112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Chris Shurilla who is with the Victory Bible Baptist Church in Troy, Illinois. Pastor Shurilla is the guest of Representative Stephens. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Shurilla."

Pastor Shurilla: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May we bow our heads and close our eyes in reverence of our God. Our heavenly Father, Your word says in 2 Chronicles 7:14, 'If My people, which are called by My name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek My face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and will heal their land.' And our land needs to be healed. Lord, we're no longer a humble people. We know You resist the proud, but this morning I ask that You hear this prayer and that You grant this House wisdom and discernment as they strive to govern this state. Bless each one of them, their families, place a hedge of protection about them, keep them safe, give them the guidance that is needed. Guide their decisions in this Session and please heal our land as they're working together. We're a nation founded on Your word and we ask these things based on the promises of Your word and ask in the name of Christ Jesus, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge today by Representative Tryon."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Tryon 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 Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Hoffman and Soto are excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bassi, Cultra, Myers, and Tracy are excused today."
- Speaker Lang: "Is Representative Sommer here? All right. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 Members being present, the House is in order. Announcements."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability & Access reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2010: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 6156; do pass Standard Debate is House Bill 4679, House Bill 5471, House Bill 5473, and House Bill 5954. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2010: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 4726; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2010: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 4781. Representative

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Collins, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary-Criminal Law reports the following committee action taken on March 12, 2010: do pass Short Debate House Bill 5494, House Bill 5835; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1702. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is House Resolution 1003, offered by Representative Poe, and House Resolution 1006, offered by Representative Senger."

- Speaker Lang: "We'll begin today on page 22 of the Calendar,
 House Bills-Third Reading and there appears House Bill
 5190, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5190, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 5190 makes a minor technical correction to the part of the Speech-language Pathology Act that deals with the speech-language pathology assistance. Right now, the College of DuPage is the only school that is offering this program based on national standards. They noticed that the program that they had, had the general education and the specific course credits flipped around in our Act, compared to what they had to offer. This Bill merely corrects that, but at the same time grandfathers in those who might have been already certified."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill... House Bill 5190. There being no discussion, those in

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Crespo, Joyce, May? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same page, House Bill 5194, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5194, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5194 provides that a person receiving public safety voice or data communication transmitted via the facilities of the state's public radio system, which is StarCom21, shall receive in writing from the State Police for certain rebroadcast purposes of the communications. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 5194. There being no discussion, those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5203, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5203, a Bill for an Act concerning nuclear safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 5203 is the renewal and extension of the Radiation Protection Act that IEMA uses to regulate various radiation sources and devices in Illinois. The Bill updates a number of the practices to bring them up to current standards. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 5203. There being no discussion, those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege and outrage."

Speaker Lang: "Which do you want to state first, your personal privilege or your outrage?"

Black: "My outrage."

Speaker Lang: "Go for it, Sir."

Black: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for those of you who don't read the <u>Springfield Journal-Register</u>, let me just point out two articles that have recently appeared as an exclusive. <u>Springfield Journal-Register</u> on March 9, 2010. The Department of Aging to leave rent free locations and spend \$532 thousand a year in

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

lease costs. So, I want to just... I just want to present my first annual 'Let them eat cake, we don't give a damn award' to the Department of Aging and the Central Management Services because in today's Springfield State Journal-Register and I quote, 'Lawmaker complaints will not stop Aging move'. We're going to go ahead and do the necessary remodeling and the necessary capital expenditures and put the Department of Aging in one building and yes, we'll pay \$532 thousand a year in lease costs. I don't know about your district, but my senior citizen agencies have laid off staff and have reduced or eliminated programs that help some of our most vulnerable senior citizens stay in their homes. So, given this scenario in the State of Illinois, the Department of Aging and Central Management Services say, well, that's too bad, we're going to spend \$532 thousand a year in a lease cost where they don't spend any lease cost now and your senior citizens in your district can eat cake. Congratulations, Congratulations, Department of Agency. You really seem to get it. You really seem to understand the fiscal crisis and you really seem to not give a damn about the seniors of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes the Majority Leader."

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

Speaker Lang: "The record will so reflect. Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, Sir."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Stephens: "Which part of Representative Black's remarks were a point of personal privilege?"

Speaker Lang: "I think that's a private matter between the two of you, Sir."

Stephens: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, a point of personal privilege also."

Speaker Lang: "State your point."

Poe: "Yeah. I, too, would like to address the issue of Aging moving out of the facility that the state owns. it's being in Springfield, in my district, I think that's something that they have not did enough background. think, if you read the newspaper you get the feeling of the community. The state is in probably the direst straights that they've ever been in history and at this point, it's probably not a good time to give up office space that the State of Illinois owns. There's other office space in the City of Springfield which the local Legislators toured about a year ago when we was talking about Traffic Safety. There is other space available and to move in and spend \$530 thousand on rental for the next year seems to be an inappropriate time to do that. So, Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to ask that you would discharge Resolution 1003 out of the Rules so we could have a fair hearing on that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Poe, I will be back to you shortly. The Chair recognizes Representative Pihos."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I, too, would like to continue the discussion on the Department of Aging. As Minority spokesman on that committee, yesterday we heard Bills that would go from 'shall' to 'may' that would reduce services for our senior citizens because the Department of Aging says they do not have funding. So, now they want to relocate the Department of Aging at the cost of over a half million dollars per year. The Department of Aging is currently in a rent-free space that the state already owns. Regardless of whether or not we are facing a multibillion dollar deficit, the being proposed by the Department of Aging is irresponsible and irrational and would be a waste of the taxpayer money. The state cannot afford to pay bills we already have. We can't afford to pay more rent or to move 140 state employees, their phones, their faxes, their computers. Given the current financial crisis in our state, we should be looking for less expensive locations for our agencies that are in free rental spaces, not moving them out of rent-free buildings to places where we pay rent. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie on Representative Poe's Motion."

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

Speaker Lang: "Under the applicable House Rules, since the Lady has objected and it requires unanimous consent, the Chair rules that the Motion fails. The Chair recognizes Representative Mitchell."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Mitchell, B.: "A point of personal privilege here. I've turned my light on before."

