker Mautino: "54 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'nay', and 1 voting 'present', 2 not voting. Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, if you could just give me a moment.

Mr. Speaker, to the ruling of the Chair as to the number of
'yes' votes, 54, number of 'nay' votes, 61. I want to make
sure that we've got this correct. Mr... Mr. Froehlich voted
in the affirmative?"

Speaker Mautino: "Can I ask what your question is, Sir?"

Stephens: "I'm trying to affirm... trying to... to verify whether..."

Speaker Mautino: "The..."

Stephens: "...Representative Froehlich voted in the affirmative to..."

Speaker Mautino: "There are... there are roll..."

Stephens: "...sustain the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Oh. Yes. According..."

Stephens: "Mr. Mr. Speaker..."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "...to the Roll Call, yes, he did."
- Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I had asked for a verification of the 'yes' votes, and I think I'm within my rights that you should have kept the Roll Call on the board and read the names of the affirmative votes."
- Speaker Mautino: "A verification is not required if the Motion fails. This would have... you need to have 71 'no' votes. So, verifying the... the 'yeses' on here doesn't add anything to the 'no' votes under the House Rule that you cited."
- Stephens: "Well, my problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is that I was not asking to verify the 'no' votes. I asked to verify the 'yes' votes. That's in the record and I'm within my rights. I demand that the vote be put back on the board, or we'll just through this on a point of personal privilege. I want to know if these 'yes' votes, these people who stood against reform in Illinois are in the chamber or not."
- Speaker Mautino: "Under Rule 56, the verification in this style is out of order."
- Stephens: "And I would suggest that Members voting other Member's switches is against the rules. Staff voting Member's is against the rule. And I'm suggesting that some of the affirmative votes, they either… they either are against reform in Illinois or someone voted their switch. I want to know if Representative Froehlich is in his chair and voted against reform in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Mautino: "Sir, you have the... the document, a copy of the Roll Call."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Stephens: "You're... that's entirely my point. I have the Roll Call, and I want the Gentleman from Cook to stand and say that he voted 'yes'."

Speaker Mautino: "Sir, we are not doing a verifications of the 'yes'. You're required to get 71 'no' votes. The Motion has failed. The Mo... the verification does not apply under the Rule you cited when a Motion fails."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Mautino: "Do you... wish to appeal that ruling?"

Stephens: "In... in a point of personal privilege. We had the following Sponsors of the Bill: Representative Osterman, Representative Ryg, Representative Walker, Representative Franks, Representative Crespo, Representative Froehlich, Representative Gordon, Jehan Gordon, Representative Michael Smith and others, who were Sponsors of the Bill. of the Bill and put out press releases, I'm sure, back in their district saying they wanted reform, real reform. You had one courageous Legislator on your side of the aisle who stood up to the sort of, dictate... dictatorship that this Body's too... gotten too used to, gotten too used to. want to debate real reform. That's all we want to do. We just want to see where you really stand, and once again, we're denied that privilege, a privilege of simply debating right and wrong, good and bad, real reform or the kind of reform that you're going to... you know what, who was the guy from the Collins Commission who said, you're going to pass reform, you're going to pass something. Call it reform and then call it a day. Illinoisans are tired of Democrat dictatorship, Democrat protection plans. That's all this

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

place has become. How can we make sure that you have absolute control? How can we continue to make sure that Democrats, corrupt Democrats, one right after the other, continue to get re-elected. That's what this place has become. It's a shame, it's a sham. I'm tired of it."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measure/s and/or action motions were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for Floor consideration' Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 39, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 658, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1020, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1267, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1268, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342, and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1984."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm invoking Rule 18(g) and move for the discharge of House Bill 4448 from the House Rules Committee. I don't need to go through the whole script. I can quote Rule and verse if you want me to do that. House Bill 4448, which again, has been denied a hearing, would move the primary from the current date of February. Nothing like spending a balmy February in Illinois. It moves the primary back to June. Almost every government group and reform minded individual has asked for this. At one time, we did debate moving it to September, but that

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

debate was cut short some years ago. So, I simply renew my Motion, Mr. Speaker. I want, under the applicable House Rule, House Bill 4448 discharged from the Rules Committee, so that we can at least discuss a long overdue change in how the primary could be moved. And I would further submit to you that this isn't precedent setting. During the last presidential campaign, the Democrat Majority thought it would be beneficial to the Illinois Senator, Barack Obama, to move the primary to February. It would give Illinois, perhaps, more of a say-so in the presidential primaries. It was my understanding at the time, we would move it back March when that happened, but that was I should have known better. misunderstanding. So, Mr. Speaker, I can run through chapter and verse if you want me to, but under House Rule 18(g), I move for the discharge of House Bill 4448."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Black, I have your Motion.

Representative Currie."

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

Speaker Mautino: "There's been an objection to the Motion and therefore, the Motion fails. Mr. Black."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for Majority Leader Currie. No one was happier than I when she was named Majority Leader. She has rejected me more than my first girlfriend. And I, even though that's been a long time ago, Mr. Speaker, I still remember how that hurts. And Majority Leader Currie, you're literally bringing tears to my eyes by this constant rejection. My flowers, my box of chocolates, my framed

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

picture, not of me, of you, nothing seems to work. Under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair, and there'd be a recorded vote on our Motion to Discharge House Bill 4448."

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

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For point of personal privilege. You know, this is an issue that many people in my district, even prior to whenever we moved for the... the primary date actually farther away from the General Election so that we could be one of the first whenever, now, President Obama was on the ticket in that primary. I had many people ask why in the world we don't roll it the other way, because they believe, and truly do believe, that it's true reform in the State of Illinois. A shorter primary season, less time to be... I think that... that the... a lot of the corruption that occurs, occurs because of the length of that... that time, whenever we're between the primary and the General Election. This sends... this sends a clear message that Illinois wants to be a reformed state, that they... they want to move forward, and actually stop this... this constant campaigning. Of course, I know that my people would also support it for the simple fact that, that way the ads would slow down that are always on the TV and the radio and everything in that sense. It... I... I'm a little bothered, though, by the fact that a Bill like this has to be put on the back burner, has to be blocked, go through these procedures. This procedure that I complained about so much when we first passed the rule of the House

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

that one person can stand up and object and stop the procedure of the House of Representatives from moving forward with a Bill that I believe that many people on the other side of the aisle would support. I only believe that also... I believe also, though, that maybe it is time that as these Motions move forward that Members of the other side of the aisle do join with us to override the Chair, so that we can go... be about this business of righting the wrongs in the State of Illinois, becoming a better government, and a government that's back to the people, not under just the control of one person. I support the Gentleman's Motion to override the Chair, and I ask Members of your side of the aisle to join with us. This is a sensible Bill, it could quickly come to the floor to be dealt with and move it over to the Senate."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Tracy: "You know, Governor Quinn wisely appointed a commission that studied... that appointed people from all over the state to hold hearings and have a commission on ethics reform in this state. And we have such a golden opportunity in these last few days of Session to really address what has been recommended to us, to do more than pay lip service and appear to the public that we are trying to reform. And in that commission, they recommended shortening the primary season, moving the primary to the third Tuesday of June, rather than February. And one of that reasons was, is in looking at why corruption is so rampant in Illinois among

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

politicians is the cost of elections. We've looked at campaign finance reform, and now we're looking at their second suggestion, which was to move and shorten the primary. All of us here bear the burden of corruption. bear the badge of corruption. If we don't take a stand now and do everything we can to remove the taint of corruption that holds over our heads in this state. Just this week, Senator Burris, once again, comes to the forefront of the news. Do you think that pay-for-play is going to go away? Do you think the public is going to believe that we're sincere in our effort to thwart corruption if we don't continue to address what causes us to be in such a corrupt state? I think it's wise that we take a look and ask that the discharge of House Bill 448 (sic-4448) be discharged from the Rules Committee and that we have an honest and open debate and truly seek to reform what has led us to this corruption state. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Rep... Representative Sacia, and Representative Black to close."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to speak to 4448, if I could, House Bill. I was first elected some seven years ago. I started running eight years ago, and I remember calling fellow State Representatives who were already seated and asking them how you erected campaign signs. And I rapidly learned that what you do is you buy two battery-powered electric drills with two foot bits, and you literally drilled the holes in the ground. Whenever I have an opportunity to speak at home and I discuss with the audience the amount of money that we now spend to get

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

elected to a position that is a two-year position and pays, roughly, \$60 thousand a year. And it is not uncommon to, nowadays, spend upwards of a million dollars per campaign for that seat. A big part of this reason, Ladies and Gentleman, is we're running for over nine months. If it made any sense at all, other than political expediency, I could buy in to it, but it is a senseless act of spending desperately needed money for social programs or other needed areas to become elected or reelected. This is a Bill whose time is way over due, Ladies and Gentlemen. Be you a Democrat, be you a Republican, be you Independent, be you Green, this makes no sense to continue business as usual. This is a rare opportunity for us to move forward. Let's change the primary date. Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained'. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 68 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the Chair is sustained. Page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1300, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1300, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and just bear with me one minute. The next three Bills, and I assume you're going to call all three of them, are pretty much all related. It deals with an initiative that we implemented some four

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

years ago, where we created the CLEAR Commission. And the CLEAR Commission was created... first of all, I should just tell you a little bit about who's on the CLEAR Commission. It's made up of judges, former prosecutors, people like Judge Gino Divito, Edwin Burnett, the former public defender for Cook County, Dillard, Phil Rock. So, it's made up of both elected officials and people that are interested and have been involved in government over the years. The charge of the commission was to take a look at the Criminal Code... or the laws regarding the Criminal Code in this state, because in many instances, the antiquated, some were created prior to 1960. There's a lot of duplicity in the Criminal Code, and in terms of trying to figure out what charges one should bring against an individual, the intent of the commission was to work at making that... bringing more clarity to it and thusfore, came up with the term the CLEAR Commission. The staff, and I want to commend Peter Baroni and Jim Templeton... Jean Templeton, who have served as the codirectors and have been, really, the people behind drafted this legislation, have been very instrumental, and I want to commend them on their work. And as a result of their work, they came up with Senate Bill 1300. And 1300, basically, is just a rewrite... I won't say a rewrite, but it's clarification of ... and recommendations regarding changes dealing with that part of the criminal code that defines Class X felonies. It cross references on such issues as terrorism, changes dealing with the Municipal Codes, a lot of legal stuff. And not being a lawyer, I'm prepared to answer some

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

questions in that regards, and I think my cosponsors, who are all attorneys, can also assist me in it. But 1300, primarily, just makes nine substantive changes. And pretty much everything else deals with realignment or reorganization of the Criminal Code, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have about those substantive changes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

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

Turner: "Yes, he will."

