77th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The House shall come to order. We shall be led in prayer today by Senior Pastor Elder Henry Bolden II, who is pastor with the Pentecostal Church of Jesus Christ in Peoria, Illinois. Pastor Bolden is the guest of Representative Jehan Gordon."
- Pastor Bolden: "Heavenly Father, we thank You today for Your grace and Your new batch of endless mercy shed when we woke up this morning. We thank You for this great quorum of leaders, this great gathering of minds and thinkers, representing from all over this great State of Illinois. I pray today, Dear Father, You enrich our leaders with wisdom and knowledge today to conduct the business of this state in a unified way, knowing this day that many great decisions have to be made for the good and peaceful life You promised us in scripture. Finally, I ask, Dear Father, that there might be a sense of oneness and agreeableness in this historical place for this day and for weeks to come. In this we ask, in Your hallowed name, Amen."
- Speaker Mautino: "Members are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance. We will be led today in the Pledge 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 Currie."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Feigenholtz is excused today."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Fortner and Mulligan are excused today."

Speaker Mautino: "Take the record. 115 Members having answered present to the roll, the House is in order and a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' and referred to the Order of Second Reading is Senate Bill 1181."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may have your attention. We are very honored and blessed to have with us in our presence a Pearl Harbor survivor this morning. A Pearl Harbor survivor from Mattoon, Illinois, my district. If I may take just a minute to talk about Mr. Carl Browning. Carl, would you and your wife stand up? They're in the gallery behind me. Carl... If I may Mr. Speaker, Carl enlisted in the United States Navy in September 1939, was sworn in October 18, same year. He served basic training at Great Lakes here, was transferred to San Diego, where he

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

was assigned to the destroyer USS Mackenzie. While on the East Coast, he did a neutrality patrol until the ship was turned over to the British in 1940. From San Diego, he was transferred to Pearl Harbor and assigned to the USS Dobbin for six months. In the spring of 1941, he was transferred to the USS Phelps DD360. This was the destroyer leader he was on when Pearl Harbor was bombed. During the second attack on Pearl Harbor, he was on the USS Phelps as it got under way and patrolled outside the harbor. The next day, the USS Phelps joined the task force outside of the Harbor. For the battle of Pearl Harbor, he was awarded the American Defense ribbon, the Bronze Star, the Asiatic ribbon, and two silver and two bronze battle stars. After damage to the pan side of the Phelps in 1944, the ship was sent to the East Coast for repairs. Mr. Browning was then transferred to Ordinance School and assigned to the Henry W. Tucker until October of 1945. His stint was up October 26 the same year and he obtained the rank of Gunner's Mate 2nd Class. He married Pauline Cox in July of 1946. They have three children. With him here today is his daughter Carlissa and her husband Steve, her granddaughter Heather, and their great-grandchildren Kevin and Isabella. They have many other grandchildren, great-grandchildren as well who were unable to attend today. After the military, Mr. Browning owned his own company and then joined Carpenters Union in... Local 347, where he was an active member for 53 years in our community. Let's give Mr. Browning, once again, a thunderous round of applause."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. The Lady from Cook is seeking recognition, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Thank you. I rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Davis, M.: "You know yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we debated House Bill 1812 and I had a great conversation with my Italian families. And this morning, I was presented with a gift from Mr. John D'Amico, from the Italian families and I'd like to share that gift with you. It's a bakery package of... what do they call them? Cannolis. So my Italian family has presented me with a box of cannolis. And in my method of saying thanks is, Mr. Speaker, I change my vote to 'yes' on 1812."

Speaker Mautino: "The record will so reflect your intentions.

Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "Certainly."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention, please. All of us have the privilege of bringing Pages to the Illinois House of Representatives. And often they are young people from the age of, say, 10 to 15 or 16. I am joined this morning with a Page from my hometown of Pecatonica, Illinois, Mr. Don Stengal. He is 85 years young. He has been around the world four times, a tremendous world traveler and he always wanted to page for the Illinois House of Representatives. Would you welcome, Mr. Don Stengal, your Page."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Poe is seeking recognition."

Poe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like the Journal to reflect that on Senate Bill 1894, I was... intended to be a 'yes'."

Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions.

Representative Lyons, Leader Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I arise on a point of personal privilege. Yesterday, October 15 was the International Credit Union Day proclamation. We missed it by a day, but we wanted to bring it to our attention that credit unions are, of course, nonfor-profit financial cooperatives. And I believe and is here in the State of Illinois, there's a couple of million of our Illinoisans who are members of credit unions. I have the privilege and honor to serve on a credit union board. I know they're in every one of our districts in some manner. It's a policy of people helping people to the credit unions of Illinois and across the country and throughout the world. Congratulations on your day to all credit unions."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measures and/or Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'approved for floor consideration' is House Bill 1526 Amendment #2 and Amendment #1 to House Bill 1911. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance, to which the following measure/s were

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1526. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendation/s: 'recommends be adopted as amended' is House Resolution 77; 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 226. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, to which the following measure/s were referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'recommends be adopted' is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1409, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1732, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2109."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Menard, Representative Brauer is seeking recognition."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like the record to reflect on Senate Bill 1894 that I intended to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will so reflect. On page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1911, under House Bills-Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, place that... what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1911 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1, offered by Representative Tryon, has been approved for consideration.
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Tryon on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1911."

77th Legislative Day

- Tryon: "Yes. Floor Amendment #1 essentially is House Bill 1322 from last year, which set up the ability for counties to lend IDOT the money and enter into an intergovernmental agreement that the county was willing to pay 10 percent of the cost. This would allow projects to proceed when there's no capital Bill and would set up a timetable for a county to be repaid. This came out of the House, I believe, unanimously. And this is a Bill that's agreed with IDOT. They wanted some changes that went beyond what could be done in the Veto Session, and so this is a new Bill that we're going to pass over to Senate hopefully and start what, I think, would be a very valuable program where counties could work with IDOT and start projects even before we sell bonds on the capital Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1911. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Place this Bill on Third Reading and read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Tryon on House Bill 1911."
- Tryon: "I think I covered it in my... in my Motion for Amendment #1. This is, I think, this is good public policy. It came out of here unanimously in the last Session. And I would urge an 'aye' vote.

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 1911. And on that, Representative William Davis is seeking recognition."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Davis, W.: "I don't want to read too much into this Representative, but I just want to make sure I understand it. So, counties are allowed to put, is it, collective dollars into a state fund, so various counties can come together collectively and pool their money into a state fund that would help them to be able to match... create the match for receiving federal funds? Is that what... kind of what I understand?"

Tryon: "It's... it's..."

Davis, W.: "So, if I've got... if I'm the county and I've got \$100 thousand, I'm pooling my money into a state fund with other counties to create a multimillion dollar fund, so to speak and then that money will be used to draw down on federal funds and then I'll just get my... my federal money? You know... I mean, help me to under... I just want to make sure I understand."

Tryon: "Okay. In part, you'd be correct. It would allow a county or multiple counties and I'll give you an example. In my district, there's an interchange at I-90 and Route 47. The interchange is actually in Kane County, but it's just as important to McHenry County. So, McHenry County has put up \$3 million, Kane County has put up \$6 million, tollway's put up \$21 million. The only variable that hasn't been funded is the IDOT money of \$16 million. So, this

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

would allow the counties to lend IDOT and put in this fund, get the federal match money that we would be getting in order to do this interchange, start the project, and set up a repayment schedule for... for IDOT to repay the counties as they lend the money. It's a way to leverage our federal dollars. We... we give back a lot of dollars to the Federal Government that... because we don't have necessarily the money to start a project. So, this is just one of those ways to think outside of the box, where we could start a project, lend the money. IDOT knows there's a capital Bill coming and we could get it started."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I think I understand that."

Tryon: "Right."

Davis, W.: "But it certainly sounds like an inventive idea to help, you know, big projects and you say they are multi-jurisdictional because they encompass more than one county in this case, correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct, but it could just be one county, too."

Davis, W.: "It could just be one county?"

Tryon: "Right."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So I guess what I'm just trying to make sure. So, these... this state fund is just the moneys of those counties? This doesn't put any, in other words, IDOT can't put some money into this fund to help grow the pot in order to be able to say, hey, we've got a match for this big project and draw down on federal funds or is this money just money from counties?"