Speaker Lang: "State your... state your point, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was in the Department of Aging... or excuse me, the Aging hearing yesterday when our leader, Representative Pihos, talked to the agency, I think it was the assistant director or someone and the assistant director referred us to their public relations. Their p... They say, well, you'll have to ask to your bp... their public PIO, I guess, they're called. Five hundred thirty-two thousand dollars that the department is spending going from free space to rented space at the same time Governor Quinn is calling for... being an assault on seniors and less money for our seniors. We, in central Illinois that represent central Illinois, we have a high level of senior citizens and their services are being under assault, under assault in Washington D.C. by the ObamaCare, under assault here in Illinois by Governor Quinn. Has the Governor not looked at the unemployment figures that came out the other day? Illinois has a 11.3. It went up. Unemployment went up in the State of Illinois. percentage point and a half over the nationwide average. We need jobs and what does the Governor do? He spends money that we don't have. This is an outrage."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. I'd like to speak to the Motion as well.

Mr. Black spoke yesterday briefly about what we were doing
here as window dressing and a lot what he said was correct
because right now our House is burning down around us and

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

we're picking out drapes. We have to ... we have to understand that the day of reckoning is upon us. This is a Resolution that we should discuss right now. When I found out last Friday about the Department of Aging wanting to spend millions of dollars instead of doing with what they have, I was outraged and I said it was a boneheaded move. And I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion; I think we should hear this now. I think we need to send a strong message to the administration that we cannot continue on this path, that they must nullify this contract that the Governor, through his executive privilege, Executive Order ought to nullify this contract. I think we should hear this now. I think we should send this to the Governor today because I think we have to concentrate solely on the budget. We have to fix this. Our House is burning. Folks, we are in a crisis. This is important. We should talk about this now and we should get this on the floor."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a House Resolution, doesn't that have the force of law? I don't know... I don't think anybody in this chamber would stand up and oppose a House Resolution that requests that the Department of Aging proposed lease of \$532 thousand a year when senior programs all around the state are being cut in all of our districts. My seniors don't get any home delivered meals that they can just pop in an oven or better yet, a hot home delivered meal because we don't... The biggest senior citizen service

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

agency in my district doesn't have the money to pay the preparer of the food, so they've had to stop delivering home delivered hot meals to seniors who are shut in. deliver three frozen meals now that the senior can cook, if they're able, to help get them through the weekend and two additional days. They've laid off service personnel. all due respect to the Majority Leader and I echo the thoughts of my friend and colleague from Representative Franks, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Resolution. It's not putting you at risk for some law or Bill that you don't like. It's just a Resolution saying, in effect, hey, take a look at this. Should you be spending \$537 thousand a year on rent to move into a different building when you're already in buildings that don't cost you any rent and yet you're cutting programs to our senior agencies? This is indefensible. It's immoral. It's wrong. And if this chamber, just to Representative Franks, if this chamber can't come together on this kind of a Resolution saying in this fiscal crisis we put senior citizens... My parents are gone. My grandparents are gone. I am a senior citizen and if we can't put some of our most vulnerable senior citizens ahead of somebody's misquided desire to move into a half a million dollar rental building at this fiscal point in the state's history, then I... I don't have much hope. have much hope that we'll right this ship. I don't have much hope that maybe we even really care. This is wrong. To not consider this Resolution today is absolutely wrong, immoral, unjust and talk about sticking your head in the

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

sand, if you can't rally to the point of supporting a Resolution that supports our senior citizens, then I... I don't know if there's any hope whatsoever for the crisis this state is in. I... at the applicable time, Mr. Speaker, since the objection has been made, under the applicable rules I would ask that the Chair be overruled in this case. And if there's ever a time when the Chair could be overruled on the objection, it's for a Resolution to protect some services to our senior citizens. If you're opposed to that, may God have mercy on your soul."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, in..."

Speaker Lang: "State your point, Sir."

Rose: "...support of Representative Black's Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is ridiculous. It's absolutely ridiculous. Representative Franks called it correctly. Representative Pihos called it, Representative Poe, Representative Black. You know, I find it ironic that Wednesday was Council on Aging Day over here. Many of our local Councils on Aging, who have not been paid, were here the same day the Governor was asking for a tax increase. To pay for what? from free space to half a million dollars a year in rent? What is wrong with this place? More importantly, why would anyone object to this Motion? Why on earth would anyone object to this Motion? Senior citizen's Councils on Aging haven't been paid, universities haven't been paid. of you on the other side of the aisle that represent universities, why would you want to waste \$500 thousand rather than... rather than... I need a... I've just been so

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

unbelievably exasperated by this place. We're wasting half a million dollars a year going from free space to leased space, schools aren't being paid, universities aren't being paid, Medicaid providers aren't getting paid, the Council on Aging senior citizens aren't getting paid, but this, why would you object? Why would you object? To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, for once don't join the sycophants and just hang out in the Majority Party and do what you're told. This is common sense. When did common sense get trumped? When did common sense get trumped? Why would we pay one more penny for this when it's already free? Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my little two cents in this because I think it's Earlier I heard my colleague, important to do so. Representative Pihos, make her comments and she and I both are on the Aging Committee, I'm the chairman and she's vice chairman and I want to say that I agree with her comments, but you know, in looking at the analysis here and I thought about something. You know, every day that I come to work here I share an office in the Stratton Building that is supposed to be a place that has plenty of asbestos to go around. And I sit there and I work there every day with other state workers and other Legislators and then when I look at the analysis and I see someone's saying... talking about mold and air quality and I'm thinking about the people who live in poor housing who have to share their space with rodents and other things that are unhealthy for

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

them, but yet they survive. Yet, they live. Yet, they go on day to day and hoping that people like myself never forget them and speak out. And the Governor's a friend of I don't have any political gain to stand up and shout and scream and make scenes and act like he's the worse thing since whatever. You know, I'm not going to go there because I know he has an awesome job and I can't walk in his shoes so I won't place judgment. But I do want to go on the record to say that I think it is a very bad move and it sets a very bad example. And if he's listening, I say it as a friend, to whoever makes the decision, that the Department of Aging, if they are sharing rent free and now they're talking about moving into a space of a half a million dollars, I think that just does not make a lot of good sense especially when we are trying to balance and trying to deal with unfunded mandates. I just think it's an unwise, unfavorable thing, very much untimely and I think someone should rethink that position and that we should stand down and the Department of Aging, like the many people they serve who are in situations that they can do nothing about, that they survive, they make it and I think that the Department of Aging should do no less. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Your point, Sir."