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Reboletti: "Representative, I hope to join you as one of the Chief Cosponsors up there. I know that... round number two? I mean..."

Turner: "You were supposed to be number two up there. I'll have to double check."

Reboletti: "Well..."

Turner: "In fact, Rose, you're on there as well... but go ahead."

Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate that, Leader. I don't know if you've mentioned the list of proponents of the Bill, but I... if you would read those for the Body, I think it's important that they know who... who supports this. Obviously, a lot of folks worked for many years on this, put a lot of hours into it, and these are some of the folks that were also part of it, and I think that maybe, if you could read the proponents, that would be important."

Turner: "Yeah. The Cook County State's Attorneys Office, the Cook County Public Defender's Office, the State Bar

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Association, the Department of Human Services, the De… the Public Defender's Office, the State Appellate Defender's Office, the State Appellate Prosecutor's Office is also… as I said, the Illinois Attorney General is also on board there. But, as you say, most of the law enforcement bodies are very supportive of this legislation."

Reboletti: "Well, Leader, I appreciate your Leadership. And as part of this, as I look at our analysis, and I'd heard the CLEAR Commission when I was still a prosecutor and we looked forward to clarification of the code as it continued to expand, as it became more confusing, and became more difficult to charge, to look at defenses, to look at the inequities in some of charging. As I... as I look here, and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We look at making substantive changes in the mental states, redefining what 'knowingly' is, which better helps prosecutors make an informed decision on charging. We've added to the defense of compulsion or duress in certain situations dealing with the defendant's spouse or child. We've taken care of the conspiracy cases because there's always been an issue about what level the conspiracy should be at. Should it be at the same level as the actual crime, or should it be a level less. And this deals with those inequities. We also deal with increasing the penalty of solicitation, of murder for hire, for soliciting a person under 17, to 20 to 60 years. And we've heard on this House Floor from some of our colleagues about some of the heinous crimes in the City of Chicago where children are being killed in our streets, and the gangs are involved in this, and this would be an

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

additional tool to lock them up for many years. So, I know that, Leader, that there were numerous folks who worked on this, Senate Republican staff, Senate Democrat staff, House and Republican staffers that are no longer here, but they... they put in quite a bit or work, and I continue to look forward to, not only the other couple Bills that you'll be presenting momentarily, but also, for the additional work the CLEAR Commission's going to do. And I would urge the Body's support. Thank you."

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

Fritchev: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we... we oftentimes on a too regular basis, perhaps, pass many pieces of legislation out of here dealing with changes to the Criminal Code. With those changes, come inconsistencies and uncertainties through the code, which are rampant these days. It impacts not just the job of the legal system and the judiciary, but really the rights of the accused, as well. This Bill and the next two Bills being the carried by this Gentleman are among the most important pieces of legislation we'll deal with at this Session. They will greatly help to revamp and streamline and increase consistency within the Criminal Code. It is an opportunity to put into place, the work of the CLEAR Commission, who has had some of the best and brightest on there. This represents a culmination of years of their work. It deserves our strong support and 'aye' vote, and I thank Representative Turner for his Review work and leadership in getting this to where it is. So,

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Gentlemen, I'll save the comments on the next two Bills, but this Bill and the next two coming up, please give them your strong support. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Howard, the Lady from Cook."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At a time when I am the Chairman of the... of the committee that past these three Bills out yesterday, I'm very pleased because as I talked to Pete Baroni, who you know is the director of that commission, I asked him, how is this going to help the citizens of the State of Illinois? And he said to me, it will make the law people-friendly. It'll make it citizen friendly. He says now the normal citizen will be able to read the law and understand how it applies to them. I have always been of the opinion that if people knew better, they would do better. And I think the ability to read the law and to understand it is going to make more people understand the difference between right and wrong, and I think that things are going to be better. I'm hopeful that it is going to make my job of trying to help people get out of trouble, who have gotten into trouble, a little easier. I commend Art Turner for leadership in this Bill. commend Pete Baroni and the others in the CLEAR Commission. I know it is... it is a work in progress, and I look forward to the other aspects as they come along. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Sacia: "Representative Turner, I, too, rise in literal applause to you for the work you've done. And the one thing that

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

came out yesterday in committee, and I think you were as shocked as I was, for the past three, perhaps, four years, those of us on Juvenile Justice, those of us Judiciary II, those of us on Prison Reform have asked the question over and over when are we going to address sex crimes. Now, by that, I meant, specifically, when are we going to differentiate between the Romeo and Juliet sex offender and that of an older person having sex or fondling a young child. And you and I, I believe, are in complete agreement, Representative Turner, that we were told over and over, well, the CLEAR Commission, when they bring everything together will have that. And yesterday, we all learned with pretty much a resounding 'no' that that has not been dealt with or is not planned to be dealt with in the CLEAR Commission. And I know you and I are both committed towards working to that objective, Leader Turner. And I quess, if I had a wish, it's that as the CLEAR Commission continues its work, beyond the three Bills that we address today, that somehow they would understand just how significant and important that this matter of sex offenders be addressed. I know you have mem... citizens in your district, I have citizens in my district that were charged with sex crimes when they were an 18-year-old young man, and they had sex with a 15-year-old young lady. They are now married and they're still on a... sex registry. A very unfair situation, and I would appreciate any comments you would make, Leader Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Your point is well-taken.

One, as you know, the Bills and the changes that we're

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

presenting today, it's only 25 percent of the work that the commission is intending to do. And so, the issue of sex crimes will be looked at this fall and addition to the issue of bodily harm. There are about four or five different areas that they'll be studying this fall as well as spring. As I said, but they're on 25 percent of the way The concern that you bring forth is one that certainly I'm sensitive to and thought that the commission would directly address that. Keep in mind that the recommendations that they have made, for the most part, were consensus recommendations done in a consideration without... without... well, I should say with the political concerns, but yet with the approval of all Members. There's a lot of changes, some of which are still problematic, but the issue of being soft on crime, I think, was a concern that the commission and its staff members were... well, had to deal with as they were trying to look at these legislative... proposed legislative changes. It's our hope and I think that the message that you and I would like to send to the commission today is that if we could put aside some of the political considerations and this idea of being soft on crime or hard on crime and really start to get with the nuts and bolts where there is duplicity and some redundancies within the law, that we can truly address those, but this is a good first step. And I still support the work as presented here today, but there is still some issues that we still have to... to deal with and some inconsistencies I think that have to be addressed. But the commission's work is not complete, and hopefully, as we

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

move forward, and I think as the message we send from them here today, they will, hopefully, take into consideration that the Legislature's expecting a little bit more."

Speaker Mautino: "Further comments? The Lady from Grundy, Representative Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, I want to commend the Sponsor for bringing this before us. This has been a long time coming. And as Representative Reboletti brought up, there were many times when I was in court, when he was in court, and we would read some of the new laws that would come from the wonderful people down here in Springfield before he and I were a Member of this Body, and the first words out of our mouth were, what were they thinking? But now, we finally have a clarification of the Criminal Code, of the criminal procedures that are going to be put in place in the State of Illinois. Where there were no mental states, there are now mental states. Where there were confusion that would go in favor of the defense bar, or in favor of the prosecution, those have now been clarified in the series of three Bills that the Sponsor has brought before the... that's going to be brought before the House. Finally, we have something that is going to protect the rights of the accused, that is going to protect the rights of the victim, and it's going to be right here in the State of Illinois. So no longer will we hear from the courts across the State of Illinois, what were they thinking, because we finally got something right. The only thing that is missing, and as the Sponsor brings this today, is

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

former Representative Patricia Lindner, because she spent a lot of time on that CLEAR Commission and a lot of time working on... on the laws and working on this. And I wish that she was here to see this passing today, because she did a lot of work on this, and we should thank her as well for the work that she did. As a former prosecutor, I know that you all say, oh, tough on crime, and always voting, you know, in favor of the prosecution, but I'm also very, very happy to see when I read through these Bill and read through these analysis that we're also protecting the rights of the accused. So, be sure when you go home and someone asks why you voted for this, this clears up so many questions that are in the criminal law and the criminal procedure code of the State of Illinois, this is something that we got right, and it's something that we can all be proud of. So, thank the Sponsor, thank the CLEAR Commission. Everyone should join in as the Sponsor of these series of these three Bills. We did something right, and I thank you for that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Durkin: "To the Bill. I'm a current member of the CLEAR Commission. I took over for Representative Lindner a few years back, and I just want to let everybody know that CLEAR Commission is an extremely well-balanced committee. It's made up of members of the bar, a great number of defense councils, public defenders, but also prosecutors, judges, and other public service individuals. So, it's really a great commission, and we do have some really