Tryon: "It would be just from the counties and the reason we're running this Bill is IDOT doesn't have the money. So, you

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

would be using the county money to get the match because the county's going to be paying IDOT's share and then through an intergovernmental agreement, IDOT will pay back the counties."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Tryon: "Mmm mmm."

- Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' 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. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1911 has received the Constitutional Majority and is hereby declared passed. Mr. Tryon, on page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1322. Yeah. I believe on a Motion to override. Out of the record. Page 2 of the Calendar under House Bills-Second Reading appears House Bill 1409. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1409 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie on Floor Amendment #1."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Can we go ahead and amend the Bill and then discuss it on Third Reading? 'Cause I move adoption of Amendment 1."
- Speaker Mautino: "Lady moves for adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have

77th Legislative Day

- it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Place this Bill on Third Reading. Read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1409, a Bill for an ACT concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie on House Bill 1409."
- "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The Currie: Governor has a brand new budget director, and he has requested a change in the date for making the budget address to the Legislature and to the people of the State of Illinois. This measure would enable him to make that address on the last Wednesday of March 2010. That would be March... March 24, 2010, and after that budget address, then all budget address will revert to the old schedule, which was the third Wednesday in February. I think it's important for us to get the very best possible information from the Governor about the budgetary issues we face and I think it would be appropriate for us to accede to his request. I hope you will join me in supporting passage of House Bill 1409. And I would be happy to answer any of your auestions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 1409.

  And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,

  Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 1409 as amended. Ladies and Gentlemen, this continues a

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

practice that has gone on, I think, far too long. The Governor is supposed to address this Body in a Joint Session about the budget on the third Wednesday in February. By continuing... your side of the aisle continues to move this back. This Bill would move it back to March 24. Now, that gives us two months to look at the Governor's figures and to come up with a budget. I would submit to you that in the last two years it didn't make any difference what the Governor proposes your side simply lump summed large amounts of money and left town. And we all know that that's worked very, very well. If in fact, and it's true that the Governor has a new budget director, it was your side of the aisle who insisted on that. You'll remember we discussed some length last spring that the Governor needed to fire... Governor Quinn needed to fire the budget director. I think that person's name was also included in your fumigation Bill. We didn't used to do this as a matter of course. We expected the Chief Executive Officer to address the budget issue and the House would then have almost three full months to go through the Governor's proposal: add, subtract, ask questions. The Appropriation Committees used to do real work. The longer we delay the start on the budget process, particularly in this budget year, the more difficult situation I think we will find ourselves in towards the end of May. Perhaps, a good reason to do this is that you have a new budget director, but perhaps the real reason is the Governor may be engaged in a Primary Election battle and would rather concentrate on that than delivering the budget address on the third Wednesday in

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

February. I think this is bad public policy. This Body has gotten in the habit of doing it time after time after time and if anybody on this floor can stand up and say we really and truly devote our attention and efforts and energy to trying to craft a budget, I wish you could explain that to me, because we really haven't done a very good job in the last three or four years. We have a new Governor, we should begin the budget process in February. I don't think there's anything to be gained by putting it back until the 24 of March, which gives the House literally less than 60 days to complete action on a budget. It didn't work well in the past; I don't think it'll work very well in this budget year. I request a 'no' vote on House Bill 1409 as amended."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Leader, did... have we ever had it this far back in the year? I know we... at several times we..."

Currie: "I'm trying to find out the answer. I have not so far been able to."

Bost: "Okay. I..."

Currie: "But I know that we have done it the third week in March."

Bost: "Right. I think this one is a little later than ever before."

Currie: "This would make it one week later. Right."

Bost: "Yeah. I think this one is a little later than ever before."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Currie: "Right."

Bost: "Now, the times we've done it before, I mean, last year was very sensible in the fact we just impeached a Governor. We had a brand new Governor coming through and I stood in agreement with that. But the Speaker... the actual Speaker, he was around for the writing of the Constitution and there was a reason why the date was set on when the budget address would be given. And the reason for that was most probably so that we could have time to actually work correctly on a budget. Do you believe that was probably the reason?"

Currie: "That probably is right. I think the difficulty we face today is that if the Governor's not in a position to give us good, solid information and good, solid recommendations at the point at which we would be most grateful to receive them, I don't think we do us or the people of the state any kind of service by denying his request for a delay."

Bost: "Thank you for your answer. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I have a tendency to believe that there may be other reasons why we would be delaying this and what those political reasons are, maybe they'll come out in the future, but the Governor has been the Governor now for over a year, he should be able to move forward and use his staff to present a budget to us quickly. Now, what we discovered last year, if you'll remember, we had quite a hard time coming together on a budget. We could not get it out in time. If he would present his budget, it would give us the opportunity and the time that we need, but obviously, this is important to someone, because I don't know if everyone

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

understands this or not, but this Bill was actually defeated in another committee before it moved into the Executive Committee today. And I stand in total opposition to this. I think the Governor should move forward with exactly what is set forth by the Constitution, that he should present our budget quickly, so that we, in our Body and we as the elected officials from each one of our districts, can have the input that we need and a long time to work on a very, very difficult problem. I stand in total opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Lady's Motion. You know, it's easy to stand on the floor and be in the Minority Party, the Party not of the Governor and try to make it appear as if everything, every decision made by the Governor is political. It's easy to say, well, it's about the Primary Election. It's about the fact that he just can't get his act together. You can say anything you want to say. The fact is that Governor Quinn took office at an unprecedented time in our state, an unprecedented problem with our current budget and now lay on top of that the fact that, on a daily basis, our receipts are dropping. We hear that it's getting worse and worse and worse, not only for the fiscal year we are in, but for the fiscal year that we are about to, in the spring, begin to discuss. I think the Governor, if he was on the floor, would say to you that he would like to do this earlier. It certainly would be better to do it earlier, but how do you put a

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

budget together when you don't know what the revenue picture is going to be? How do you put a budget together when we haven't figured out how we're going to fill the holes in this year's budget? And so you can call it politics, you can call it whatever you want, but the facts are that Governor Quinn's in virtually an impossible situation in terms of trying to create next year's budget, when we don't know yet how we're going to finish this year's budget: what those numbers are going to be, how we're going to pay for the MAP grants that we authorized yesterday, how we're going to take care of the mentally ill and those with developmental disabilities and all those other groups of people who are suffering under the budget that we're currently living under. So, you can talk politics and it's unfortunate that many do, but this isn't about politics. This is about trying to craft a budget for the State of Illinois. Yes, it will mean that we'll have to do our work a little more quickly, but it doesn't mean we can't start to do our work. It doesn't mean we can't start the process of taking a look at what's going on in state agencies and be critical where it's appropriate to be critical. But it does mean that if you want a good product to come out of the Governor's Office this particular year, I think he needs a little more time to do it. I would urge 'aye' votes."

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

Franks: "Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to speak to the Bill. I appreciate the prior comments. And I don't

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

see this as a partisan issue. I see this as a fiscal issue. I rise in opposition to this Bill. Right now, our bills that we owe state vendors are over \$3 billion behind... \$4 billion behind almost. Let me repeat that. We're between 3 and 4 billion dollars behind on paying our vendors. As a result, our state contractors are laying off employees, which is the result... means that we'll get less tax revenues because less people are employed. Our latest fiscal numbers show that in the first quarter our receipts are down over \$340 million dollars. The Governor said two days ago that he thought that we were going to receive \$900 million less than projected. That's almost a billion dollars extra in the hole. Now yesterday, we appropriated over \$200 million for the MAP grant program without any clear way to pay for it. So, as of this week, we have an additional billion dollar deficit on top of our already projected \$11 billion deficit. So now, we're looking at a \$12 billion deficit and the answer has been to delay, to borrow, and to not pay our vendors. Now we're told that we're not going to have real focus on the budget issue until sometime in February, after the Primary, which is seven months into our fiscal year, to talk about trying to deal with this year's fiscal budget. That is not sound public policy, and we should not enable this of behavior. Instead, we should type accountability. Now, we've been spending a lot of time down here talking about yesterday, the Senate passed recall, which I thought was important. And we're talking about campaign finance reform, which is certainly important. mean, yesterday, we even brought up on the House Floor for

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

a few minutes Senate Bill 600. Now, that may be important to some, but the fact of the matter is the most important thing that the State of Illinois ought to be working on, right now and every day, is our budget. And we should not be putting it off. That's irresponsible to do so. I can tell you, when you give governmental agencies additional time, they take every minute and then some. administration, I can tell you, we had a hearing in my State Government Administration Committee, back in April, dealing with the Coke/Pepsi contracts, for Representative Mendoza and I had those. We were told that we would have an answer within two weeks. Well, here it is mid-October still don't and we have any whatsoever. I've reached out to the Governor's Office after we passed the capital Bill and I said, listen, I'd like to know what's going to happen with all those other capital projects that had previously been appropriated but never funded. And here we are. We're promising all these extra billions in riches to our communities, yet we don't have any plan to pay the old ones because we've never paid for our bonds. We've never set the bonds out to be sold. So, I think that we need to get our fiscal house in order. I think we need to remain vigilant, and I don't believe that we should be giving additional time because that's not going to solve anything. What we ought to be doing is focusing exclusively on the budget at this point. I encourage my colleagues to vote 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition.