Brauer: "You know, I want to add my two cents worth in this or maybe I should say a half a million dollars. Voltaire once

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

said, the thing about common sense, it's not that common. And that's exactly what he would be scratching his head about today when you look at the deficit that we have, when you look at the need for revenues and then all of a sudden we turn around and spend money like this, \$532 thousand. It's going to be leaving our senior programs that could, if not spent there, could be spent someplace else. I think it's time we look at common sense. I think it's time we realize common sense and we say this is a commonsense situation that says we need to keep our senior citizen services in rent-free building as opposed to going out and paying for that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons cited by Department of Aging is that these buildings are in disrepair and are flooding. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you read today's Wall Street... I'm sorry Journal-Register, in it, it says Secretary of State Jesse White's Office, which is responsible for this building, for maintaining the Herndon Building, disputes some of those ascertains and Secretary White's spokesperson says that isn't happening. So, at the very least we need to get to the bottom of this before we start moving on to luxurious places to spend the state's dollars. I would like to get to the bottom of it, especially, especially when an elected officer of the State of Illinois disputes what's going on and someone of such high regard as Secretary White. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?'

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 59 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Motion... the Chair is sustained. Back to the Calendar, page 22 under Third Reading, House Bill 5217, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5217, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. House Bill 5217 takes and it aligns Illinois following the National Association of Insurance Commissioner's model Bill in how we deal with derivatives in insolvencies. It also increases the limits on the guaranty funds because we haven't raised them in quite awhile and insolvencies are bigger. These are the funds where if a company goes insolvent, then the other companies are assessed to make sure that those claims get paid. I know of no opposition. Be happy to answer any questions on this Bill. And ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 5217. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. This Bill is intended to enact the NAIC model language addressing several consumer oriented receivership issues. This Bill is negotiated with and supported by the Illinois Insurance Guaranty Fund, the Illinois Life and Health Insurance Guaranty Association and the Illinois

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Health Maintenance Organization Guaranty Association. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5255, Representative Osterman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5255, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5255 is the initiative of the Illinois Academy of Audiologists and consolidates the licensure payment within the Department of Financial Regulation... Professional Regulation. Currently, the audiologists have to pay a check to Public Health for their licensure as well as the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations. It would consolidate their payment. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 5255. There being no debate, those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5278, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5278, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is an... builds on the efforts of the Illinois Association of County Clerks and Recorders to hold down the cost of low turnout consolidated elections. It does two things. It eliminates the requirement that a Primary be held because of the filing of a write-in candidate. If... Three years ago the Municipal Code was changed to trigger a consolidated Primary for an office if more than four times the number of candidates be elected to that office file nominating petitions. This would say that we don't have to... that the filing of a write-in candidate would not be part of that four and we could go straight to the General Election. second thing is that it would eliminate unnecessary but costly consolidated General Elections if all of candidates on the ballot are unopposed and there are no referenda on the ballot, then the polling place... a particular polling place would not have to open and unopposed candidates would deem to be elected. The clerks indicate that, especially in smaller counties, that this would save them significant money and in this day and age

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

we need to save every penny that we can. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 5278. The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Black: "Representative, I think anyone in the House chamber who's not in favor of trying to save money is in the wrong business at the wrong time. However, there is a, I think perhaps, an unanticipated consequence in your Bill. Staff is very concerned and I think it circumstances someone could be elected to office and that person's name would never appear on a ballot."

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think that's true, but if they're uncontested then what is... I'm not sure that there's really a point in forcing that process to happen."

Black: "If their name does not appear on the ballot for the position that they're running for, then how does one go about a write-in vote since that office would not even appear on the ballot?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, we passed legislation awhile ago saying that if you're wanting to be a write-in candidate you had to do... you had to apply with the election authority to do that six months in advance and so you would still be... have the capability of being a write-in candidate. And if the election authority received the proper documentation to become a write-in candidate, you would do that and then there wouldn't be an election held

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

because there would be a name on the ballot or there'd be an election to be held."

Black: "But is that... now that just happened in my legislative district. The requisite time period was met, an individual announced his intent to write-in... to be a write-in candidate and so there was space, in fact, on the ballot. But that was for a state senatorial race. My... my concern is for the, well, let's just say in some cities you elect the city clerk, in others you do not or you elect the city auditor. I just wonder if there's enough constructive notice in a town the size of my hometown, say 34 thousand people, whether someone would meet that statutory deadline to declare as a write-in, and if they don't meet the statutory deadline, then that city auditor or city treasurer could be elected to that post if she, in fact, is unopposed and her name would never appear on a ballot. I mean, I understand what you're trying to do. I just wonder if it's good public policy to allow someone to be 'elected' to an office, but that person's name was never printed on a ballot and never appeared on a ballot."

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think you could argue the same thing is true that is it good public policy to waste taxpayer dollars simply to have a name appear on the ballot and have no contested election. When I'd think we'd all like to see, you know, that democracy would work and we would have contested elections. But in... I mean, the practical reality is if there is no contest, then kind of what's the point. And to your point of the write-in, even in consolidated elections a write-in candidate has to file

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

for to appear... to legally appear on the ballot as a writein candidate. And so, you know, the necessary documentation and paperwork would be filed with the clerk and that election would proceed."

Black: "But I... I certainly raise no objection to your point about the fiscal responsibility issue and, in fact, sponsored legislation sometime ago that in various ward elections, when my hometown went to a ward rather than an at large, if there were no candidates, not enough for a race in a ward in a Primary, you didn't have to have that. So, I'm not... I'm not adverse to trying to save money, but this goes even further than the Primary situation. A person can be elected to office whose name never appeared on the ballot in the Primary and whose name would not appear on the ballot in a General Election. I..."

Nekritz: "I agree, Representative, but I think it's a balance thing and we're... we're... we do that all the time here, we're being asked to balance the merits of one versus the merits of another. And I think in this instance the saving... saving money, when there is no contested election and everyone was afforded an opportunity to step forward and have their name appear on the ballot and they elected not to."

Black: "Well, the possibilities are endless. I was trying to think somehow if I could amend this into state legislative races because I know over the years I could have saved a great deal of money if my name wouldn't have had to appear on the ballot. And I was unopposed in several of those elections, but I still had to go on the ballot. And I... I...

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

again, I... I have no quarrel with the fiscal part of the Bill. I'm just not completely comfortable with the public policy question as to whether a person should be elected to office, any office, and their name never having appeared on a Primary or General Election ballot. Now, it's an interesting concept, I'll grant you that. I am a little worried about the public policy implications. And I thank you for your indulgence."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Rose."

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

Speaker Lang: "Said he yields."

Rose: "Representative Nekritz, Article III, Section 1 of the Illinois Constitution reads as follows: 'Every United States citizen who's attained the age of 18 or any other voting age required by the United States for voting in the state elections and who has been a permanent resident of this state for at least 30 days next preceding any election shall have the right to vote at such election.' How can we turn away somebody who wants to show up and check that box, even if it's uncontested?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think, you know, in an idea...
if we had unlimited resources, that would be a great thing
to do and to provide everybody that opportunity, but in
this instance... I mean, so they show up and check an
uncontested box. I don't know what that gets them."