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

interesting debates, but at the end of the day, I think we've... we've done some really good work. This is the first of many things that we're going to ... recommend to the House of Representatives and the State Senate, and I just want to make it perfectly clear, there's no penalty enhancement in this. There's no penalty reduction, as well, but what this does, it helps the practitioner. And I echo what Representative Reboletti and Gordon said, that the Criminal Code and the code of criminal procedure and the code of criminal law is a bowl of spaghetti, and it's a mess. But the fact is, this is how we are able to at least bring some common sense to the practitioner that's going to assist not only the prosecution and defense, but also the judges. So, I enthusiastically support this recommendation, and I hope everybody joins us."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Leader Turner, kudos to you. I know that there was a lot of work over the years, and we've... when I first came down seven years ago, we were talking about the need to redo this. At that time, there was fresh... a sentencing guideline commission review that I think had been done under Attorney General Jim Ryan from the 90s, and you know, it seems like we do these every 10 years and they never go anywhere, but they're absolutely necessary, and I'm so excited today, Sir, that you brought this forward and this is going to happen. It is absolutely necessary from practitioner's standpoint. I want to, I think, thank everybody, staff, I see Jay there, everyone

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

else has worked on this. Mr. Baroni, everyone else has worked on this to finally make sense of our Criminal Code, and at this point, my only regret, Leader Turner, is that for some reason, I was supposed to be on the board with you up there, and I... I've apparently been knocked out by far better people. So, I look forward to voting for it."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And Representative Rose, the board just won't show all the names, unfortunately, but you are with me, and you have been supportive over the years. Again, I think it's been pretty much said, I think the commission itself and the makeup of the commission, tells us that any recommendations coming from this esteemed group, which is also includes one of our former Members, Representative Robert Molaro has got to be right on target in terms of trying to help us bring some sense to this Criminal Code. And simply, I would just move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1300 and urge that we all vote 'aye' on this particular Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1300. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Flowers, Representative Crespo, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1300, having received Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1267, Representative Burke. Read the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1267 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment 3."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #3 would require that production companies provide proof of a \$2 million bond in commercial general liability insurance that covers any damage injury resulting from pyrotechnic display services pyrotechnic services, provided in order to production company license. The original Bill required proof of 1 million in products liability insurance and 1 million in general liability insurance, which is the same insurance requirements currently provided for pyrotechnic distributors. After discussions continuing on the Bill, interest parties realized that the insurance the requirements were not practical for the production companies so the parties agreed to this change to make the requirements more workable while ensuring sufficient insurance is provided for. We would also add that a task force will study appropriate insurance policies providing pyrotechnic displays and pyrotechnic services. This provision was added due to the lengthy debate between the parties as to what the insurance policies were appropriate for providing pyrotechnic services in different industries. Thirdly, provides that the Bill will take effect upon becoming law, and the Bill was previously silent on the effective date. And four, would make other

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- changes for the purposes of clarification of intent and correction of drafting mistakes. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment 3. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendment."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1267, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker re... surrounding the subject of pyrotechnic displays and calling for additional insurance and just tightening up some language that was pre... previously left out. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, one quick question. I understand pyrotechnics to mean fireworks displays. As I was scrolling through the analysis, I think this is more than that. Does it have something to do with movie production, and explosions that they sometimes use for special effects or..."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Burke: "Yes, it does, and... and we are so often aware of these displays occurring within closed structures in this day. So, that was the concern."

Black: "Okay. So, it... it doesn't impose additional restrictions on those who put on commercial, Fourth of July fireworks displays. You're after a different kind of, for lack of a better word, an explosion or fire or what have you."

Burke: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1267. 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. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1267, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1342, Representative Gordon. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1342 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gordon, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gordon on Floor Amendment #1."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 just added in some things, there were some questions from the Department of Revenue, and so we just made... made their changes. We had... this Bill has to do with a grant program with... regarding intermodal facilities through the

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, and we had so that they would report information change it regarding new employees to relevant state agencies on a quarterly rather than on a monthly basis, which is already in law. So we just made it the same as it already is. didn't... so we didn't have to change it. And also in the event that the intermodal facility becomes part of a business district or a TIF, then that income attributable to the employees in that portion of facility won't be counted towards the state incentive payments, and the relevant state agencies can also write the rules to implement the Bill. And those were the three things that we put in for the Amendment. Everyone's in favor of the Bill, and I would ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning intermodal facilities. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 1342 is... starts a grant program through DCEO for eligible intermodal facility developers. This is one of the intermodal facilities that is right in the edge of my district. It also runs into Leader McGuire's district.

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

He's kind enough to let me carry the Bill, which I thank him for again as I did in committee; we were in front of the State Government Committee. There hasn't be a vote against this. What this will do is allow the grant in... for state fiscal year through 2010 through 2016. exceed \$3 million in a fiscal year or the total amount in infrastructure cost incurred by the developer. And the tax increments that direct... are directly attributable to the creation of new jobs an eligible intermodal facility developer's project shall transferred into the Intermodal Facilities Promotion Fund, which is the one that's created by this on a monthly basis. And these only available to an intermodal facility developer with a proj... project located, currently, in the City of Joliet, only because that's the only one that's currently eligible, but there are other ones that can come up later. This will make us the largest inland port for transport in the country if the pending project is approved. It's also... what's good about this is... this is not a spec... a speculative investment. There's only... the only... the money will only come through if people are actually working, and the jobs are actually created. it will bring in approximately \$2 billion over 15 years. There will be over \$10 thousand... or excuse me, over 10 thousand jobs created and 300 million new wages salaries. It's all union labor, union contracting, and the best part about it, for some of the people, some of my friends up north, that would like to hear this, it is a green facility. I'm happy to answer any questions."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 1342.

No one seeking recognition, 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. 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1342 is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, page 8 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 414, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 414 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Floor Amendment 2, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. This is an effort to try to, in our urbanized areas, make sure that our road and housing projects reflect the important priority the state places on affordability. So the idea is to make sure that in the dense areas of the state, these decisions are, to a degree, guided by the question, whether or not... so what this Amendment, which we worked very hard on with the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Department of Transportation, and the Illinois Finance Authority would just say that this should be one of the factors that these agencies take into account when improving projects in urban areas. I'd be happy to answer your questions..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved..."

Currie: "...and I'd appreciate your support."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "...adoption to Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 414. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Inquiry of the Clerk. I... I was just looking at... on our analysis here, and it says that House Amendment 2 has been included in House Amendment 3."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2 was filed by Representative Currie. There is a Floor Amendment #3 that's been referred to a committee."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader..."
- Fritchey: "Thank... I actually got my question answered over here. Thank you though."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie moves adoption of Floor Amendment 2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted in the opinion of the Chair. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 414, a Bill for an Act concerning state government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. The Bill is exactly as I described it when we adopted Amendment 2. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and I'd appreciate your support for passage of Senate Bill 414."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 414. And on that, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, would the Majority Leader yield for a question?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Eddy: "Representative, our analysis is similar regarding a Floor Amendment #3, and I... I guess my question is, was there something on Floor Amendment 3 that was going to add to this that you've decided not to pursue?"

Currie: "Floor Amendment 3 incorporated Amendment 2, but it added also a very different concept having to do with how we do capital projects. That Amendment was assigned to the Transportation, Regulation, Roads, & Bridges Committee, and it's my understanding that that Amendment is now in a subcommittee. So we're pursuing Senate Bill 414 with just the second Amendment, which is the way the Bill had been reported out unanimously by that committee earlier this week."

Eddy: "Okay. So as amended and a final action here in the House anyway, there's no opponents to this? There was just..."

Currie: "That's right."

Eddy: "...another concept that..."

Currie: "There..."

Eddy: "...may have another day."

Currie: "That's exactly right. There's no opposition."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis, Will."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."
- Davis, W.: "Representative, as I'm reading through the analysis here, this is a... do I understand this correctly. This... the idea of doing this is... is supposed to provide a better way of distribution of funds or..."
- Currie: "No, it does not... it is not about where funds get spent for housing, transportation, or what have you, except to the extent that you're making decisions that are based on density. So, the idea is to have decisions that are going to help make for affordable housing close to where people work, where they live, where they shop, and that's the point of the Bill."
- Davis, W.: "So if it's all about creating affordable housing closer to where people work, so this has no benefit to communities, particularly, in the south suburbs where we have a dearth of jobs, and unfortunately, we are unable to do things to help create job opportunities. We're not attracting companies, we're not attracting corporations, so at the end of the day, this is more of a benefit to the north and northwest suburbs where the job centers are and not the communities like mine?"
- Currie: "What it's concerned about are lower income people and their housing options. So the idea would be that if there's a transportation, a train station that the housing might better be built close to that, or a bus line, than out in the cornfield. So it would be a benefit to the

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

South suburbs. This measure came from the Center for Neighborhood Technology, and they're concerned very much as what happens in areas where there are lower income Illinoisans."

- Davis, W.: "I'm familiar with CNT, because they've worked out in the City of Harvey, but I mean on this particular analysis, again, this is not really about where the job centers are..."
- Currie: "But it... but it's not going to decide... this Bill doesn't decide whether there is housing built in Dolton or Homewood as against Elk Grove Village. If there is a plan to do housing in your area, this index might help decide where in your community that housing will be built. But it doesn't say, we're going to spend our money only in places where there is the density that is the point. So, we're... this has nothing to do with the distribution formula for transit or for housing. It only has to do with... within the community where a something is planned, making sure that affordability is one of the priorities guiding the decision."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I apologize for, kind of, focusing on the issue of how dollars are spent, and you've made that very clear that it's not focused on that, but I... I still would have to express that concern about... if it is talking about where the housing is built and... and having affordable housing. The key to having affordable housing is also having... or it being put... or having the individuals in there who can afford to live there, which means that they have to have access to jobs, and other opportunities. So... so,

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

again, going to my original statement, and just trying to understand this, while there is probably a need to make these kinds of decisions, you know, but if it's not a... put in a broader context of also where the jobs are located so that individuals don't necessarily have to travel two and a half hours to get to a..."