Representative Currie to close."

77th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Surely, we'd all like to get the bad news early in the season, but the reality is the Governor won't have much to tell us the third Wednesday in February. It seems to be appropriate for us to accede to his request that he come and tell us what the budget news is the fourth Wednesday in March, March 24, 2010. That will give us the time we need to craft a budget and to do... to make him come earlier with nothing to report will not help us craft a budget anytime sooner or in any better shape. I think as a matter of courtesy to the Chief Executive of this state who has been in office less than nine months, who has a brand new budget director, I think the only appropriate vote on this Bill is 'yes'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 1409. 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. 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1409 is declared passed. Representative Currie, this Bill, after checking the Bill, requires 71 votes. And so this Bill ... Representative Currie on House Bill 1409, this legislation will take 71 votes."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I request Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "It's granted. Mr. Clerk, put the bill on Postponed. Page 2 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1526.

  The Clerk, what's the… what's the status of 1526?"

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1526 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 2, both offered by Representative Lang, have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang on Floor Amendment 1."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, Floor Amendment #1 would provide an EDGE. The ability for Navistar to get an EDGE tax credit. Navistar has many, many jobs in the State of Illinois, and this would allow them to bring people in from the State of Indiana. And at a time where we need as many jobs as we can find in our state to improve our economics, to provide for economic growth and development of our state, it's a good thing to do. As far as I know, there's no opposition to this Bill. There was none in committee that I recall. And I would ask your support on the Amendment."

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

Eddy: "Inquiry of the chair."

Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry."

Eddy: "It's my understanding that Amendment 2 becomes the Bill.

Could we get the status of Amendment #2?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Actually, I thought Amendment 2 was technical, but bear with me a moment."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "One moment, please. Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw Amendment #1, move on to Amendment 2."

77th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 1.

  Representative Lang on Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1526."
- Lang: "Thank you. I've already explained it, previously. I would ask your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that question, Representative Connelly."
- Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of this statute... of this Amendment. For far too long, the State of Illinois has been a net exporter of investment, people and jobs. Today, in particular, to the State of Indiana and their great Governor, Mitch Daniels, we take a shot across the bow. We're bringing 800 jobs from Indiana to Illinois. This is a tremendous economic development project for Illinois, for my region, northern Illinois. In many ways, I feel like a fan of the Detroit Lions today. The Detroit Lions can't possibly think about the Super Bowl until they win a game. Well, they won a game a few weeks ago. We can't possibly look at Illinois as a great economic development state until we do things like this, bringing 800 jobs to Illinois. This is step one. This is like winning our first game. I ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

77th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1526, a Bill for an act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. You heard the explanation. I would move for the passage of House Bill 1526."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 1526. And on that question, Representative McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."
- McCarthy: "Representative, the analysis that we have on our computer says that the cost is 4 million per year for 10 years. Do you agree with that?"
- Lang: "That's correct. And the analysis further... not the analysis you have, but the analysis I have would further indicate that over the 10-year period, we would gain over \$100 million as a result of this Bill."
- McCarthy: "And the \$100 million will be in what form? Is that property taxes? Sales taxes?"
- Lang: "Sales taxes and income taxes, Sir."
- McCarthy: "Does the sales tax... I mean, they're going to make products that will go into the retail market in Illinois?"
- Lang: "That is correct. This would include direct sales taxes related to the jobs created and the jobs preserved, as well as, sales that are in the market place."
- McCarthy: "Can you tell me what percent you use of their total sales that you estimated would be retail sales in our state as opposed to the other 50 states?"

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Lang: "I don't have that, Sir."

McCarthy: "But you are allowing for that? It's not total sales."

Lang: "The estimate I..."

McCarthy: "You're not counting of all in Illinois right away."

Lang: "I can only tell you that the estimate I have from Ernst & Young, who was hired by Navistar to look into this, estimates \$115 million to the State over 10 years as a result of passing this legislation."

McCarthy: "And would there be additional money that would also go to like counties and cities or is it just... there's 115 million include all forms of Government?"

Lang: "I don't think I can answer your question, but this just says income and sales."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Lang: "So, I presume that there would be some additional dollars to counties and cities."

McCarthy: "And I didn't, maybe, listen as well as I should, but that \$115 million, is that over the same 10-year period they're talking about?"

Lang: "Yes, it is, Sir."

McCarthy: "So it's a net plus of about 75 million?"

Lang: "That's correct."

McCarthy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favors vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting

77th Legislative Day

- 'present', House Bill 1526, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost is seeking recognition."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd like to add Representative Biggins to the excused Roll Call, if we could, please."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, please add Representative Biggins.

  On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second

  Reading, appears Senate Bill 1732. Mr. Clerk, what's the

  status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1732 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie on Floor Amendment #3."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the house. I move adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1732. And then, I hope we can discuss it on Third Reading after we adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie 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 Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1732, a Bill for act concerning State Government. Third reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that is a trailer Bill to the procurement changes that we made during the Spring Session. I think we unanimously voted for them, but there are problems with the timetable in the original Bill. The Governor believes he will not have time to make some of the appointments that he's required to make under the Bill by the first of January and the execu... ex... Executive Ethics Commission is tasked with appointing a number of chief procurement officers; they, too, have requested a delay. So, what this measure would do it makes no substantive changes, but says that the effective date of the Bill will be moved to July 1, 2010. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I hope you will join me in voting for this measure so that when our reforms go into effect, they do so exactly the way we intended them."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Thank you. Majority Leader Currie, it's my understanding that there have been some negotiations going on with the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce regarding some procurement reporting... Excuse me. ...some reporting requirements that they're concerned about. If... if the... well, I guess we'll just cut to the chase. They are under the impression that there will be a Bill, a trailer Bill, run during the last week of Veto Session, which is a week

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

after next, that would address their concerns about the reporting requirements. Is that your understanding?"

Currie: "My understanding there's a... discussions are proceeding on that issue and I am hopeful that we're able to come to precisely the resolution you're encouraging by the time we come back here in a week and a half."

Black: "All right. I..."

Currie: "But that would not be a trailer Bill to... to the old Senate Bill 51. That would be a trailer Bill to the pay to play language. It would not affect any of the underlying language in this Bill, the one that this is trailered to that we adopted last spring."

Black: "If... if we don't do a... a trailer Bill some of the reporting requirements become somewhat onerous."

Currie: "Right. But I think those are reporting requirements that are in current law under the pay to play legislation we adopted not last spring but a year before then. And tho... that isn't to say that I'm not... that I'm being dismissive of your concerns. I'm not at all dismissive of them, but they're really not about Senate Bill 51. They're about a Bill that is already law and I know that the proponents of the changes would like those to go into effect... the changes they want, they'd like those to go into effect before January 1, 2010. I can appreciate their perspective. We are working on it and I hope that we're able to do that when we return to Springfield the week after next."

Black: "All right. Because it... it's my understanding that the chamber was given some reasonable assurance by your staff

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

that negotiations were continuing, they were amicable discussions and that they felt that legislation would, in fact, be able to be considered in that last Veto week. So, is it fair to assume that, in fact, it is... is ongoing and..."

Currie: "But... But my... yeah."

Black: "...barring some unexpected difficulty may very well happen?"

Currie: "That is exactly right. My understanding is that there is agreement on the language. But that's... it is not the subject of this Bill because this Bill deals with another whole issue."