Rose: "I quess... here's..."

Nekritz: "And the other thing is that, you know, I mean, there is experience in this state with this where there have been

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

precincts that have been forced to open and judges have been paid to sit there all day and they have..."

Rose: "Representative, I..."

Nekritz: "...it was uncontested elections and they have three voters..."

Rose: "I agree with you."

Nekritz: "...show up."

Rose: "Representative, I don't..."

Nekritz: "I don't know if that's the kind of..."

Rose: "I agree with you."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Rose: "I totally agree with you. It's a complete waste, a complete waste. What I'm saying though is, I don't think... well, I don't know that the Constitution gives us this flexibility. I'd like to get some clarification on this and I'm not... and I... Representative, you know I'm not on your committee, otherwise I would have raised this had I been a Member of your committee, but I would like to get some clarification from someone, you know, a constitutional expert on this because as I read this I don't think we can undo this. I could be very well wrong and there may be case law interpreting it differently than I just read, but it seems clear. It says, 'shall have the right to vote.' That doesn't mean we can take it away just 'cause it's expensive."

Nekritz: "Okay. I mean, I'm... and honest, Rep... honestly, I don't know the answer to your constitutional question either, but it's not... it's not that we're... I mean, they do have the right to vote."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Rose: "Representative, you and I are..."

Nekritz: "But we're... but we have also have the right to administer the election in a way that makes sense and so..."

Rose: "All I'm asking, Representative, is you and I are friends. If I was on your committee, I would have raised this at the time. I... I... as I was listening to the debate I went and just pulled up the Constitution here and saw this. I would feel more comfortable... I'm an attorney as you are, I would feel more comfortable if I had some advice from a con-law expert and we've got another couple of weeks here. You know, perhaps we could get some clarity before we vote on it, Representative. I would like... I want to vote for it. I want to vote for it. I just don't know that we can waive the Constitution."

Nekritz: "All right. Well, I... Representative, I think you know that I would like to proceed. I'll be glad to work with this Bill and the Senate Sponsor, whoever that may be, to get those clarifications, you know, before we move forward in the Senate. But I would just as soon go ahead and move it right now, if that's okay."

Rose: "Well, Representative, I mean I will probably vote 'no' for now."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Rose: "I just... Like I said, I would like to get some clarity and we have a couple weeks here. So, that's all. 'Cause I share your concern. I want to vote for the Bill, but I don't think we can knowingly vote for something that's unconstitutional. So, thank you."

Nekritz: "I think I've done that a time or two here."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Fortner: "Representative, I think I understand what you're trying to do in terms of cost, but I think there are some public policy aspects that we should not overlook to having an uncontested name on the ballot. I would guess that perhaps that sometime in your political career you have been the only name on a particular ballot, is that correct?"

Nekritz: "I've only been so fortunate once."

Fortner: "Well, I can think to a couple of occasions where it happened to me. In 2005, I stood unopposed as the mayor of the City of West Chicago. My sense is that if my name had not appeared on the ballot that could have created more public confusion because they'd say, well, we were... we thought that you were running for reelection and we didn't see you there. You know, what's happening with that? understand what you would have been doing in that part, but I think that there is some public sense that they look and see all the names of the people who are on the ballot and who then they read about in the paper the next day even if they didn't vote, and they say, oh, okay, yes, person's now been reelected. So, I think that's... that's one aspect I wanted to at least raise that has some utility with the public. There's a second aspect as well, then I'll let you respond to both, is that there are certainly cases where I know it's been the case that for me, when I've been the only name on the ballot, that 100 percent of

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

the voters voting in that election did not choose to vote when I compare that to other unopposed and candidates in the area, there's some sense that the public official can take that as a sense of how much public pleasure or displeasure there might be with that official. If there's an unusually low number of cast ballots for an unopposed candidate, I would certainly take that myself very seriously that perhaps the public has some concerns and I would want to be able to address those as a public official. And I think the public would like to have the ability to be able to weigh in and perhaps that we don't have a 'none of above' option in Illinois, the fact that they can choose not to cast a vote is at least a way of expressing some sentiment towards the candidate in that race."

Nekritz: "Okay. Now, I've forgotten the first point which I knew... I knew I would."

Fortner: "The first point was the public confusion over having the name appear."

Nekritz: "Oh. So... so this would only occur where there are no contested elections at all in the consolidated election. So, that's not going to... I mean, I would... that's not gon... doesn't happen very often and it's not... and if you had a contested trustee's race, a contested township race, a contested anything else in your... in that consolidated election, then your name would... then the uncontested races would appear with the contested races on the ballot. So, that would, I think, in our area be a pretty unusual item."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Fortner: "So, in that case... what you're saying in that case, the... there would still... all the uncontested candidates would appear along with the contested race in the..."

Nekritz: "Right. This only allows the precinct to not open when there's no contested elections on any part of the ballot. Now, as to your second point, I think, again, you know, there are... there are reasons to hold the election and there are reasons not to and I'm just... I'm coming down in favor of saying, you know, if there's only going to be three voters show up to a polling place to vote in uncontested elections, then is it really worth the expense to open up the polling place? Are there counter... counterbalancing policy reasons? Yeah, there may be, but I think in this instance the cost outweighs those counter-balan... those other considerations."

So, just to conclude my remarks and I Fortner: "Yeah. understand and appreciate that, as I say, I appreciate the I also, I guess my feeling is that as we move more and more and more... there's more and more interest in the use of things like early voting and the electronic voting, both the printing of ballots as well as the ability to consolidate polling places in some of these elections becomes more and more prevalent. So, for instance, in my polling place there are, depending on the election, either two or three precincts that vote together. They use a consolidated set of judges. I'm not sure that as we move forward, are able to use electronic means in early voting, which I think are good things that move us forward, that this is as relevant as it might have been in past years

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

where those were not the up-and-coming technologies. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McCarthy."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the question is put. Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to address the constitutional questions raised by... by one colleagues. I did ask my seatmate to contact the lobbyist for the Cook County Clerk's Office who doesn't think that there is a constitutional issue with having the right to vote, so I just wanted to pass that along to you. We can have further clari... you know, some more clarification about it, but... but in any event I do think that the cost, you know, as the debate has shown, there are some... some equities on both sides, but in this particular case I think that the equities come down in favor of saving the money and allowing someone who is... who has gone through the process and elected to put their name on the ballot and no one else has decided to do that, to save that money and allow the election authorities to pinch their pennies. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 5278. Those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Davis, Mr. Washington? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 17 voting 'yes', 90 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the Bill fails. The Chair recognizes Representative Rose."