Currie: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...job or something like that, then I... I just have that kind of concern with, you know, what..."

Currie: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...you're presenting. So, I... I apologize."

Currie: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "I'm... I'm just reading what I... what I have in front of me. Thank you very much."

Currie: "Thank you."

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

Watson: "Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

Watson: "Jus... a couple of questions, Leader Currie. One is... is... is there a cost associated with this Bill as it... as it comes out?"

Currie: "It... Did you ask is there a cost..."

Watson: "Yes, Ma'am."

Currie: "...to the Bill? No."

Watson: "Okay. And number two is, it's... if I understand it correctly, it would be used as an index, and it'll be used as... as a way of deciding where projects go."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Currie: "It... within... this doesn't decide across the state where we're going to spend our housing money or transportation money. It says within... within metropolitan... within dense... densely populated areas, this index will help us determine within that community where a housing project might be built, where a transit station might be located."

Watson: "So..."

Currie: "So it doesn't have anything to do with deciding whether statewide monies are spent here rather than there. It has only to do with within a metropolitan area trying to make sure that the monies are spent most efficiently to promote affordability for lower income Illinoisans."

Watson: "So... So, this would not be in... in any way related to some of the moves we saw, mostly in the Senate, about shifting..."

Currie: "No."

Watson: "...the funding formula."

Currie: "Nothing to do with that at all."

Watson: "Thank you, Leader Currie."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. Just to show you that on occasion... on more than a few occasions, actually, Majority Leader Currie and I can work together and have similar views. For those of my colleagues that are downstate that have some fears and concerns about this, I don't think you need to at all. No one guards scarce transportation dollars anymore than I do, coming from

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

largely a rural district, but some of the things that we have learned the hard way in rural districts, metropolitan planning areas need to take the formula that Majority Leader Currie's Bill encourages them to look at. we've done in rural areas on occasion, is we have built senior citizen housing developments or complexes pastoral setting so our grandmas and grandpas can look out and enjoy the scenery, an occasional deer. But what we forgot, was that these houses were... these facilities were often three and a half miles from a grocery store, five, or six, or seven miles from a doctor's office, twelve or fifteen miles to the nearest hospital, and it made it very, very difficult for people to get to where they wanted to For those who will... who were still working, they obviously had to be able to drive a car, and as we age, more and more people do not, or can not, drive their own vehicle, so they have to rely on mass transit, and many of these developments were put in an area that did not have mass transit and may not have mass transit for five or ten more years. So, what often happens, the developer had to buy a little people mover, a twelve or fifteen passenger van, and you'd make various trips to and from the complex, to the grocery store, to the doctor's office, or whatever. And I think what this formula does, is to say you should into consideration what kind of transportation facilities would be available. And when you have these facilities that attracts people, people may attract retail complex or other business locations. So, I really think this is a win/win, not only for metropolitan areas, but

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

it's some... it's something that those of us in rural areas need to be more aware of. You can't divorce housing from transportation and employment needs. You can have the most beautiful complex in the world, but if it sits 20 miles outside of town, and this is where seniors go to live, you have some real problems that you could have avoided with just a little planning. I think it's a good Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 414. All in favor, vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommer. Representative Sullivan. Do you wish to be recorded? Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 414, having received Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Brauer is seeking recognition."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State you point."

Brauer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the floor right now, we have the youngest Member of Congress, and it's actually his birthday yesterday, and he's halfway to 56.

Let's give him a warm welcome back."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome, Congressman Schock. Page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 658, Representative Colvin.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 658's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3, offered by Representative Colvin, have both been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Colvin on Floor Amendment 2."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's the intention of the Sponsor to table Amendment #2 and adopt Amendment #3."

Speaker Mautino: "Was your Motion to withdraw Amendment #2?"

Colvin: "That... that is correct."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes. The Gentleman wishes to withdraw Amendment 2. So withdraw that Amendment, place... and place # 3 on the board. Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask for your consideration of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 658, which deals with a very important issue in terms of affordable clean energy in the State of Illinois. It deals with a study that is being proposed to be conducted for the purposes of building a gasification plant on the southeast side of Chicago, on a brownfield site, on the banks of the Calumet River. Gasification, it's a SNG plant, which is synthetic natural gas, which sequesters about 98 percent of the carbon dioxide that is typically emitted when you are using coal. This plant, if approved and built, first, would require a study. A study to satisfy cost... costs demands to build this site to satisfy IEPA and EPA demands for the site, to determine the costs of transporting the natural resource, Illinois coal, from downstate Illinois to this plant for the purpose of creating synthetic national gas... natural gas. Amendment #3

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

is... that represents the sole intent. This study is typically financed through a program they have at the Illinois Finance Authority, which can cost up to \$10 It's a bond program that's financed through million. Illinois Finance Authority. There's no GRF whatsoever involved in the finance of this study. Ιt reimburses the costs of this study to the corporation. In this case, Leveadia International, which has built several of these plants in the State of Illinois... excuse me, in the United States of America, including one in our neighboring state, Indiana. There's no none opposition. I'd be happy to answer any questions about Amendment #3."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment 3. And on that, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, before you have amended this in its final form in Amendment 3, there was some opposition because of some communication issues, but... but that opposition has been removed?"

Colvin: "Thank... Thank you, Representative, for your question.

An opposition has been removed. There was some misunderstanding about a provision in Amendment #2 with regard to the Illinois Power Agency and their role in the procurement of energy for state agencies. That language, which brought some unreadiness from the power companies here in the State of Illinois, has been all removed. In committee, they expressed their opposition to Amendment #2.

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

We have since taken that language out. That's essentially what Amendment #3 does, take that language out. All the power companies are in support of this Amendment, or I should say, have no position on the merits. With respect to that, the Bill moved out of committee in a unanimous fashion."

Eddy: "Okay. So, there's... there's no opposition?"

Colvin: "There's no opposition."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you. Very quickly to the legislation.

I... I hope everybody is paying attention and will support this. This has a potential to provide thousands of jobs in Illinois by using Illinois coal. We've been looking for these types of demonstration plants for a long time, and I commend the Sponsor, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment 3. And on that, the… all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 658, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Eddy really put this Bill in great perspective. We've already discussed what these Amendments do, but I think Representative Eddy's comments are very poignant. We're talking about the creation of thousands of jobs. While this plant will be located in the 33rd Representative

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

district on the banks of the Calumet River, the coal to run such a plant will come from areas where Mike Bost represents, Representative Reis represents. So it would create economy and jobs throughout the entire state, literally, from the northern tip to the southern tip. It... it creates jobs, it creates a clean, efficient energy source in... in an area where job creation is greatly needed. With that, I would simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 658. And on that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Beaubien."
- Beaubien: "Yes, just a brief statement. I'm very familiar... familiar with this Bill. It is a study, and it... there'll be no GRF money in this program if it goes forward. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 658, and the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 658, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1934, Representative McAsey. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act concerning real property. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mc... McAsey."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- McAsey: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1934 allows for the Department of Corrections to sell land adjacent to Statesville Correctional Center to Will County for the purposes of building the regional 9-1-1 communication center, and the purchase would take place at fair market value. The Bill does describe exactly... how fair market value is to be determined through three independent appraisals, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 1934.

 The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1934, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 39, Representative Bost. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1, 3, and 4 have been adopted. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Moffitt, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 39, Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was anxiously awaiting to have this opportunity. Floor Amendment #5 incorporates what we've already passed in the House earlier this Session, House Bill 1041. It passed out of here 105 to 2. What this does is goes back and gives the same

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

compounding to some of the oldest firefighters as what current ones receive. This is simply about fairness. It's not going back and giving them a lump sum. It only goes forward, and that they would get the same level of compounding, as they would have had they got it right from the start. This picks up a group of firefighters. When we started this... that Bill this year, there were 99 of them. Unfortunately, one of them died last week. The average age of these firefighters is 82 or excuse... the... the average age of the firefighter's 87, the youngest one is 82. So, these are the oldest firefighters. You've passed it before. I would move for adoption of this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Amendment #5. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 39, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 39 as amended under the three Amendments, simply becomes the omnibus pension Bill dealing with some issues, everything from a widow's benefit to the firefighters. I'd be glad to have your... ask for your 'aye' vote."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 39. On that, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Bill, but I am... I'm extremely disappointed that Floor Amendment #5 did not take care of some of the oldest firefighters living in the State of Illinois. This is the front page of my hometown newspaper, Sunday, May 17, 2009. You see these two gentlemen on the front page, and I know you can't see it, they're brothers, Hank Shouse and Jack Shouse were Danville firefighters who began their career in 1946. When Hank Shouse, who's now 87 years old, went to work for the Danville Fire Department, his salary was \$1,200 a year, \$1,200 a year. He did not have air masks. He did not have Nomex equipment. He was a hose man, so he rode on the back of the truck, outside on the back of the truck holding on to that bar. Many of you who are older will remember seeing that. They don't do that anymore. They didn't have the high-tech helmets. They didn't have any of the hightech equipment that they did... or that they do now. Hank Shouse is 87 years old. There are fewer than... fewer than 100 of these firefighters left in the State of Illinois still living, and all we asked for in the House Bill was to move this date back, the effective date, by one year. And we were told no. No. One person on your side of the aisle said, no, we'll take it under advisement. It went to Senate, and the Associated Firefighters negotiated, literally around the clock. The bottom line