Black: "All right. Well, Majority Leader, I've always found your word to be good. We... we obviously have some concerns with... with the language. I know Representative Watson has some... has heard from some of the road builders in his district that some of the language certainly needs to be clarified if not in fact changed, because the reporting requirements would simply put a burden on them that they many not be able to meet and they certainly would not want to be barred from state contracts if they're unable to do that and perhaps others can make that point. I had some concerns about voting for this, but I think you've given me reasonable assurance that you will work with all interested parties. And while you and I haven't always agreed, I've always found your word to be good and I appreciate that."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Eddy: "Thank you. Leader Currie, just to... to follow up briefly. There are concerns regarding this delay and I... I think the... the delay from your standpoint is necessary because of the really difficult nature of... of implementing this in the manner the original Bill passed and I... I think it's important to note that as this... this unfolds there would be the opportunity for input and for those who have specific concerns to come somewhere with those, is it..."

Currie: "Yeah. And... and the issue that... that you're addressing the same issue as the former speaker did, then I think the answer is that that would be a different Bill because it primarily has... is a response to legislation that was adopted some time ago and is already law."

Eddy: "Do... do you have any time estimate as to when the actual language in that trailer Bill might be before this body?"

Currie: "I am hopeful that that will be the week after next."

Eddy: "Okay. During... during the time that that language is being drafted, there are opportunities for input related to that final language by staff..."

Currie: "Yes."

Eddy: "...on... on those on our side that have that?"

Currie: "Absolutely. And I..."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, again, we're trying to make sure that not only we... we understand the intent of this, but we're going back to the Bill. Would... would you... would you be willing for just a couple of minutes to let our staff do some... a little bit of research and bri... and come back to this after about five minutes, in... in case we have specific questions

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

related to the underlying Bill that they would like to get on the record?"

Currie: "All… all… all we're doing… all we're doing is delaying the effective date of a measure that has already been signed into law by the Governor. There's nothing substantive in this Bill."

Eddy: "So it's your understanding then that by delaying the effective date nothing in the underlying Bill is going to be affected in a manner that is negative to members of the House or... or any of the underlying..."

Currie: "Right. Right... I... I wish we had known in May that the appointments of these various people would take as long as we are now told that it will and we could've just done an effective date of July 1, 2010, but we didn't know that then. We thought January 1 would be adequate. We're now told by the people who have responsibility to make these appointments that they can't get it done in that time. And so all this measure does is to say July 1, 2010."

Eddy: "Okay. Well...

Currie: "No substantive change."

Eddy: "Well, we appr... appreciate that and also appreciate the understanding that as the final language is being drafted your... your willingness to give us some... some meaningful input, that's appreciated as well..."

Currie: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "...and with that, we... your... you've always been a person of your word and we appreciate that and we'll work with you on that. Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Representative."

77th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "This Bill requires 71 votes. No one else seeking recognition. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Burke, Mendoza, do you wish to be recorded? Take the record. 85 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1732 has received a Constitutional Majority and is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Joint Resolution 77, Representative Smith."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is our twice a year opportunity to act as the giant school board for the state when we..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Smith, if you would hold for a second.

  Mr. Clerk what's the status of the Resolution?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 77 has been approved for consideration and placed on the order of Resolutions.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee on this Resolution."
- Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. Just wanted to ensure the Amendment had been adopted, please continue."
- Smith: "Yes. The State Board of Education referred 58 waivers to the General Assembly during this process. And we have to take action to deny any of those that we wish to deny otherwise they all take effect. And so we are beginning this process in the House for the first time in most of our memories. We have an agreement with Representative Mitchell and with the leadership of the Senate Education Committee. This Resolution would deny three specific waivers. The first one is by the Wheaton School District

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

and it has to do with computerized simulators in driver's This is similar action to what we have done in education. the past in denying this. The second one is from the Lake Park Community High School District #108. Thev had requested teacher eval... moving teacher evaluations from a three-tier scale, which they are currently, to a two-tier scale. And the third one is from Hononegah Community High School District 207. And they had requested the elimination requirements for classroom observation by an administrator and had asked to do that through a peer review rather than by the administrator. So, that's all this Resolution does. We deny those three specific waiver requests. I know of no opposition at this point. move for the passage of the Resolution or the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of House Joint Resolution 77. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey is seeking recognition."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He says yes."

Fritchey: "Representative, after 13 years I still have to ask this question to make sure we all get it right. So a 'yes' vote is to deny the waiver requests from the schools. A 'no' vote would be to go along with the waiver requests by the schools."

Smith: "That's right."

Fritchey: "I just wanted..."

Smith: "A yes is a no."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Fritchey: "I... you know, it... it's kind of like our pay raises. So, I just want to make... make sure that everybody understands it this time. So if... if we're going to go along with the recommendations and deny these specific waivers, which I think is probably the prudent course of action to take here, that needs to be a 'yes' vote to deny the waivers from the... from the school."

Smith: "That's right."

Fritchey: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Eddy: "Representative Smith, just very quickly. You spoke about one of the waivers that was requested and denied and it had to do with driver's education simulators and... and that has been an issue. And I just want to alert those in here who have school districts who have requested those waivers from the six clock hours. I think in this case they were asking for three hours in a simulator and three behind the wheel."

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "That those districts still, as of today, have not received one dime for that unfunded mandate. So the fact that in January there are plans to begin funding that with legislation that we passed last year that's good, but the fact is today those schools up and to this point have not received any money. So, if you have any of those school districts who… who are in that waiver request, you may want

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

to just for the... the sake of that district not receiving those funds yet try to support them. That would take a 'no' vote, if you're trying to support that district's application for an unfunded mandate. Is that correct?"

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "Okay."

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "And the... and the 'yes' vote on this means that you have supported the state board's recommendation that those requests be denied and therefore that unfunded mandate be implemented."

Smith: "That's right."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I just... th... this is a little confusing sometimes and... and if members would just pay attention especially to the districts who made the requests, I... I think that it would be in... a judicious thing to do given... given the funding problems we have in our schools to support that local district. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Smith to close."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, just simply as for an 'aye' vote to accept the recommendation of the Education Committee in denying these specific waivers."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is 'Shall House Joint Resolution 77 pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Sullivan, Boland, Franks, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the Record. 79 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Joint Resolution 77,

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Durkin is seeking recognition."

Durkin: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Durkin: "I'd like to recognize the Westchester Middle School who has joined us today. That is my hometown, Westchester, Illinois. And my office assistant, Mary LeCompte's, daughter, Madeline LeCompte has joined us today and I wanted to give them a warm Springfield welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, to which the following legislative measure and/or joint action Motions were referred, action taken on October 16, 2009, reported the same back with the following recommendations: approved for floor consideration', 'recommends be adopted' is Amendment #1 to House Bill 4599."

Speaker Mautino: "Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 382. Representative Brosnahan for a Motion to override."

Brosnahan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I... I would move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto. House Bill 382 is a nursing scholarship educator fund. This Bill received widespread support. The Governor's AV mentioned that he thought this program was duplicative and he also made it subject to appropriations. And I disagree with the Governor's actions and his message. And I would ask for a 'aye' vote. Thank you."

77th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Reprehen... Representative Brosnahan moves that House Bill 382 do pass, notwithstanding the Amendatory Veto of the Governor. This requires 71 votes. And the questions 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. 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', this Motion, having received a Supermajority, House Bill 28... 382 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Amendatory Veto of the Governor. Page three of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 226, Representative Smith, under Senate Bills-Second Reading. Mr. Clerk what's the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 226 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2 and 3, offered by Representative Smith, have both been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Smith on Floor Amendment #2.

  The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to

  Senate Bill 226. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'.