Rose: "Now, Speaker, that didn't have to happen. We could have... you could have just recognized me. I could have asked for follow-up when she was clearly referencing me in her call to some unnamed lobbyist. All we were looking for was maybe there was a constitutional solution to the question and perhaps that Bill could have failed. But Mr. Speaker, all we needed was 30 seconds to resolve that and instead you hard-charged on and then my good friend, Elaine Nekritz, got such a terrible Roll Call. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

Black: "I would just like to echo what Representative Rose said and I don't think that was a vote against Representative Nekritz and it wasn't a vote, necessarily, against the Bill. If... if you had simply recognized Representative Rose, his name was used by the Sponsor of the Bill. It's been practice here for years from both Parties that when your name is used in debate you have a chance to respond. And, you know, we can get in such in a hurry here that we can damage a Member's Bill and I don't think that had to happen. All you had to do was recognize Representative Rose and since it got 17 votes, Mr. Speaker, could I request that Representative Nekritz be allowed to put it on Postponed Consideration? Does she get another bite of the apple?"

Speaker Lang: "Is that a parliamentary inquiry, Sir?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Well, you know that she does not."

Black: "Well, then you know what this means, Mr. Speaker. Your name will have to appear on a ballot and I had every intention of using that Bill so that your name would not appear on the ballot and you would have then been elected by acclamation."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also like to echo that What's been happening sentiment. lately, which understand we're supposed to have a shortened Session, but it's going to be really long if we keep this up, every time you think somebody's losing a Bill or getting a Bill that shouldn't be you have a designated hit person stand up and call for the end of debate. I think that's a really bad way to go, particularly when it's a volatile debate or it's a debate on something that has some merit. So I don't think that that should be the way that you should go and then just ignore the Body. So if you're going to continue to do that on every Bill that we have, that one of the majority Members we may have a question with, I think it's think it's going to be a really long time before we're out of here."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "I just want to make a point that Representative McCarthy is not a hit man. He's a thoughtful Legislator that time and time again has called the previous question on Bills. And I think that the Lady from Park Ridge owes the Representative an apology for implying he's a hit man."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan, for the last bite of this apple. Go ahead."

Mulligan: "Actually, I did not mention anyone by name because I didn't want to do that on the record, but if Representative Osterman would like to have another hit at it that's fine. He seems to think that none of us can have an opinion except for him. So, quite frankly, I think that I can have an opinion too. We also have done that and I have disagreed when my Members have done the same thing. I think when a debate is fairly heated and going on, if either side stands up, although it's much easier for the Majority to get away with it than it is for the Minority, and you stop a debate that's fairly active, I think that's a really bad thing to do. And I did not mention the person that did it. I don't know if he did, but I don't think that was a very smart thing to do."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Point of personal privilege. I would love to further this debate and I have a feeling that we will have ample opportunity through the course of the next three months, but I will spare all of our colleagues that for today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think any Representative is entitled to his opinion and we all have opinions. A wise old man once told me that everybody in the world has at least two opinions and they're a lot like your armpit, they usually don't smell very good. But having said that, I think it's time, if we're going to get

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

to this point, that we dust off, and I mean this in all great re... in all due respect because these two Gentlemen were friends of mine, maybe it's time to dust off the Monroe Flinn and the Jay. Ackerman trophy and just simply set it on the desk of whoever is the designated caller of the question. Because those two gentlemen did it for years and they did it very well, with style, grace and well, there aren't enough objectives... adjectives to remember our departed colleagues who were often the designated callers of the question. So, I respect Mr. Osterman's opinion and I respect Representative Mulligan's opinion and I expect... and I really respect Representative Rose's opinion. It's just too bad he didn't get to offer it before we voted on the last Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Moving on down the Calendar... And the Chair, in an effort to move as many Bills as we can before we adjourn today, is going to put on the timer. These items that are on Short Debate are going to be held to Short Debate and no one will get additional time. We're just going to move through these Bills. The next Bill on the Calendar is House Bill 5290, Representative Coladipietro. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5290, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Coladipietro."

Coladipietro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5290 amends the service of process provision of the Code of Civil Procedure. The Bill does two things. It increases the population limitation from

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

one million to two million, and this is being done in response to DuPage County, the anticipation that they're going to go over a million in population in the next This provision won't affect any other counties, and will simply maintain the status quo. And the other provision of this Bill will affect the servi... It sets up a for service of protocol procedure on inmates correctional facilities. There's been some regarding service there that is in violation of the statute. So, this will simply clean that up and set up a protocol. I'd be glad to take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Ford, Washington. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5322, Representative Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5322, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Twentyfive years ago this state said early education
opportunities for kids at risk of school failure are a very
good thing to do. So, we've been providing preschool for
at-risk kids for 25 years. Four years ago, we said that to
the extent money's available, we ought to make that program

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

available to a lot more three-and four-year-olds. Under old rules, if you had... in order to meet requirements, you had to have 20 kids, all of them had to be at risk in a classroom, otherwise, there could be no preschool program funded by the state. The new program said that you don't have to have 100 percent of the kids in the classroom at risk. You can have a classroom that has 17 or 18 at-risk kids, and... and it is that program that four years ago, we... we put a sunset on. Four years later, I think it's time to take the sunset off. Taking the sunset off does not create an entitlement. It does not require us to spend one penny, one dime, but it does say that our commitment to preschool opportunities for youngsters will continue, and it does not put at risk those 20 thousand children who are today in classrooms, getting access to preschool programs that would be... they would be cancelled if the sunset were not either repealed or extended. So, that's all the Bill does. There's no entitlement, no required spending, and I would appreciate your support for recommitting ourselves to the idea that early education opportunity should be available to our... our children."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I object. Oh, I'm sorry. This... Is this a Motion to discharge Rules?"

Speaker Lang: "No, Sir."

Black: "Oh, this is already out of Rules? Will the Sponsor yield?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lang: "The Lady will yield, Sir."

Black: "Representative, even though you and I sometimes disagree on Motion to Discharge, when you have a good Bill, I'm going to get up and say you have a good Bill. This is a good Bill. Vote 'aye'."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I stand in strong support of the Bill, and also want to congratulate Leader Currie on her championing of early childhood education all these years. This is an important, permanent transfer of... of statute so that we can continue to serve children. And I urge everyone to support this."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving down the Calendar, House Bill 5329, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 5331, Representative Reitz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5331, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5331 addresses inequities that we have currently with our ambulances systems in Illinois. This would define 'ground ambulance services' and 'ground ambulance service providers' in rural counties. We're trying to take care of the methodology

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

that we use for Medicaid reimbursement for ambulances, and... and I think this helps to address that. This will set up a rate and have the department institute the methodology. There... it's estimated that this would cost \$38 million. We have put a... a provision in with Floor Amendment... or House Amendment #2 to make this subject to appropriation, but we would really like to get this methodology started within the department. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for passage. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Connelly. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5350, Representative Bellock. Out of the record. House Bill 5351, Representative Bellock. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5351, a Bill an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5351 amends the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. It provides that the Illinois Supreme Court or any Circuit Court may adopt rules allowing the use of video conferencing in involuntary admission hearings. This is a Bill that's agreed upon by all the major mental health

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

groups in Illinois, and it's to allow safety issues and costs sav... costs savings in transferring patients."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady..."