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

is, 87-year-old Hank Shouse is still excluded from this Bill for no good reason other than the fact that somebody on the Democrat side of the aisle said, no, we're not going to do that. Fewer than a 100 of them, and yet, two days ago, I look up on the board and I see where we approve the attorney general investigators could buy pension credit for prior service up to five years. These are young men and I've worked on this with Don... with Representative Moffitt for three years. This is not fair. It is not fair to some of the oldest, living, retired firefighters in the State of Illinois. Hank started to work, as I said, \$1,200 a year, and he can't even get included in compound Bill, which would... which would give Hank munificent sum of about \$50 a month more on his pension. And let's just be brutally honest, what kind of a liability 87-year-old firefighter going to put firefighters' pension system? Do you think Hank is going to live another 30 years? He's a delightful fellow, but even Hank doesn't think he's going to live 30 years, 20 years, maybe even 10 years. I had three of these gentlemen in my... in my district. One just passed away earlier in the week. I... I think it's... I think it's a perversion of the process, when one Member of the Democrat Party, Majority Party, simply says, we will not negotiate a Bill that would go back six months so that you could include fewer than 100 of the oldest firefighters still living, who gave a goodly portion of their life under much more difficult conditions during their career that they can't be included in the 3 percent compounding. I'm sure this Bill will pass. I hope

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

it passes, but I'm tired of waiting. And I will not support this Bill until two of the oldest firefighters in the state, who live in my district, are treated fairly. We've waiting... Hank Shouse has been working on this for 15 It's a simple matter of fairness to Hank. it's a simple matter of fairness to me. I can't support the Bill, because I think the way it was done, while everybody negotiated in good faith, and no body has worked harder on this than Representative Bost and Representative Moffitt and the Associated Fire Fighters. But because somebody had erroneous information or had a bad day or had a headache, whatever the cause, no, we aren't going to negotiate. We aren't going to change this Bill. tremendous attitude. On behalf of Hank Shouse and what's left of his family, I really thank you for that attitude. And it's not Representative Moffitt's fault, and it's not Representative Bost's fault, and it's not the Associated Fire Fighters' fault. The fault is, the way this process works. One person should not have that kind of power to say, this is all we're going to do. I will not negotiate. Don't confuse me with the facts. Don't bring me numbers. I don't care. Take it or leave it. In this case, Hank Shouse and I will leave it."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Moffitt to close. Excuse me.

Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just on the Bill now. I just want to... I hope you really understood what Representative Black said. I just want to second his comments, and when I initially introduced this legislation,

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

is at the request of some firefighters back home, it does not include them either. So, the… we're not done. We're only doing part of the job. There's still a group from '77 to '86 that is not picked up. I'll… I'll be back asking you to do that in another Session or next… next year. It should have been done this year. This just does part of the job, and time is not on their side. And I… I think if any municipality… of course, they're… they're not even fighting. We just… it was the right thing to include all of them. Thank goodness we're taking it part way, but we will be back and ask to do the rest of the job next year. So, I'm going to vote for it, but I wished we were including all of them. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 39. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hannig. Representative Mitchell. Representative Reitz. Do you wish to be recorded? Representative Flider and Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 39, having received Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1320, Representative Turner. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1320, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of committee... I mean of the House. Let me just say that 1320 is a continuation of the series of Bills that we spoke of earlier in terms of the CLEAR Commission. This is another one of those big Bills. This one deals with the Illinois Sentencing Policy Advisory Council. It sets up and advisory council which will analyze sentencing as it's been done here, in the State of Illinois. The composition of the council will be made of 19 people. There'll be academicians, politicians, labor, law enforcement, correctional officers, people from the Criminal Information Authority. And their duties is to analyze sentences as they're being issued throughout this state, and to try to come up with some uniform policy dealing with sentences here in the state. Right now, there's \$1.4 billion spent by the Department of Corrections, and what this will do is just try see if we can do an effective... a much better use of how we spend that money in dealing with the criminal justice in this state. And I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1320. As I said, this is part two of the CLEAR Commission recommendation."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1320. The Gentleman from DuPage, Represen...

Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Turner: "I will."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Reboletti: "Leader, you had mentioned 19 people will be on this commission. I... I'm showing 23 on our analysis is... I'm just want to make sure that the number is correct. I'm showing that 23 member Illinois Sentencing Policy Council."
- Turner: "Your... your update may be just a little more current than mine, Representative. I had 19, but you're right. Representative, I think you're right."
- Reboletti: "'Cause I... I'm showing that there's 18 full-time members and 5 ex officio members. So, I think that is... brings us to 23. And to the Bill..."

Turner: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Leader. To the Bill."

Turner: "There's nine... there's nine... Go ahead."

Reboletti: "I... I'm sorry... I'm sorry. Go ahead, Leader. Make sure we're correct on this. It's 19."

Turner: "Right."

Reboletti: "I think it's important, and I hope that the council will look at everything across the board, not only from felonies and misdemeanors. I hope they look into the traffic code. We're seen a lot of problems with disparities in DUIs, issues of supervision versus conviction. I think we also need to take a look at how we give out restricted driver's permits and judicial driving permits as far as people who we have suspended driver's licenses. We have a lot of folks that are in county jail, mandatory jail sentences for driving violations. It's something else we need to take a look at, and I'm hopeful that the commission will look at all offenses and will come

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

back with some solid recommendations. So, I would urge for the passage of this legislation. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1320. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Beiser, Representative Dunkin, Representative May, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1320 is declared passed. Page 4 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 1325, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1325, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. Again, this is part three, the third Bill in this series that... recommendations from the CLEAR Commission. This deals with the issue of forfeiture. Right now, there's about seven different areas where the statute speaks of forfeiture dealing with involuntary servitude, obscenity, sex offenses, computer crime, WIC fraud, terrorism, anal... animal violat... animal rights. And so, what this particular Bill does is pull all of the forfeiture legislation into one spot where a person can go and know what... what forfeiture laws quali... qualify for the particular offense. And that pretty much sums up what this Bill does, and I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1325."

64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1325, and the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Flider, Representative Mitchell... Take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1325, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1350, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, on Floor Amendment #1."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1350 and the Floor Amendment to it are the agreed measures for unemployment insurance. As you know, we've been working with an agreed Bill process on this for a long period of time. The agreed Bill process broke down, and it was necessary to reinstate it. And over the last several days, Members from all four caucuses, particularly, Representative... Representative Mautino and I, worked very hard with both business and labor to put this agreed Bill together. With this agreed Bill, the state will receive \$200 million for the UI trust fund from the Federal Government. Additionally, we will modernize our system

64th Legislative Day

- with no… at no additional cost to employers. We will get several… seven extra weeks of benefits for the people of Illinois. This is a good agreed Bill, and we would ask for your votes."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1350. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. The Bill is as I described it. I would ask for your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1350. And on that, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative, just thanks for your work on this. I think, perhaps, we can all look at how business and labor work to come to an agreement in the... in the small amount of time we have left to get this done, perhaps, we can use that as a model as we approach a budget deadline. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Mulligan: "What happens to these provisions when the federal money runs out?"

Lang: "The... you're talking about the \$200 million?"

Mulligan: "Yeah, it sounds like a lot, but if there's enough people..."

Lang: "Well, what..."

Mulligan: "...that are unemployed..."

Lang: "...the rea..."

Mulligan: "...it's not."

Lang: "Part of the negotiations, Representative, revolved around the issues that business had that they wanted this to be cost neutral, and this Bill is cost neutral to business."

Mulligan: "So, they would continue past that time?"

Lang: "The... the..."

Mulligan: "Or we hope the Federal Government..."

Lang: "The extended... the extended benefits go to a certain point in time, I don't have that date in front of me and they end. However, the changes to the law that we're passing today, presumably, would last into the future. During the negotiations, it was the desire of the business groups in the negotiations to make sure that whatever we did was cost neutral to business in Illinois, and this Bill accomplishes that."

Mulligan: "All right. So, everyone was pretty much onboard by the time you were done with the negotiations."

Lang: "Yes, this is a totally agreed Bill."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Lou... Excuse, me. Representative, the... the \$200 million of additional federal stimulus dollars that you're going to capture with this Bill, I... I couldn't hear. Is the \$200 million going to go into the kinds of infrastructure improvements in the system or will it be used to expand weekly benefits?"
- Lang: "It would be the latter, Sir. It goes into the trust fund so that benefits can continue to be paid out."
- Black: "But it doesn't... does it expand benefits exponentially or just keep the current level?"
- Lang: "It expands the weeks of benefits, plus with the modernization, there are two small, little new benefits and I can go through them if you wish. The Federal Government, under what they called modernization, sent those four options to modernize our UI program, and we had to pick two. Part of the negotiations between business and labor was to make sure they picked two they agree to."
- Black: "All right. So, at the end of the federal stimulus money, we are not... if I understand you correctly, we are not building into our base an expanded number of weeks. When the feder... Excuse me, when the federal stimulus money runs out, then we go back to the 26 weeks."
- Lang: "Well, I don't know if those things are simultaneous, but the… but the feder… the new federal program for extended benefits will run out at some period of time."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Black: "Well..."

Lang: "Additionally, the… the sunset on the UI program is… is… will be coming up, and in a couple of years the entire unemployment insurance program in Illinois will have to be reevaluated."

Black: "All right, but this Bill then does not obligate Illinois employers to maintain the additional weeks for an indefinite period of time once the federal stimulus dollars have been depleted."

Lang: "That is correct, and..."

Black: "Okay."

Lang: "...those..."

Black: "All right."