  The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk,

  further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Smith."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The Amend... The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Smith."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. an issue having to do with school district detachments and it... it is sometimes maybe a little bit of a confusing area of the School Code. But currently residents of a particular school district can petition to detach from that school district and attach themselves to a neighboring school district through a specific process in the School That process involves a petition that is filed with the regional superintendent and the board that actually makes that decision is the Regional Board of School Trustees. Those individuals are elected and perhaps you've always wondered what they do, this is one of their main functions. The problem we have and we're addressing with this legislation is that in Cook County there is no Regional Board of School Trustees and so the law provides that each township in Cook County could have a township school trustee, one trustee. Many of the townships in Cook County have decided to do away with that position. there are, affecting approximately 43 school districts, a situation where if residents seek a detachment their only recourse is to go before the Board of Education of the school district they're wanting to detach from. And so I think there's an inherent problem in that that you're not really going to get a fair and unbiased opinion from the

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

School Board of the district you want to detach from. This legislation simply says that in those cases in Cook County where there is no Regional Board of Trustees, there is no township school trustee, that the petition would be heard by the State Board of Education and there is some involvement for the state board in the current law, if under normal circumstances a petition is filed and the regional board of trustees has not acted within a ninemonth period then the state board steps in and would make the decision. So, this simply fills what I think is a hole in the School Code. It would allow individuals a fair opportunity, a fair hearing, to have this issue considered. I'd be happy to answer any questions, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 226. And on that, Representative Reis, from... the Gentleman from Jasper is seeking recognition."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we get some order in the chamber? 'Cause I bet the vast majority of people in this chamber have no idea what they're voting on. Just like the people that were subbed into committee to get this out had no idea what they were voting on."
- Speaker Mautino: "I would ask the chamber to bring the noise level down so we may hear the debate."
- Reis: "I... I'm going to go straight to the Bill and I'll let Representative Eddy ask some technical questions on this. But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is something that is really changing public policy with regards to education in the State of Illinois. We got this Bill very late in the game, didn't even have enough people to get it

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

out of committee the other day neither of the two schools come to testify. The only people that did testify were the Sponsor of the Bill and the people who were opposed to it, the State Board of Education. We ask that we delay this until next year so that we can have proper debate on this Bill, that we can hear all sides. Maybe we can try to figure out some of the unintended consequences that are going to come out of this Bill. And the more we asked for that, the more people that got subbed in so that we could get this Bill out of committee. Our question is, why do we have to do this now? We can do this next spring where we can have appropriate debate on it. There's something going on here that's... that's way beyond this. And we just ask that we delay putting this off. If the Sponsor doesn't want to, we ask that people vote 'no' on this so that we can force it into next year. This needs to have proper debate. This is about the State Board of Education getting something that they do not want. This is about people, tax bases, students being affected by decisionmakers of people... groups that don't want to do it. So, if the Sponsor doesn't want to pull the Bill out of the record, we ask for a 'no' vote on this so that this Bill can be given proper debate next year."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... need to know how many votes this will take, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "This will require 71 votes."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is prepared for just a simply a group of people who have asked that we go straight to the Board of Education for a decision. Now, the way things are done in these detachments is that the Regional Board of School Trustees makes a decision after the two school districts have gotten together and tried to work out a solution. they can't make a work... or can't work out a situation where they go to the School Board of Trustees and get a... a positive answer, then it's appealed to the State Board of This simply takes away the two districts' rights to work out the situation. There is no School Board of ... of school ... or there ... Regional Board of School Trustees, so we're going straight to the appeal process, right to the State Board of Education to make the primary decision. Then you have no appeal process. only appeal they would have then is to go into the court situation, which would cost both districts and citizens money. There's a better way to do this. We have contacted the school districts; they know nothing about this. This is started so quickly that it needs time for us understand. We are not the decision makers here. This has a local situation and should be handled locally. So, at this point, I certainly urge a 'no' vote and to make sure that we don't set a precedent that other school districts may want to try to follow as well. We're bypassing way more than... of how this situation is handled than we should So think about it long and hard. This can be handled differently and we don't need legislation for a small group

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

of people. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Spearker."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Eddy: "Representative Smith, the State Board of Education been contacted regarding their position as being the adjudicator of a local decision related to a detachment issue. What... what's their position on the Bill, the state board?"

Smith: "Representative, I believe the state board has filed in opposition to the Bill."

"The State Board of Education is opposed to getting Eddy: involved in a local decision related to detachment of property, yet this Body is going to, in a matter of three days, change public policy and invoke the will of a State local Board of Education on a decision regarding To the Bill. The Gentleman brings to this detachments. Body an issue that needs to be addressed and I'm not going to quarrel with that. There are... there are no Regional Boards of School Trustees to bring this issue to in Cook County because there isn't a regional office of education. There are also no trustees in some areas to take this question up locally. So, we have a public policy issue that needs to be fixed. The State Board of Education is not the place to fix this and the State Board of Education themselves recognize the fact that they should not be involved. We need to take our time. We need to develop public policy that still allows for local input related to

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

detachments. Most of the time school districts, if they're given the opportunity to work this out locally, make deals, they swap land, they make sure no district is harmed. the General Assembly and/or the State Board of Education doesn't have to get involved in local issues related to detachments. It's just bad public policy. On many occasions some of you on the other side of the aisle that are concerned about Chicago school districts and how those schools are closed and students are moved around without local input, without any local meetings, you've come and said let's stop that practice. Let's look for a way that local... local individuals and communities can be involved in decisions related to their child's education. On many occasions, we have agreed with you. This is the same issue on a larger scale and we're sending this to the State Board of Education. The other part of this that's interesting is we've had a year, an entire year, this is a... there's no reason for us to do this now. There's absolutely no reason that we need to take this up and in three days affect public policy related to local decisions about where children attend school. It's bad; it's a bad Bill. deserves a 'no' vote. We need to work together on a solution. I'm happy to do that. This is not the solution, Ladies and Gentlemen. Respect community input to detachment issues and vote 'no' on this legislation."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the event this Bill would get the required majority, I... I can't add

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

anything to what my colleagues have already said. I think they were very reasoned and rational arguments against it. But should this Bill get the required majority for passage, I would request a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "That's granted."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, may I also point that the board... a lot of people just look up at the board and say, well, this must be something about grow your own teachers. This has nothing to do with grow you own teacher; that's a good program. This is injecting the General Assembly into some kind a of dispute between two school districts and asking us to settle the dispute when the two superintendents of those districts said they're not even aware of this Bill. They're not even sure why it's here. The State Board of Education slipped in opposition. I don't know what the And I'd real problem is here. like to work with Representative Smith and I know all my colleagues on this side of the aisle would as well. But this is... this opens a real can of worms. And I think we should go slowly. If there's some problem that Representative Smith needs are help with, we've... we have that next week in the Veto Session and we could certainly bring it up then. But right now we just simply do not have an understanding of why the General Assembly is being asked to dis... to disc... excuse me, to decide a deannexation request between a school district and the other school district. If we start that, there... there could be no end to it. If you need a Regional Board of School Trustees, as people said, fine, we'll help Smith create that Regional Board of Representative

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Trustees. But it has nothing to do with grow your own teachers. This is a very complex, complicated issue that's come up in the last 36 hours. I think it deserves, at this point, a 'no' vote. However, should it get the requisite number we would request a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Smith is seeking recognition."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's no hidden agenda here. There's no special reason that this legislation is being advanced other than trying to address a problem that exists in the School Code. Having said that, you know, I have... have worked with colleagues on the other side of the aisle in our committee to address many serious issues, and I value their opinion. I would like to take this out of the record, continue the discussion. I think this is an area that needs to be addressed and I'd like to ask for their support and their help in doing so and remove it from any type of political questioning that might have arisen this week. So, I'd like to take it out of the record at this point."

- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, at the request of the Sponsor, remove this Bill from the record. On page 2 of the Calendar, appears under House Bill-Second Reading, House Bill 4599, Representative Gordon. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4599, has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gordan, has been approved for consideration."

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

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 is merely a technical Amendment. It just identifies what the gas use tax to identify the businesses in Illinois that are exempt from paying the exemptions and that they have to get a certificate from the Department of Revenue so that they can show the gas company that they are, in fact, exempt. The other businesses have to get that same certificate and for some reason it was left out with the gas tax. And so, we're just clarifying the statute so that they are... it's also clarified."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 4599, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gordon."
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4599 exempts manufacturing businesses from paying state taxes on their use of natural gas and electricity. These manufacturing businesses would be exempt from paying the gas use tax, the gas revenue tax, and the electricity excise taxes. What's interesting about this, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that every single state touching us has this specific exemption and we're the only one without it and that makes us a little bit less than competitive in today's market.

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

I've noticed for the past few days since I have been down here that so many people have been jumping on as cosponsors and I truly appreciate that. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote and I would be happy to answer any questions. In my district alone, which I'm probably about an hour out of the City of Chicago, I would probably say that every single plant in my district is going to be affected by this. But like I said, I'm happy to answer any questions and I thank you for your cosponsorships."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 4599.