Bellock: "I don't know of any opposition."

Speaker Lang: "...moves for passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5357, Representative Coulson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Ho... House Bill 5357, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5357 creates the Community Behavioral Health Center and Infrastructure Act. It is subject to appropriation. It will help all of our behavioral mental health centers, as well as other community agencies, be able to set up a program as money becomes available to purchase infrastructure needs including information technology, vans, et cetera. And I can answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5378, Representative Holbrook. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5378, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "...Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5378 requires the ICC to have the office of Retail Marketing Development to update their consumer information. I know of no opposition to the Bill. Citizen's Utility Board, the ICC all agree. It hasn't been done in nearly a decade. There's no additional cost to the state."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor shall vote 'yes';

those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Colvin, Golar,

McAuliffe, Osterman. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On

this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5398, Representative

McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5398, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5398 would add from 17 to 21 members on the Veteran Advisory Council. There would be one appointed from the Adjutant General, the Illinois National Guard, one

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

person from the Attorney General's Office, one from the Illinois Secretary of State, and one person appointed by the director of the Illinois Department of Employment Security. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Verschoore. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes'; none voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5410, Representative Howard. Please, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5410, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Howard."

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5410 is an initiative of the state of... the Appellate... excuse me, the State Appellate Defender's Office. This Bill amends the State Appellate Defender Act by clarifying the number of people who may share one attorney or staff position. It also clarifies the duties of the State Appellate Defender and lastly, it clarifies that the State Appellate Defender can ask for a direct appropriation from the General Assembly in order to... to conform with the analogous Section of the Capital Litigation Trust Fund."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5411, Representative Burns. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5411, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burns."

Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5411 is an initiative of the University of Chicago Medical School. Under previous law, we required medical schools to conduct background checks on applicants to the medical school. What this Bill would allow them to do would be to use private contractors who could do background checks on a person's criminal background from across the country. I know of no opposition to the Bill. And I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

And on this question, the Representative... the Chair recognizes Representative Careen Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Gordon, C.: "I... I'm sorry. Representative, you said this will allow private contractors to do background checks for people who are going to medical school?"

Burns: "That's correct."

Gordon, C.: "So, it won't be FBI checks, it won't be through the criminal law enforcement agencies any more?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Burns: "The... the issue right now is that the Illinois State Police can only do background checks if... for crimes committed in the State of Illinois. The medical schools want the ability to be able to do background checks from across the country. So, they use the Illinois State Police currently, and they also use this service. This would allow them to use the services they're currently using. Most of them are using the American Medical Colleges' criminal background check service. And so, that's what this Bill allows them to do."
- Gordon, C.: "The Illinois State Police can't access the FBI national database for background checks?"
- Burns: "My understanding is that, right now, the Illinois State

 Police gives them background checks on crimes committed in
 the State of Illinois."
- Gordon, C.: "I understand that, but why... they... when... when we run a background check, we... I mean, we can get warrants, and... and we can know what crimes they've committed in other states whenever we do a background check. So, why isn't that being done? I mean, you can do that when... I mean, say... say someone has... has been arrested overnight and we go into weekend court, and... and we run their name. We know what crimes they've committed in... in other states based upon their backgrounds and everything else. So, why isn't that information being done in... in this situation?"
- Burns: "Again, my information is that all... the only information that's being provided by the Illinois State Police to the co... to these medical schools is crimes committed... crimes committed in the State of Illinois."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Gordon, C.: "But these..."

Burns: "And so, they hire an additional service anyway. So, they pay a fee to the Illinois State Police, and they pay a fee to a private service to get national information. And so, instead of having to pay two fees, what we're... what we're saying is let them pay one fee and they can both information... both pieces of information."

Gordon, C.: "So, State's Attorneys Offices can get this on any morning, in any county, when we're in Bond Court, but the State Police aren't providing this information in these situations."

Burns: "That's right. And that's why this is an initiative of the medical schools."

Gordon, C.: "Great. Thank you."

Burns: "Thank..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burns..."

Burns: "...you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "...to close."

Burns: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote from my colleagues."

Speaker Lang: "Those in fav... those in favor should vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5429, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5429, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5429 creates the Homeowners' Solar Rights Act to prohibit a homeowner's association or condominium association from prohibiting the installation of a solar energy system, or other energy device. I... This is an agreement between the environmental groups who support solar power as well as the realtors. And I would be glad to answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. And the Chair recognizes Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "...He yields."

Reis: "Just one question, Representative. What if a home is on a historical society and it's a designated home? Sometimes they have very strict rules with regards to paint color, windows, door size. Is there an exemption for something like that?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, this is a... a Bill that essentially tells those associations and condominium and homeowners' groups to have a written policy on... on file about solar energy, and an application for that installation would likely trigger that association to put one in place."

Reis: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "Does that answer your question?"

Reis: "I... I support what you're doing. I just want to make sure we're not overruling some federal designation of a..."

Feigenholtz: "No. No, we're not."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Reis: "...historical nature. Okay. Thank you."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill should vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5437, Representative McCarthy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5437, an Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5437 amends the Bingo Tax and License Act. In the very small Section that we have there for senior bingos, there's very tight restrictions on these that they can only have... cards can be sold for 50 cents or less only. The prizes in any one game could be valued at \$5 or less. So, it's a very small Section. And what we're amending, today they... these senior bingos can only be held in a building that is owned by a... a municipality, or in a building that is like a nursing home that has some federally assisted funds. The... in this Bill, we amend that just to add two groups. It can now be held in a building owned by a church, or it could be held by... in a building that is owned by a veterans organization. I do have a church in my area that came to me with this because they were told that their little bingo that they hold at the end

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

of their senior meetings every month was... is actually an illegal event. So, this would make it... allowable that they could hold these minor bingos in... at a church or a veterans organization. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

And on the question, the Chair recognizes Representative
Fritchey."