Lang: "...those extended benefits are federal programs that they are paying for."

Black: "Okay. I... I'm just looking over an email that I received about nine days ago from a member of the Illinois Construction Industry Committee reminding me that this... this industry contributes millions of dollars to the unemployment trust fund, and he expressed his concern that this was going to circumvent the agreed Bill process, and, excuse me, I was off the floor when you started. If I understand the conversation since, you were able to go back to the agreed Bill process on... on this particular Bill."

Lang: "When you received that email, Mr. Black, the agreed Bill process had broken down..."

Black: "Okay."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Lang: "...and that's when Representative Mautino and I resurrected those talks and in about two days, we got this agreement."

Black: "So then, it would be my understanding that both labor and employers have... have come to an agreement with your Bill. All right."

Lang: "Yes, Sir. This continues the agreed Bill process."

"Okay. I... I appreciate that very much. Thank you, Black: Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think it's very important, and I... I commend Representatives Lang and Mautino and everybody that worked on this. There's a lot of misunderstanding about the unemployment trust fund. Ι often have people come into my office, constituents, and I'm sure all of you do as well, wanting to know why they were denied benefits or they didn't file an... an appeal. And I've had over the years, several workers who said, well that's my money. I contributed that money every pay period to that unemployment trust fund, and I want my money back. And I think what... what Representative Lang and Mautino have understood, the employers contribute every dollar to the unemployment insurance trust fund, hundreds of millions of dollars. And one can argue whether our system is on a level playing field with Indiana. In fact, I know we're not with Indiana, but... but beyond that. At least the employers who pay all of the benefits to... into the fund were consulted, had a chance to work through the process, and I echo what Representative Watson said. It's a shame we can't do that on all of the contentious issues that we're faced with here. If... if this can be worked out

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

between labor and management, I don't know why we can't work out real ethics reform and all of the other issues that confront us. But in this case, the process worked, and I thank you all for doing that, and I will contact the people who've written me and explain why... well, not why, explain their objections have been addressed, and it's an agreed Bill, and it deserves and 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1350, and the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Mitchell wish to be recorded? Take the record. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1350, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Place Senate Bill 1716 on the board, Mr. Clerk. And read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1716, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill's been read a second time, previously.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. A man... a state mandates note has been requested on the Bill and has not been filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1716?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1716 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, where it was held pending the filing of a state mandate's note. That state mandate's note has now been filed. No other note requests are pending."

64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. On Third Reading is Senate Bill 1030, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr... Place the Bill on Second Reading. Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Turner on Amendment 2."
- Turner: "Withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "Amendment... Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Turner on Amendment 3."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is a gut and replacement Amendment. First of all, let me... I should start off by saying that this Amendment and Bill is supported by the State's Attorneys... the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. And what Amendment #3 does, is it prohibits... it... this Bill and the Amendment becomes the Bill, deals with the issue of juvenile expungement. And it deals with juveniles that are charged with a misdemeanor as their first offense, it allows them to be able to file a petition for expungement upon review hearing to be held within a month after their eighteenth birthday. And what Amendment #1 does, is it prohibits the Department of State Police

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

from forwarding the juvenile's FBI... juvenile's records to the FBI department. And the FBI admits that this is a problem, and it's something that they accept this policy change and they support it. It amen... it also amends the Juvenile Court Act where the first-time offenders for misdemeanor only cases, as I said earlier, would be able to automatically apply for expungement upon their eighteenth birthday. The third thing it does, is that if the court finds that those records should be expunged then circuit court shall send a copy of that order to the State Police who would then expedite that procedures."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1030, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

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

Turner: "Speaker, as I mentioned earlier in the description of the Amendment, that is in fact the Bill. And basically, what it does, is for juveniles who… misdemeanors, first-time offenders only, would be able to… allows for the court to be able to process the expungement upon their eighteenth birthday. And that… that is the Bill. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1030."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Senate Bill 1030. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Bill. Ladies Reboletti: and Gentlemen of the Body, this is a Bill that we've worked on for numerous hours over the last three or four weeks. Started out with looking at arrests, and now we've looked at actual judications. And numerous times, juveniles come in contact with the system. It's very simple misdemeanors. We're not looking at any crimes of violence. We're not looking at gun crimes. We're not looking at felonies. the person's adjudicated delinquent, maybe on a criminal trespass to a motor vehicle, they complete their terms of supervision. What would happen is we're going to allow the public defender or their counsel upon taking care of their sentence to file a motion to expunge upon their eighteenth birthday or after they've completed their sentence if it goes past that age. This would ... expungement would not be automatic in the sense of it automatically happens upon that age. It would happen after a full hearing. prosecutor in the court room will be able to file an if there were objection any new cases, any adjudications, or any new arrests. So, there'll be an opportunity to be heard; the juvenile will have due process, will have counsel. The state's attorney will have adequate time to make the... any objections, and at the same time, there's a fee structure in here to reimburse the participants in the system, the prosecutor's office, the clerk's office, the public defender's office to defray some

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

of the additional costs, but at the same time the minor still has to appear in court on that last date to ask that the expungement occur. And at that point, if everyone's in agreement, a certified order will be sent down to the Illinois State Police, where that record will be expunged. And so, we're giving an... an opportunity for that youth to go ahead and stay out of the criminal justice system, have an opportunity to go to college, have an opportunity to go into the profession of their choice. And I think it's... it's commonly good sense, and I would urge for its adoption. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Further questions? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to thank Representative Turner and Representative Reboletti for working so hard in bringing this Bill forward this year. This was one of the main initiatives of the Juvenile Justice task force, and this is the Bill that will help young people, if they get that record expunged, to be able to go on to what Representative Reboletti said, to college or to a job or to a new life. Thank you, very much. We appreciate your support. And thank Mary Reynolds and the Juvenile Justice, all their initiatives for their strong support and hard work on these issues to help young people."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Eddy: "Representative Turner, I want to commend you, as well.

I've supported this legislation in various forms because I believe in what you're trying to do here. I worked with lots and lots of young people throughout my time in education and... and we need to have an... some kind of system whereby they don't have to live with the mistakes forever if those mistakes aren't violent, if they're... if they're misdemeanors, if... if we can possibly do it. I do have a question for you regarding any opposition at this point as... as amended. Were you able to work out an agreement so that, for example, the chiefs of police are... are they still opposed?"

Turner: "No. Representative, they're not opposed. It's a...
it's been a... a labor of love, but the negotiations have
worked out well, and... but everybody, at this point, is in
agreement. And I should... for the record, as Rep...
Representative Reboletti has mentioned, the juvenile has to
appear on that eighteenth birthday. He has to appear there
as the request for the expungement is made."

Eddy: "And I think that's obviously one of the… one of the important components of this. It maybe has removed that opposition. But on our analysis, I want folks on this side to… to understand that there is no opposition at this point, but…"

Turner: "There is no opposition, Representative."

Eddy: "...but you've worked hard on this, and I think it's time for us all to support a commonsense approach to giving juveniles a second chance in this system so that they... they can continue, hopefully, on a positive career mode and not

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

have this hanging over their heads. Congratulations, Representative."

Turner: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Rose: "Representative, if I understand correctly, there's now a provision in here that would allow the state's attorney to object and ultimately the court will decide. Is that accurate?"

Turner: "Say that question one more time."

Rose: "No... no problem."

Turner: "I didn't..."

Rose: "There... there is a provision in here that would allow the State's Attorneys Office to object."

Turner: "That's correct."

Rose: "Yeah, I... Representative, I... Leader, I appreciate the work that you've put into this, and I know at times past, you and I've sparred on issues similar. On this one, I... I intend to vote for this; I intend to support you. This does make good sense and with the protections of the State's Attorneys Office being allowed to object and go to hearing, I really think you've done a wonderful job of bringing this forward, and I intend to vote for it. So thank you, Mr. Leader."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1030. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'.

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Moffitt, Representative Mitchell, Representative Chapa LaVia, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 93 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1030, has received Constitutional Majority and is declared passed. Page 13 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1984, Representative Monique Davis. Read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1984, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill has 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 Monique Davis."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Davis, on Floor Amendment #1."
- Davis, M.: "Floor Amendment 1... Floor Amend... Excuse me. Floor Amendment #1 requires the subcontractors of instructional services, activities, or undertakings of a school district or charter school, they're covered under the Illinois Labor Relations Act. That's all."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1984. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Monique Davis."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Davis on Amendment #2."
- Davis, M.: "Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker, brings a larger group of people who are working for the schools under this section."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1984. And on that, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Eddy: "Representative Davis, I have Floor Amendment #2 and... I wanted to check to see if as written this has removed all opposition. I thought there was..."

Davis, M.: "There is..."

Eddy: "...still a little work to be done on this."

Davis, M.: "There is one more Amendment coming. I'm going to ask that it remain on Second Reading for the third Amendment to get here."

Eddy: "Well, I..."

Davis, M.: "But... but, we would just like this second Amendment adopted, and then the third one... we're going to hold it on Second until the third one arrives."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, and the Amendment has been adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Hold this Bill on Second Reading. Page 14 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 182. Representative Bradley. Out of the record. On the Calendar, page 14, is House Bill 496, Representative Miller. Out of the record. Page 15 of the Calendar is

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

House Bill 699, Representative Brosnahan. Out of the record. House Bill 746, Representative Feigenholtz. The Lady has file a Motion to... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 746. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Bill 746 is the Rapid Reintrogression Pilot Program. It is something we've been working on in the Human Services Department that's been an incredibly successful program, and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 746. And the question is, 'Shall the House concur?' 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. On this Concurrence Motion, having received 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 746, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz is seeking recognition."