On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wish to Representative Gordon for this Bill. Now, some of you might consider this one of those evil corporate I, on the other hand, look at it as an loopholes. opportunity, a real opportunity to entice people to either stay in the State of Illinois, people who hire our constituents who create jobs, those jobs create tax revenue. This is I think a win-win process. If you use these sources of energy in the manufacturing process, then you're going to get a tax break because you're actually making something in the State of Illinois which we need to have lost hundreds of thousands encourage. We manufacturing jobs in this state in the last eight or nine This is a positive, proactive Bill that will encourage those manufacturers currently who are using a tremendous amount of energy to create a product, when other

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

states are enticing them to leave Illinois and come to their state because they won't charge them this kind of a tax. And we have lost many companies to other states who are a little more progressive in how they treat the businesses that create the jobs that all of us, every one of our districts need that kind of entrepreneurship and... and those people who manufacture goods generally pay a fairly decent wage. I commend the Sponsor. If there's ever a Bill that should get true bipartisan support, it's this one. I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 4599. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' This requires 71 votes. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Tryon, Representative Osterman, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 4599 has received a Constitution Majority and is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd also like to add Representative Tryon to the excused list, please."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, add Representative Tryon to the excused absentees. The Gentleman from Vermilion is seeking recognition. Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Yesterday I asked if we could get some kind of parliamentary response giving us some direction on the

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

definitive... a definition, if you would, on gubernatorial compliance and gubernatorial noncompliance. How that is determined and whether or not there's really ever been a definitive court case on... on that issue. understanding that... that the Speaker of the House makes that determination. I think at onetime he did put out a... a document, but it's been some time ago. We're just curious to what... what brings about a compliance noncompliance, whether it's ever been tested in court. I realize the parliamentarian may be on paternity leave. So, it's nothing critical, but perhaps when we come back the second week we could get some clarification or maybe even a one-page summation of just how that is arrived and how that decision is made and what would constitute compliance and noncompliance. I just... a lot of questions have been asked of me and quite frankly, I don't know the answer. So, when... when you have time or when Mr. Ellis is able to do that or any of his esteemed colleagues, maybe we can address that at some point."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Black. Page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 600, Representative Lang. Read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 600, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I explained this Bill pretty thoroughly yesterday. It's a Bill about turning over to the people the power to elect everybody that's in the political process. The Republican

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

state central committeemen in this state have been elected through a nonparticipatory process by elitist in their Party and this is evidenced by the fact that since we met yesterday I've received well over 100 e-mails from Republican friends of mine in the State of Illinois who say that this is something that they would like to have done. I daresay that in the last 24 hours many on the Republican side of this chamber have received calls from their constituents because I've received calls and e-mails from your constituents. The simple matter is that you can't talk about wanting to be open and transparent and wanting to have the people have a say in the political process unless you're willing to actually turn it over to them. I've gotten much else to say on this. I'll save much of it for my closing. And Mr. Speaker, I would move for passage of Senate Bill 600."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to caucus in Room 114 immediately."

Speaker Mautino: "How much..."

Osmond: "I'm sorry, 118 immediately."

Speaker Mautino: "How much time will you need for the caucus...
are you requesting?"

Osmond: "At least an hour."

Speaker Mautino: "The Republicans will caucus in 118.

Representative Lang is seeking recognition."

Lang: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I know there's desire by some on the other side of the aisle to run out the clock. When I hear at least one hour that means to me that they're going to

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

just hide whereever they feel like hiding for a long period of time. And I would ask the Chair to give a specific time to come back to this chamber when we'll commence the business of the House of Representatives whether everyone has returned or not."

Speaker Mautino: "The House will be in recess for one hour.

The House will come to order. The Gentleman from Jackson is seeking recognition, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'd also like to add to the excused roll list Representative Black and Representative Schmitz."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, add Representative Black and Schmitz to the absentee list... excused absentee. Mr. Clerk, on page 2 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 600. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I made my preliminary comments when the Minority Party decided to go to caucus. So, I'm prepared to debate the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Leader Tom Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Cross: "Representative Lang, what is in this Bill that... is there anything in this Bill that would do anything about the unemployment rate of 10 percent in the State of Illinois? Yes or no."

Lang: "Well, despite the fact that your question is out of order, the answer is no."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Cross: "This Bill is out of order, but I asked a question. Is there anything in this Bill that does anything about the 10 percent unemployment rate in the State of Illinois today?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that does... that deals with the issue of Special Elections in the State of Illinois for vacancies in the United State Senate?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that... that changes the Primary date for elections in the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the issue of redistricting in the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the issue of recall for Members of the General Assembly?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with an area of economic reform with a variety of Bills that we've introduced that would require three-fifths votes for a tax increase?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the concept we know and have referred to as pay-go here in the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the concept of the sunshine commission, a Bill that we introduced? Yes or no."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Lang: "Not as... not as you introduced it, but this Bill is all about sunshine, Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that... but that, and the deal... the issue we have called sunshine..."

Lang: "No. Certainly not, Sir."

Cross: "...deals with the... Okay. Is there anything in this Bill that deals with property tax relief?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Okay. Anything in this Bill that deals with the… take any number you want, 5 billion, 4 billion, 8 billion, 12 billion, the hole in the budget deficit?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the unpaid bills in the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in... in this Bill that deals with the \$80 billion pension shortfall in the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the issue of Medicaid funding and the significant backlog of bills in the... for the Medicaid providers?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that deals with the issue of funding of education and the potential of some of our school districts not getting any money?"

Lang: "No."

Cross: "This is purely a Bill that regulates how the Republican Party in the State of Illinois elects their state central committeemen, correct?"

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Lang: "What it does is make up the way both Parties select their state central committeemen on a level playing field, on a Parliamentarian, to give all the people of the State of Illinois who have an interest in electing state central committeemen, whether they're Democrats or Republicans, an opportunity to vote on those people."

Cross: "It does regulate the Republican Party. Is that correct? I know you've got a staff person telling you what to say..."

Lang: "I don't..."

Cross: "...but it does regulate the Republican Party, does it not?"

Lang: "It certainly does, Sir."

"Okay. We have now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Cross: Gentlemen of the House, spent approximately an hour, hour and a half today, an hour, hour and a half yesterday, dealing with the regulation of, and the approach the Republican Party takes in electing their state central committeemen. There may be... there are people in our Party that agree with this concept. There are people in our Party that don't disagree with it. It's an issue that I suspect, you know, as I said, many... not many, some support and some don't support, and it's an issue that the Republican Party can handle on their own, just like the Democrat Party handles issues on their own. And if people want to have a vote on it, that's fine too. I would suggest though, and I said this yesterday, that I... with all due respect to the Sponsor, and I see some of the other Sponsors on there, this isn't about what's good for the

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Republican Party, or what's good for the people of the State of Illinois. And for those of you that are listening that are strong proponents of Senate Bill 600 don't, for one minute, think that on its face this is what this is about, or that the Representative that's the Sponsor here, or the Speaker of the House, cares about what goes on in the Republican Party. As we said yesterday, if you weren't listening, this is a distraction. This is a diversion. This is a message. This is punishment because we, in this state, are not dealing with the real issues of today. are not talking about economic reform. We are not talking about ethical reform. We are trying to talk about the internal workings of one political Party, not what's good for all of the people in the State of Illinois. We have a crisis in the State of Illinois, or at least 177 people in this state have said we have a crisis, both economically and ethically. We have people out of work. We have people that can't make their mortgage payments. We have kids that can't afford to go to college. We have people that don't have health care. We have an ethical crisis. We have a former Governor in jail. We have another one under indictment, and we do nothing, and have done nothing to address any of those issues. Oh, we go around the edges. FOIA. Let's regulate that big, bad municipal government that is running amuck. Let's take care of procurement, and go after the Executive Branch. Let's do a fumigation Bill and get rid of people in State Government. Let's do recall, but only affect the Governor. But yet, we've done nothing to police ourselves. Why is that? Is that because

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

the person that runs this place, and runs this state for the last 38 years doesn't want any change because he has a lot of power. He's the chairman of the Democrat Party and he's the Speaker of the House, and heaven forbid, heaven forbid, we would do anything to diminish that power. got a whole lot of that power for all it's worth. We're not going to create any opportunity to have that power be taken away from somebody who's been here for 38 years, who wants to retain that power for seemingly another 38 years, and everybody in the country, and everybody in the state says, enough is enough. The changed group, an independent body, nothing to do with us, from AARP to the Better Government Association, to the Center for Tax and Budget Accountability, the list goes on and on, says, you guys have got to change how we run government in Illinois. You need to get it. You need to make a difference. You need to take care of policing yourselves. Every media outlet in the State of Illinois says you got to do it, but yet, we don't do it. Do we not get it? No, I think we get it. I think you get it. Campaign finance, which is what this is all about along with Primary change... the date of Primary change, and redistricting, and Special Elections. The list goes on and on, but campaign finance happens to be the issue now. The real center of the issue here of the retention of power, because it's all about money, which is what this is all about. Does nothing to take away that power. It enhances that power. It gives the man who's been here for 38 years even more power, and we're going to create all these little diversions so we don't talk about