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

Speaker Lang: "There being no one wishing to debate, those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rose. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5443, Representative Reboletti. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5443, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House.
5443 seeks to be a part of the death penalty reform as well
as dealing with other mental health defenses in our court
system. As we deal with death penalty cases and other
cases where the defense is relying upon some type of mental
health deficiency, we don't have the... the interviews aren't
being recorded. And many times when the expert is looking
to testify, they turn their notes over to the prosecutor's
office, and what the DuPage State's Attorney's Office is

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

seeing is that they may only have two or three pages of notes based on a six-or seven-hour interview. So, we're looking to make sure that... that the state can make a motion for it; the judge can issue an order, those interviews can be protected with protective orders from the court, and that the State's Attorney's Office can also get it an interview by another mental health professional when we're looking at expert testimony. So, I would ask for the passage of this Bill. It's a reform, and I think it makes good sense. And I'd be willing to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor shall vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Graham.

Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

This question, 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti, House Bill 5444. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5444, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill's a cleanup Bill. Every time we amend the DUI statutes we don't follow them all the way across the… the Code. And this would make sure that the… that the vehicles and other items that are available for forfeiture in these proceedings are… are put

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

in the right part of our Criminal Code. I'd entertain any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5458, Representative Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5458, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "This is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. It allows the Attorney General to recover moneys from third parties that cause injuries under the Public Employees Disability Act, similar to what we do in workers' comp. Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman's moved for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Durkin: "Jack, I didn't hear a word you said. Could you speak up and maybe a little slower?"

Bradley: "Yeah. Okay."

Durkin: "I'm a little hard of hearing, as well."

Bradley: "Okay. So, we currently can recover third party actions for… we… we currently…"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Durkin: "That's better."

Bradley: "...can recover third party actions, moneys, under workers' comp. The Attorney General wants to have that ability to do it under the Public Employees Disability Act, bring moneys into the state."

Durkin: "So, who is the Attorney General going to be seeking these claims against?"

Bradley: "Potential tortfeasors that cause the injuries of people that we pay claims for under the Public Employees Disability Act."

Durkin: "Okay. So, it's the... it's for recovery from..."

Bradley: "Third part..."

Durkin: "...from actions which emanate from the..."

Bradley: "Yes."

Durkin: "...within the Industrial Commission..."

Bradley: "Yes, just..."

Durkin: "...which is a no-fault system."

Bradley: "Just like..."

Durkin: "Correct?"

Bradley: "...in workers' com... No, it's like in workers' comp."

Durkin: "Well, workers' comp is a no-fault system, and if it..."

Bradley: "No. No. Subrogation, though, isn't. You go after a third party that causes an injury, it's not necessarily a no-fault system."

Durkin: "Are those individuals who the Attorney General going to be seeking those moneys from, are they going to be able to assert defenses, which they otherwise not have been able

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

to use in the original claim before the Industrial Commission?"

Bradley: "I think we're talking about apples and oranges. So, we pay a public employee's disability claim, right? We then have the right, under this law, to go out and sue the party that actually caused the injury to the public employee; thereby, get their insurance company, potentially, to reimburse us for what we paid as a result of their injury."

Durkin: "But again, the initial claim in which there has been some type of determination of damages is that a..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin, please bring your remarks to a close."

Durkin: "Is that a claim which is emanated from the Industrial Commission?"

Bradley: "I... it... it's wherever the public employee's disability claims go, but it's not... it's not the same as workers' comp."

Durkin: "Well, I understand that, but I think that the claim...

that the subrogation claim, but we're still going to seek

damages from an employer... oh no, from a... from a vendor..."

Bradley: "It's not necessarily a vendor."

Durkin: "Well, do..."

Bradley: "I mean, it can..."

Durkin: "Can you do me one favor, and I'm not trying to do this..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Durkin: "...as a... to stop the action. Could you pull this out? I want to talk this about you off the record for a few

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

minutes 'cause I have had some thoughts about this? If you can extend that courtesy, I would truly appreciate it."

Bradley: "Okay."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. The next Bill is 5459, Representative Coulson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5459, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Coulson."

Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5459 amends the Safe Haven Bill, Newborn Infant Protection Act. What we're doing is changing the forms that people fill out and hoping, that after 53 newborns being saved by this Bill, that we'll also get more information by amending the packet that's given to those parents who are relinquishing their child. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins, Ford, Harris. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. This question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5469, Representative Farnham. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5469, a Bill for an Act concerning financial regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Farnham."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Farnham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5469, the Bill is to clarify who may become a beneficiary after the death of a person who holds a trust at a financial institution. There's been some confusion because the current statute states that the bank may release holdings of a trust to the person named as the beneficiary. This legislation clarifies that organizations such as not-for-profits may also be named as beneficiary. Changing the language to broaden it to include businesses, not-for-profits, as well individuals, will limit the liability of financial institutions that disburse trust because it will codify the organizations instead of just individuals mav be beneficiaries of trust."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor shall vote 'yes';

those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

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

wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

On this question, 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

hereby declared passed. House Bill 5477, Representative

McAuliffe. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5477, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5477, in respect to a township officer or a member of a township board that they would... if they admit guilt of a criminal offense in the form of a written

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

agreement with a state or federal prosecutors and plead guilty to a felony, at that time, that would constitute a resignation from that office, and it'd be effective at the time that the plea agreement is made. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

And on the question, the Chair recognizes Representative

Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, which crimes would... would disqualify someone from holding office, when you're talking about felonies?"

McAuliffe: "If... if they pled guilty to a felony, bribery, perjury, or other infamous crimes under the State or Federal Law. That would... that would fall under that category."

Franks: "Would a DUI fall within it, if... if it was a felony DUI?"

McAuliffe: "I don't believe so."

Franks: "I'm just... Is there a list, possibly? I'm just not sure what this would include, and I... and I'm... and I guess my other question would be, do we prohibit other... in other elected offices..."

McAuliffe: "Yeah."

Franks: "...people from holding office?"

McAuliffe: "I had a Bill like this that, probably about eight years ago, at the time, a Chicago alderman pleaded guilty,

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

and they asked for his resignation. He didn't have to resign, was still able to keep his office open, and still collect a paycheck. And I thought that was wrong and we... I figured we'd extend this to township officials, too. So, if they're... if they admit that they're pleading guilty and write that out, that they're still not going to get their salary and still have their office."

Franks: "I think that makes sense. Thank you."

McAuliffe: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Reis: "Representative, how did the township officials come out on this? Were their concerns addressed and..."

McAuliffe: "They... they never came in to committee."

Reis: "They never slipped in, or offered any..."

McAuliffe: "No. They didn't slip either for or against."