Nekritz: "Point of personal... privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Speaker Mautino: "I'd like... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to recognize some people in the gallery who are making a significant sacrifice. They've come down to Springfield to highlight the social service needs and the safety net needs in the State of Illinois and to bring great attention to it. They are on a hunger strike. We

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

talked about it yesterday, but they've joined us in the gallery again today as they continue their hunger strike while we try to figure out what we're doing with our... their budget. So I want to just give them a round of applause."

- Speaker Mautino: "Page 15 of the Calendar appears House Bill 756, Representative Feigenholtz. The Lady from Cook has filed a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This, somehow, got omitted from another Bill that's on the Governor's desk. This is simply clarifying where the proceeds from penalties that are paid to DCFS shall be deposited. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 756, and on that those 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. 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 756. This Bill, having reached the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar, House Bill 797. A Motion has been filed by Representative Wait that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3. Representative Wait."
- Wait: "Yes. I just move to nonconcur and send it back to the Senate so they can take those two Amendments off. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 797. Page 14 of the Calendar appears House Bill 182. Representative Bradley has filed a Motion that the House concur with Senate Amendment #3. Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "This is a Bill that passed out of here with a pretty strong vote earlier this year. It cleans up some in incontinuity in the unlawful use of a weapon statute. There was some negotiation took place in the Senate, and it passed out of the Senate with the changes overwhelmingly. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 182. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman... Osterman."

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

- Osterman: "So, Representative, you and I had some discussion the first time this Bill came before us about the open-endedness on that and..."
- Bradley: "I didn't... I don't know if it was discussion or you browbeating me."
- Osterman: "I thought it was a healthy discussion and, you know, we may be here tomorrow, the next day, the next day, June, July, August to have these healthy discussions..."

Bradley: "Oh, gosh, no."

64th Legislative Day

- Osterman: "...but, in all honesty, the issue... I'm going to ask you some scenarios. The issue was whether you, as a firearm owner, invited someone over and wanted to have conceal and carry on there, if that's something that the Bill intends to do versus you as a firearm owner inviting someone to the front lawn of the State Capitol and both of you having conceal and carry. So, was that tightened up in the Senate?"
- Bradley: "Yeah. My understanding is, I think Senator Harmon actually negotiated this, and I believe the vote was 57-0. Is that correct, in the Senate?"
- Osterman: "You know, in all honesty, today is not the day to ask about negotiations in the Senate..."
- Bradley: "Okay."
- Osterman: "...on certain pieces of legislation. You're the House Sponsor of this Bill..."
- Bradley: "So, anyway, I was going to answer that question that you asked. So, my understanding is, is that the language was changed so that not only are you an invitee, but you also have to have permission."
- Osterman: "Not only a legal invitee, but you have to have permission. But my question is, is this... is this something where you're having a barbeque, and I'm being totally honest, at your house and you invite people over, and it's your premises, you own the property, you're inviting people, versus an open-ended thing, wherein all honesty, you could ask Representative Phelps or Bost to come on the House Floor with a concealed firearm. And I... I say that in all honesty to you and I, you know, trust your answer."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Bradley: "No, you have to... you have to not only be a... invitee, but you have to have permission. So, someone that showed up at your home as an invitee, but they don't have permission, would be in violation of the law."

Osterman: "I guess my question goes to..."

Bradley: "Permission to carry the firearm, not permission to be at you house, 'cause that is the definition there."

Osterman: "The question, though, is is... I understand that the permission side, but does it say in anywhere in there, and if you could show me the page, does it say home or legal dwelling?"

Bradley: "It says..."

Osterman: "Or is it open-ended to be anywhere?"

Bradley: "Says dwelling."

Osterman: "Where does it say that?"

Bradley: "It lets you keep a firearm in a hotel room for self defense by including dwellings as protected place."

Osterman: "So, this would then be for leg... for legislative..."

Bradley: "It does not allow people to carry concealed firearms to school functions or in a court… abode, legal dwelling, fixed place of business or on the land, or in the legal dwelling of another person as an invitee with that person's permission."

Osterman: "So, what about public..."

Bradley: "This tightens... tightens it up."

Osterman: "What about public spaces?"

Bradley: "Abode, legal dwelling, fixed place of business."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

- Osterman: "For legislative intent then, that's the only places where these firearms would be able to be carried in a concealed manner?"
- Bradley: "That's what the statute says is abode, legal dwelling, fixed place of business, or on the land or in the legal dwelling of another person as an invitee with that person's permission."

Osterman: "Okay. Representative..."

Bradley: "Pretty specific."

Osterman: "We could argue that point, but that's your intent.

It's... a... under those clarifications, it's not a public space, and I know you're looking..."

Bradley: "Just what I read would be... just what I read would be the definition."

Osterman: "So, it wouldn't be that you could invite someone to the front lawn of the Capitol and have conceal and carry on the front lawn of the Capitol?"

Bradley: "I don't think that... you're not arguing that that would fall under the definition, right?"

Osterman: "So, your answer is no that it would not include public spaces?"

Bradley: "The law is very clear, abode, legal dwelling, fixed place of business, or on the land or in the legal dwelling of a person as an invitee with the person's permission."

Osterman: "I appreciate your responses."

Bradley: "Thank you."

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

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

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative Bradley, first, I want to congratulate you on... on getting the Amendment agreed to in the Senate to... to bring it over here. I know that your intent is to clarify the fact that people have some rights associated with carrying a handgun, and you wanted to make sure that it was specific to the types of situations, I think, that Representative..."

Bradley: "There was..."

Eddy: "...the previous speaker..."

Bradley: "There were concerns..."

Eddy: "...mentioned."

Bradley: "There were concerns in the previous debate that we had about the nonpermissive use of a firearm. And so, even though, sometimes I don't act like it, I was listening. And so, those were attempted to be addressed in this, so that not only do you have to be an invitee, but you also have to have specific permission."

Eddy: "Can I... I... would you..."

Bradley: "And that... that's a significant change."

Eddy: "And you look at the Amendment in itself, and... and, specifically, it does include the wording 'legal dwelling, or on the land or in the legal dwelling of another person as an invitee with that person's permission'. You're specifically talking about a dwelling in those cases."

Bradley: "Yeah, I mean the… the definition is very specific.

It says abode, legal dwelling, fixed place of business, or on the land of a perso… someone has a lot behind… you know, if someone has property, a farm, maybe they may not be in

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

the physical building, but they'd be on that farmland. That should apply."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and, with that explanation, I think... I think everybody is clear what your intent is and, obviously, we support it and appreciate the work you've done on this."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Eddy: "I'd encourage an 'aye' vote on the Amendment and the Bill."

Bradley: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, I've got a couple questions here.

Maybe one question, depending on your answer. On the... on the construction..."

Bradley: "Just for the record, Fritchey is wearing a coat and a tie today, so I will yield to his questions."

Speaker Mautino: "We feel so much better about that."

Fritchey: "It's 'cause my casual clothes were in the wash, so I had to wear... I had to dress up. But, you know, all... all kidding aside, let's look at how this is constructed for a second because I have a hunch that the construction and the intent and your statements may not all match up. If... if we look at the language, which was inserted in numerous places without the Bill... throughout the Bill... it says... the intentions says as follows, 'or a legal dwelling or a place where he or she in an invitee therein'. So, that doesn't seem to me my..."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Bradley: "You're not looking at the right language."

Fritchey: "My under... my understanding is this came over..."

Bradley: "You're not looking at the right language. Look at Amendment #3, Representative, page 2, lines 10 and 11. And I'm not trying to be difficult on this."

Fritchey: "No, no. You're... you're being... you're being helpful, and I think this is important for everybody to have it clarified. The problem is..."

Bradley: "I'm not trying to be difficult on this, but..."

Fritchey: "I... I can't..."

Bradley: "...it's very clear where it applies to."

Fritchey: "I... I can't pull the Amendment up on my system. Do me a favor if you would..."

Bradley: "Well... I got it... you want to... you want to take... you want to look at it?"

Fritchey: "Just... Just read that one provision how is reads. If you could just read the one provision how it reads."

Bradley: "Okay. So, it says 'abode, legal dwelling, or fixed place of business or on the land or in the legal dwelling of another person, as an invitee with that person's permission'. It's pretty specific. There's no reference to public on there."

Fritchey: "Okay, then, let me ask you what the second qualifier on this just to clarify. So I... I agree. Now, I have the language in front of me now. It does... it does limit it to the land or legal dwelling where they are an invitee. Now it says, 'with that person's permission'."

Bradley: "Yeah."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Fritchey: "Is that person's permission... is the intent that the phrase, 'with that person's permission' to reflect that person's permission to be on the land or in the dwelling, or to be..."

Bradley: "Permission to carry..."

Fritchey: "...that person's... that person's permission..."

Bradley: "...permission to carry the firearms. It's a legitimate question. I think it's clear the permission... 'cause you already have permission as an invitee to be on the land."

Fritchey: "Correct."

Bradley: "So, it'd be permission to carry the firearm."

Fritchey: "Again, I don't know if it's fully specified, so I just want to make sure..."

Bradley: "That's... that's a good question. I agree with you.

That's permission to actually posses the firearm."

Fritchey: "Okay..."

Bradley: "You might've..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has expired. Would you bring your mark... remarks to a close?"

Fritchey: "Just one minute, Speaker. I think this'll be helpful for everybody. Representative, go ahead."