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

the real issue. This is our... this is our state. This is our General Assembly, and you're conceding, and giving, and allowing one person, one man out of 12 million people to control what goes on in this state. One man out of 12 million people decides whether a Bill gets called. One man out of 12 million people decides whether or not we're going to vote on economic and ethical reforms in the State of Illinois, and to this date, he has said, no, and you are allowing that to happen. Well, we'll go back in this backroom, like we go and do all the other times, and we'll decide that those... those guys over there questioned us. How dare they. This isn't their Body. This is our Body, and we're going to show them that they can't do that. We'll call a little Bill that's divisive in the Republican Party. We'll call or cause a little cons... consternation. And so, we've now wasted three hours, and we haven't talked about those people that are unemployed. We haven't talked about the \$10 billion budget hole. We haven't talked about the \$80 billion the pension system's underfunded. We haven't talking about... talked about a broken Medicaid system. We haven't talked about any of the things we've wanted to talk about except this. This Bill does nothing to address any of our issues. Sometime, somewhere soon, you guys got to wake up over there. You're allowing this to happen. You are allowing the Speaker to control this state as if it's a kingdom, and that is unacceptable. don't know when it's going to happen. It may happen in the next election. It may be two years, it may be four years, but people are starting to get it. The change group's

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

gotten it. Every media outlet in America... in the state's gotten it. You all get it, but you're afraid of it, as that's what happens over in the Senate. They're afraid of it. I think the Governor's gotten it. Somewhere along the line, you got to get a little... a little strong, and a little tough, and go over and say, you know what, I'm not going to be with you now, Mr. Speaker. This campaign finance Bill isn't the right way to handle it. We need to take away a little bit of your power. Thirty-eight years has been a pretty good run. It doesn't mean he won't continue in a new system, but we can't let this go on. We're not going to let it go on. We'll take a vote up or down on this Bill. We'll play your game. People will vote for it. People will vote against it. We'll have the issue, but somewhere along the line, someday, hopefully sooner than later, we'll have a real discussion about redistricting, about campaign finance, about diminsioning the power that exists in a couple of people, and the list of all the other things I've talked about. But you guys, 70 of you, need to... need to make a decision sooner or later whether or not you're with the people in this State of Illinois, or you're with the king. The one guys who says, this is the way it's going to be, and this is the way it's going to be 'cause I say it's going to be this way. other reason. I got the power, and I'll tell you what's good and what's bad for the people of the State of Illinois. I, also, just... I have a substantive note on this Bill, will also point out that, historically, both Parties have managed to regulate how they handle what goes on in

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

their Parties. This is a terrible precedent to set, Representative. If this is the road you want to go down, if it passes, then we'll deal with that, but I don't believe that it really is the road you want to go down. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to at least let us speak, but I hope that soon that we can have some real debate over some other real issues that affect the lives of men, and women, and kids, and seniors who are struggling, who are scared, who have fear, who are upset, who are worried in their everyday lives, and want some help, and want some real solutions to some real problems. And maybe someday we'll do that. Today's not the day. Yesterday wasn't the day. Maybe when we come back next week, or the week after, we can address some of the real life issues for the people of the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Reis: "Representative, just one question before I make a few remarks, but could you explain to the Body how our state central committeemen and women are elected now?"

Lang: "In the Republican Party?"

Reis: "In the Republican Party. Yes."

Lang: "Well, as I understand it, Sir, the… at a Party convention where the delegates are not selected by the people, they get together and they decide who the state central committeemen will be. As I understand it, you

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

don't have one man and one woman, as we do in the Democratic Party, from each congressional district. And as I understand it, these folks are not elected at large by voters in congressional districts."

Reis: "Well, that's not exactly right, Representative. To the I don't want to... I know as a Leader, you have to do some things that are sometimes uncomfortable, and... and I won't belabor that point, but... to the Bill, Ladies and The people in the Republican Party do elect their state central committeemen. They elect their local precinct committeemen who in turn gets to vote for the precinct committeemen in our congressional district, state central committeemen. Every two years, we go through this process, Republicans are electing our Republican state central committeemen through their precinct committeemen. It doesn't allow for shenanigans and all sorts of things to go on where we don't have big Republican turnout in... in congressional districts. This is as close to the people as you can get. They elect their precinct committeemen. they don't like who they're voting for for the state central committeemen, they can vote him or her out during the next selection. We do this every two years in the Primary. Now, we changed this several years back for a Our people decided to do that, and it was upheld at our latest state convention in Decatur. I was there. They had fair debate on both sides of the issue, and our current wav of electing state central committeeman prevailed 70-30, 70-30. The people involved Republican Party said we like this method, we want to keep

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Now, I know there's a real push in the Majority Parties here and in Washington to extend their strong arm. We have CARZARS, and salaryzars, and we just told the Cook County Board what to do from Springfield. First time in a long time I heard the Speaker tell us how long we can even Now, come on. When does the strong arm of government stop? And, I just wanted to make sure that... I mean, this is so important to the media, they're here covering it. Maybe they're downstairs listening. I don't know. This is nothing more than a... a way to get the fact that the Majority Party that have been in power for the last seven years aren't getting results. Our Leader went through a long litany of things that we could be discussing this afternoon. We're not doing it, so let's put a little bit of controversy on the Dem... Republicans. Let's try to This Bill is not needed. It's shameful that divide them. we're wasting precious time when all these other issues are at hand, even debating this. Our people spoke at our convention. They like the system the way it is. I urge a 'no' vote on this. And, Mr. Speaker, should this require... get the required number of votes, I ask for a Roll Call verification... or a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "Your request will be granted. Next speaker is Representative... Leader Ron Stephens from Bond County."

Stephens: "First of all, Chairman... or, Speaker, excuse me, and thank you. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Stephens: "Do you have any excused absences that you wish to add to the record before this vote is taken?"

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

- Speaker Mautino: "I believe they've been appropriately recorded. None to add at this time."
- Stephens: "Are there any additions to the report that was made on the floor when you had one excused absence this morning?"
- Speaker Mautino: "I don't believe there have been any changes."
- Stephens: "Well, Mr... Mr. Speaker, I don't want to embarrass you, so I won't question the presence of a quorum, which is a non debatable Motion. I won't do that because I respect you, and I respect this process. A verification has been requested by the Gentleman from Jasper. You have recognized that. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."
- Stephens: "Representative, good afternoon. When did you become the Chief-Sponsor of this legislation?"
- Lang: "I don't remember the date, Sir."
- Stephens: "Can we put it in relative terms? Was it before or after... before or after the former Sponsor... Chief Sponsor of this Bill was subject of an investigation in Cook County?"
- Lang: "I really have no idea, Sir, but I don't know what the relevance of that is."
- Stephens: "I'm trying to put it in relative terms. I don't know how you became the Sponsor of this Bill."
- Lang: "I became Sponsor of the Bill the way other people do. Somebody who was Sponsor asked me to take the Bill over. You've done it. I've done it, and no one ever asked you when you've done it what the relative circumstances were."

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Stephens: "Oh, no, they have. I've asked... I've been asked every question you can possibly be asked on this... this House Floor, and those of us who've been around as long as you should know that. And, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Clerk would advice us as to the date of the change of sponsorship from one Representative Paul Froehlich Representative Lang. While you're looking at that, I would like to continue my remarks. Our Leader has done eloquent job of... of, I think describing for you when we went into caucus last night, and again this morning, we... we're just looking at ourselves and wondering, what are they doing. What could they possibly be thinking, because for the people of Illinois, this may seem to be a trivial issue and certainly, in relative... in relation to the... the issues that Representative Cross, Leader Cross, I like to call him Speaker Cross, that sounds good, doesn't it, guys? Speaker Cross. Yeah. Speaker Cross said that there were many more important issues, and we sat around in our caucus last night and again this morning, wondering just what could you possibly be thinking to make this an issue. Speaker Cross also mentioned the 38 years that Speaker Madigan has been here, and a lot of us have been here for a long time. I don't knock him for that. I think Speaker Cross mentioned that maybe he wants to be king. Now, you might think that that's hyperbole, but I would... I would have you look at the... today's addition of the St. Louis Post Dispatch. Madigan's false campaign reform would make him king of Illinois. Is that what this is about, Representative? Do you want your Speaker, your Leader, to

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

be king? Is that what it's about in trying to take over the Republican Party? You've done enough damage to your own Party, now you want to ruin our Party, too? I understand that people of good faith have different views about whether we should make this move or not, but woe is me to understand why you don't want to deal with the real issues of Illinois, and you want to talk about the internal machinations of the Republican Party. You don't want to talk about unemployment. You don't want... you want to make the Speaker king. That's what you want to do. When we talk about reform, you talk about ways to make sure that Mike Madigan is never challenged, never challenged. you want to make it avail... make him available to control... That's what this is about, isn't it? You're trying to take over the Republican Party. That's what Democrats want. They haven't done enough to ruin the State of Illinois. They haven't done enough to ruin our country. They want to ruin the Republican Party and flush everything down the I give as my evidence, if you think that toilet. Democratic Party is doing a good job in Illinois. Well, how could you? How could you? If... I mean, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Democratic Party controls everything in Illinois. Now they want to control the Republican Party. That's what this is about. Well, they haven't done such a great job. Their last Governor was indicted. One of their sitting House Members, one of our colleagues, is under a very serious investigation and I wish him well. But if he has sinned, then his has to pay for those sins. I don't know that either Party holds the moral, upper ground, but I

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

do know this, we want to run our Party the way the people that we represent in that Party ask us to. We have a good system that works. We've done it the other way and remem ... you know what, we're not... we're revisiting Illinois history. We have been here before. We used to do it the way... do it the way you suggest, Representative. We used to do it that way and we changed it for all the right reasons. We changed it for all the right reasons. Does it ... does it make anyone wonder why this Bill is being carried by a Democrat Leader and it affects Republican partisan politics at the very basic level? It's Mike Madigan, the would be king, wants every bit of power that he can have. Madigan, we don't agree on this issue. I... Mr... the Gentleman from Cook, I wish you would take this Bill out of the record. I would gladly take over sponsorship of this Bill. And I rest my case. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking recognition. The question is... excuse me. Representative Watson is seeking recognition."

Watson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Watson: "Representative... all the hype aside. And... and if I could have the Body's attention for a second. We all know there's going to be a reckoning next year, with this budget. This would be a nice gesture. Lou, I would ask if you could just pull this out. Let's start to focus on what we have to do next year and... and work together. We have... we honor a... a World War II veteran from Pearl Harbor. We honor the parents of... who made... who's son made the ultimate

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

sacrifice. Let's get down to what's real. Pull this out. Let's regroup and come back next week and go to work."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think there are quite a number of things that need to be said. I'll try to say them in some semblance of order and as briefly as I can. First, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not a Democratic plot to take over the world. This Bill has a Senate Republican as the Senate Sponsor. Senator Lauzen was the Senator... the Senate Sponsor and moved this Bill through the Senate. And might I add, that the first cosponsor of the Bill is Senator Radogno, the Senate Republican Leader. And let me also add that one of the chief cosponsors is Senator Dillard, who may be Republican Party standard bearer in the November 2010 election for Governor. So... and there are many other Republicans who voted for and sponsored this Bill in the Senate and in fact we have Republican cosponsors in the House. I doubt whether that the Republican cosponsors in the House believe this is a Democratic plot to take over the world, nor is it a plan to make Mike Madigan king of Illinois. I really don't think the Republican cosponsors either in the Senate or the House had that in mind. they had in mind were the wishes of many of constituents, hundreds of whom have called and contacted me and you about transparency in the Republican Party, about having one man, one vote, be the issue. Not let's elect a precinct committeeman who will go make all decisions on

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

behalf of our Party, but let's let people vote on who our state central committeemen ought to be and let's try to have a man and a woman to show some fairness just as the Democratic Party does. Over the last couple of days I heard that this Body has not done anything about ethics reform and I think the person and the people who said that aren't thinking clearly. Yes, we have not properly handled campaign finance reform, but if you don't think that procurement reform was ethics reform, if you don't think that FOIA reform was ethics reform and if you don't think the Majority Party in this Body who caused a Democratic Governor to be tried and convicted and thrown out of office in the State of Illinois is ethics reform, then you aren't really thinking very clearly. We did a lot this last spring on ethics reform, not everything and if you want to continue to tie all things involving ethics to campaign finance reform you can do that, but you would not be telling the truth to the people of Illinois. Have we done all we can? No. Have we done all we should? No. Did we finish the deal on campaign finance reform? course not. But don't come to the floor of this House and try to convince people we did nothing last spring because we certainly did much last spring and we will do much in future months. Ladies and Gentlemen, there have been allegations on this floor that this Bill is about the desire of one man to control Illinois. This Bill has nothing to do with Mike Madigan. It doesn't even have to do with the Democratic Party. It has to do with the rights of 13 million people in the State of Illinois to vote for

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

people and elect them to office. Whether it be a statewide office, a local office, or yes, even a Party office, that's what this is about. And I heard comments on the other side of the aisle that there was a desire to give one man all the power to Illinois and that he would control the entire agenda for the State of Illinois and how silly is that. How silly is that when despite the fact that many on the minority side of the aisle have cried real tears because I've seen them about the failure to pass an income tax increase that we so badly need to take care of all of the issues that were on Leader Crosses list. Those real tears meant nothing because the person that came to me with those real tears voting 'no' on the income tax increase, as did 11 other people on that side of the aisle who were for the income tax increase. And the only reason they voted 'no' was the very person that wants to blame the Speaker of the House for the failure to pass the income tax increase. Leader of the Republican side of the aisle said we will not support the income tax increase. And \*REVIEW\* woo to you, the 12 of you who would dare vote for the needed income tax increase because I say you can't. Because I say it's in our best political interest as a party to just say no, to just be an obstructionist, to just stand in the way of the mentally ill, of the developmentally disabled, of substance abusers, the people that need the help of State of Illinois. If you want to talk about the one person who stopped us from fixing the budget of the State of Illinois. He's on that side of the aisle not on this side of the aisle. So let's tell the truth to the people

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

of the state of Illinois. This Bill is not about any of that. I didn't raise it other people did. This Bill could have been handled in 5 minutes. We didn't go to caucus twice, you did. So, let's not talk about wasting the peoples time because this is a chamber that I have sat in when we decided what the state no ought to be. When the state \*REVIEW\* fruit ought to be. So let's not talk about the fact that we might... that we have taken the rights of people to vote away from them as something being unimportant. Let's just vote on this and move on. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of Senate Bill 600."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 600. This will require 71 votes. All in favor vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no' and there has been a verification requested. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Represen... Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Lang."

Lang: "I would move for postponed consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Postponed consideration is granted.

Adjournment Resolution. The Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 661, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 662, House Resolution 663, House Resolution 664, House Resolution 665, all by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 666, by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 667, by Representative Senger. House Resolution 668, offered by Representative Senger. And House Resolution 669, by Representative Senger. House Resolution 671, offered by Representative Coladipietro. House

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

Resolution 612, by Representative Reboletti. House Representative Reboletti. Resolution 673, by Resolution 675, by Representative Tryon. House Resolution 676, by Representative Reboletti. House Resolution 677, by Representative Reboletti. House Resolution 679 by Representative Stephens; House Resolution 680 by Representative Madigan; House Resolution 682 by Representative McGuire; House Resolution 683 by Representative Ford; House Resolution 684 by Representative Riley; House Resolution 685 by Representative Sacia; House Resolution 687 and 686 by Representative Sacia; by Resolution 688 Representative Cavaletto; House Resolution 689 by Representative Senger."

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie now moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'yes', opposed say 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 78, offered by Representative Currie.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, October 16, 2009, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, October 28, 2009 at 12:00 o'clock noon.
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie moves adoption of Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'yes', opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, Resolution is adopted. And now allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk the house

77th Legislative Day

10/16/2009

will adjourn until Wednesday, October 28, at the hour of 12 noon."

Clerk Mahoney: "House perfunctory session will come to order. Refer to the House committee Rules is Senate Joint Resolution 59 offered by Representative Bellock. Bills, First Reading. House Bill 4657, offered by Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. \*REVIEW\* Introduction of Senate Bill-First Reading. Senate Bill 332, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Bill 395, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 588, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 616, offered local Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning There being no further business, the House education. Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."