Bradley: "I... I was just going to say this is an important thing, so I'd like to take a little time here and finish this. So, there could be a scenario, right, where even somebody from southern Illinois might be having like a kid's party, and somebody they've... shows up, right, they need to have permission to be carrying a firearm, right, to come to your house. That's the case. So, that a legitimate... that's the intent of the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Fritchey: "Okay, now, were somebody to be charged under this, then really, part of this now turns on the testimony, not of the individual charged with a UUW, but whether or not the land owner actually gave explicit for a firearm. Is... does that permission have to be for... I mean, what if somebody says, yeah, I know you going to... I know you're going to have your handgun with you, that's fine, and then this person shows up with an array of weapons on them?"

Bradley: "I think that's something that would have to be sorted out by the courts."

Fritchey: "All right. But you... you agree that there's an..."

Speaker Mautino: "The time has expired. I will allow another minute."

Fritchey: "I... I'm not saying it's a fatal flaw, but I am saying that there exists a question of what do you know you're granting permission to, whether it's somebody that, you know, keep a shotgun in a case, you know, in the room with them when... when they're coming over for a weekend or whether again it's for them to come in with a whole battery of weapons. Hopefully, we'll clarify this maybe somewhere down the road."

Bradley: "I think if we can get you a FOID card, it might become more clear."

Fritchey: "All right. I appreciate your answers. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Graham, the Lady from Cook."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Graham: "Representative."

Bradley: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Graham: "I... I've been trying to listen to listen to the legislation, your presentation. I have been unsuccessful to hear clearly, kind of a little bit of the discussion that has taken place. So, again, what does..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Graham: "...this piece of legislation do?"

Bradley: "Basically, it corrects an inconsistency or a confusion that took place with the Appellate Court ruling in the 1st District of Illinois and makes it clear that if someone possesses a firearm at an abode, a legal dwelling, or fixed place of business or on the land or in the legal dwelling of another person as an invitee, and with that person's permission, that they can not be charged with unlawful use of a weapon. And so, I remember when we had... you and I had this discussion the previous time, you had legitimate concerns about somebody showing up to someone else's house as an invitee, but not having permission to possess a firearm."

Graham: "Yes."

Bradley: "And so, that's why that language was added, so that it's clear that just 'cause you invite somebody to your house doesn't mean that they have a right to bring a firearm with them, unless they have your specific permission to do that."

Graham: "Thank you, Representative. I'm glad that you took some of my concerns under consideration when you presented this piece of legislation before, but how might you secure the permission of the individual?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Bradley: "I would assume that that could be a question of fact, if in fact, it got preceded to the case, so..."

Graham: "So, in your legislation, does a person have to give you written..."

Bradley: "That's not set forth."

Graham: "...permission?"

Bradley: "That's not set forth to my knowledge."

Graham: "So, you know, and I know if an accident happens, you know, are they going to say, yes, I gave him permission, especially if something happens? Or is everybody going to back away say... you're going to say, well he gave me permission to have the gun here, and the accident happens, oh no, I didn't give him permission. So, how is that permission secured? Is it in writing, or..."

Bradley: "It... it..."

Graham: "...or is this a handshake deal? Thanks, you can bring that gun to my house."

Bradley: "It would be like a lot of other things that we deal with in criminal courts where that would be something that a jury ultimately would have to decide."

Graham: "Now..."

Bradley: "Whether or not permission, and was that permission sufficient."

Graham: "I brought up some other concerns when this legislation was presented before. Does this legislation say how you have to secure this gun when you visit an individual's house who has children in the home? Did you get that addressed in the Senate?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Bradley: "I think what this just deals with the actual potential for being charged with a crime."

Graham: "I know, Representative..."

Bradley: "That's getting into other safety issues."

Graham: "...my question is, sometimes when we present legislation, we try to put everything in it so that we can get some concerns addressed..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Graham: "...why is it. I understand clearly what this legislation does. It says whether or not a person is being... carrying an unlawful use... I understand that."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Graham: "But..."

Bradley: "I don't think it gets into that other stuff..."

Graham: "...in the carrying of that..."

Bradley: "...Debbie."

Graham: "In the carrying of that firearm, in a... in a place that you've asked permission to be there..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Graham: "...does your legislation address if there's minors on the property?"

Bradley: "No."

Graham: "It does not?"

Bradley: "No."

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

Bradley: "I had assumed that that would be something that would be addressed by whether or not permission was granted."

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

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

64th Legislative Day

- Graham: "I... I appreciate the Gentleman trying to get some of those previous concerns addressed. I, again, feel that this legislation does not go far enough to address how do you secure permission from an individual to be on that property. Doesn't ... doesn't say you get that permission in writing, that you sign off on something. It doesn't say how you secure this firearm if it's in the presence of... in the home of someone who has minor children. I respect the Gentleman for bringing this piece of legislation, and... and, I would respectfully request that this Body vote... vote 'no'. There's still a lot of unanswered questions. You guys know and I know that if something were to go down, everybody's not going to be saying, yes, I gave him permission, yes, I asked him for permission, if a accident happens. And who's to say who's the accidents going to happen to when it does, in fact, happen. I would urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Amendment #3, Representative Bradley to close."
- Bradley: "I... I appreciate the discussions taken place. I think it's been good in terms of legislative intent. I appreciate the questioning, and I also appreciate the civility of the questioning. As I said, sometimes I don't always appear like it, but I do listen to the concerns of folks in this chamber, and we've tried to address some of those concerns, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 182?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Fritchey, Representative May, Representative Mitchell, do you wish to be recorded? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 90 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 182, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 7. Representative Osmond. Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to caucus, please."

Speaker Mautino: "How long will you need?"

Osmond: "One hour."

Speaker Mautino: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 118, and Democrats in 114. The House will stand at ease to the call of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "The House will reconvene. Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair. Representative Osmond, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Ma'am?"

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you please excuse Representative Tracy for the rest of the evening?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, will... has that order. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson for the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measure/measures and Joint action Motions were referred, action taken on May 29, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations:

64th Legislative Day

- 'approved for floor considerations' Amendment #2 to House Joint Resolution 51 and Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1909."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today in the gallery, I actually have some special guests, and I would like you to help me welcome to Springfield from Terre Haute, Indiana, my aunt and uncle, Bob and Pat Tryon, who are up in the gallery behind us."
- Speaker Lyons: "Bob and Pat, have a great day in the Springfield Capitol. Glad to have you. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 932. What's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 932 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 932, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading. No Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative DeLuca, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- DeLuca: "Personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please, proceed."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce the supervisor for Washington Township, it is in the Will County portion of my district, Mr. Bob Howard. If you could please recognize. Welcome to Springfield, Supervisor Howard."

64th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Enjoy the Capitol, Sir. Glad to have you.

 Representative Barbara Flynn Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 611 can be heard tomorrow in Elementary & Secondary Education. House Joint Resolution 65 in Personnel & Pensions, Senate Bill 177 in Judiciary I, and House Joint Resolution 60 in Transportation, Regulation, Roads & Bridges. I know of no opposition to the Motion."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Any discussion?

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, I agree."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no objection, we heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor, including Mr. Black's favor, signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion is approved. The Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, we have a committee schedule. Ladies and Gentlemen, a committee schedule is being passed. I would recommend that you listen to the Clerk read off our committee schedule. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee schedule for tomorrow, Saturday, May 30, at 11:00 a.m. All committees will meet at 11:00 a.m. tomorrow: Elementary & Secondary Education in Room 114; Human Services in Room 122B; Personnel & Pensions in Room 115; Judiciary and Civil... Judiciary I and Civil Law in Room D-1. Revenue in Room 118; and Transportation, Regulation, Roads & Bridges in Room C-1. All meet at 11:00 a.m. tomorrow."

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agree Resolutions is House Resolution 479, offered by Representative Mathias. House Resolution 481, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 482, offered by Representative Rose. House Resolution 483, offered by Representative Flider. House Resolution 484, offered by Representative Cultra. House Resolution 485, offered by Representative Reitz. House Resolution 486, offered by Representative Coladipietro. House Resolution 487, offered by Representative Black. House Resolution 488, offered by Representative Tryon and House Resolution 489, offered by Representative Sacia."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Saturday, May 30. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Yeah, that's fine."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned. Representative Black, do you have something prior to the Adjournment Resolution? Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, they're several of us who, I'm sorry, was on your side of the aisle trying to get some information, which by the way, didn't work. Noon tomorrow?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Lyons: "We come... we come into order at 12:00, there's committees at 11:00."

Black: "All right. With Springfield time, that means committees at 11:30, and we come in about 12:30. Right? Are we adjourning tonight or are we in recess tonight?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Motion is to adjourn..."

Black: "To adjourn."

Speaker Lyons: "...for the evening."

Black: "Do you have any idea what time we'll be in on Sunday?"

Speaker Lyons: "Yet to be determined, Mr. Black. No, I don't."

Black: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm usually in church from 7:00 a.m. 'til 3:00. So, if you figure it out, let me know, will you?"

Speaker Lyons: "We'll give you part of that, Mr. Black, but I don't think you'll get the whole loaf on that request. Seeing no further discussion, Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that we adjourn to the... allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that we adjourn to the hour of 12:00, noon, tomorrow, Saturday, May 30. All those in favor of the Motion, signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, 'ayes' have it. And once again, allowing perfunctory time for the Church (sic-Clerk), the House stands adjourned 'til the hour of 12:00, noon, on Saturday, May 30. Have a pleasant evening, everyone. Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "You know, some of the Bills were extended 'til tonight, 'til... today. Can I assume that any extensions through today will be extended through... through Sunday?"

64th Legislative Day

5/29/2009

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias, you are correct. Any extension that was dated today, will go through 'til Sunday."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You are correct."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Have a great evening everybody. See you tomorrow."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 4580, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Introduction and reading of Senate Bills-First Reading. Senate Bill 2106, offered by Representative Froehlich, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 291, a Bill for an Act concerning civil Law. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. This Bill will be held on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."