Reis: "I know they had... We were trying to get their opinion on it and didn't get it. So, I was just wondering if there were any concerns."

McAuliffe: "No."

Reis: "Okay."

McAuliffe: "No, no one contacted me from them."

Reis: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Cross, Feigenholtz, Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino in the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Mautino in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, page 28 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 365. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 365, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Flider."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 365 is a.m. a piece of legislation the House. that is a significant reform measure that relates to legislative scholarships, and it passed the Senate by a vote of 54 to 0. And as you may recall, a couple of weeks ago this chamber passed legislation would that prohibit scholarships from being granted here by the Legislators. Passed it a couple of weeks ago, and we do not know what the fate of that will be in the Senate, but this legislation has come over from the Senate, and at a minimum, what it would do is, if that program were to continue, we... it would enable us to reform that to ensure that politics are not a part of that... the granting of those legislative scholarships. And what this would do is it would prohibit political contributions from being made by a recipient of a legislative scholarship or their family five years before their scholarship award, or five years after the scholarship award. It also requires that an applicant

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

would need to provide an affidavit that no contributions were made, or will be made, by an applicant or a member of an immediate family and the nominees must also, already, have been accepted to a state supported university. I think this is a good measure. It's very simple, straightforward. The rules are in black and white. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "This Bill is on Standard Debate. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner is seeking recognition."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? Is there a limit in terms of the contribution? I mean, I've got a... I don't have a recipient now, but I had a recipient 15 years ago, and they gave me five bucks. So, is there... If... Would this preclude the \$5 contributor, the grandma, or someone who decides they want to help me out, would they then be unable to get a scholarship because... So... What I'm getting at, is there a threshold... or any contribution? In other words, if I get a dollar from somebody, and those are the people that contribute to my cause, would they... would that then preclude me from giving a scholarship to that student?"

Flider: "Yes. There really is no threshold in the legislation."

Turner: "There is no threshold. Okay. That's fine."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Reis: "Representative, I've been watching this Bill and... and I supported the Bill that went through the House the other... the other day. In playing off of what Representative Turner just said, anything less than \$150 doesn't show up on D2s. And I was talking with my committee about this over the weekend, how are... and they take applications, they look them over, they score them, and they give me the eight names. How are they to find out whether someone gave a contribution one, two, three, five years ago that was less than \$150 because it wouldn't even... and they're not excited about going back and even looking that stuff up, but how can they determine that when those don't even show up on the D2s?"
- Flider: "I think that's a great question and really, the simple answer is that this legislation provides that an affidavit must be presented by the applicant. So, to anybody who contacts your office or who wishes to apply for a scholarship, would have to fill out an affidavit that provides that they have not provided a contribution to your campaign."
- Reis: "And that's fine, I guess, but what I think would make more sense is, once we move forward from the day that this were to become law, I think that's when going back should start. Because why should someone that gave us... came to a barbeque or did something three years ago, why should their child, once they finally got to college, be precluded from applying for a scholarship when the law wasn't the law then?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Flider: "And... and again, Representative, I think that's another great observation. In... in fact, this legislation does grandfather in all contributions up until the enactment of this legislation."

Reis: "You failed to say that in your analysis."

Flider: "Well, it... it does."

Reis: "Okay."

Flider: "And... and it clearly provides that from the beginning of when this legislation would be signed into law, then going forward, these rules would apply, but anything up to the date of enactment, that would be grandfathered in."

Reis: "Okay. So, let me get... go back. Any applicant that applies for a scholarship would sign a document saying that they never gave you a dollar in the past five years in their application?"

Flider: "Right. So, in effect, when we begin this legislation, all contributions up to the date that this is signed into law, would be grandfathered in. So..."

Reis: "Right. I understand that..."

Flider: "Okay."

Reis: "...but going forward..."

Flider: "Going forward, basically, the affidavit would also have to state, and they will not, nor will their family members provide... immediate family members provide a contribution for a period of five years."

Reis: "I understand what you're trying to do with this, Representative, and I'm going to listen to the debate, but I think we should have some type of a threshold in there. You know, we're allowed to have dinner with people, and

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

then there's a minimum threshold. I think we should have something like that in place. If they want to come to a barbeque and they're a supporter of you. But I see where we're going with big, giant campaign contributions. So, thank you, Representative."

Flider: "Thank you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In all due respect to the Senate and House Sponsors of this Bill, it just simply reaffirms what I, unfortunately, have come to accept, right or wrong and, perhaps, I've been here so long that I am just totally cynical by the process I've observed. What this is designed to do is to give everybody a Roll Call vote in the Senate, and everybody a Roll Call vote in the House. Representative Walker got his Bill out of the House, so some people have a Roll Call vote on that, to abolish these scholarships, which have been an outrage for more than a hundred years. There were reforms made years ago, nobody paid any attention to it. People who lived in... I'm just picking out names now, not picking on anybody, but people who lived in Great Creek were giving tuition waivers to people who lived in Chicago. People who lived in Chicago were giving tuition waivers to people who lived in Muddy Bottoms. Political contributions were playing a role. fact, there was a... a large newspaper story around the state of a prominent Legislator who had awarded a tuition waiver to one of his major campaign contributors just a little

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

over a year ago. You're not going to reform this. We... we pick at the edges and we act like we've done reform... And I really believed for а period of time, after embarrassment with our last Governor, I really believed for a time that we would reform this process. All this Bill does is to show me, in all due respect to the people I've served with, and... and love, and enjoyed for the many, many years, this... this Body and the Body across the... across the rotunda, will never reform themselves. I don't know what it's going to take. There's been indictments; there's been embarrassment; there... We are not financial aid officers. We are not the people who should be giving free tuition waivers at a point where the University of Illinois will probably have a tuition increase of 15 percent. You either are going to get out of the free tuition waiver perquisite or you're not. I'm not going to vote for this. just a Roll Call cover for those of you who didn't vote for Representative Walker's Bill, and this is a Roll Call cover for those in the Senate who will probably never take up Representative Walker's Bill. So, year after year that I've been here, nothing really changes. In all due respect to those of you that think differently than I do, I'm not going to vote for this. I'll vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, I'm reading through the Bill and... and I...

I... I'm kind of curious as to the Section that allows for

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

the revocation or the… the person that received the scholarship to lose the scholarship. Could… could you kind of review again what you're thinking is there?"

Flider: "The way the legislation was crafted and the way it passed the Senate and remains here in the House, is that if, indeed, it is determined that a person is not in compliance with this legislation, then they would be required to pay back the award of a scholarship to the state, the amount of the award, the value of it."

Eddy: "So, who does the investigation?"

Flider: "Well, I... that's a... that's a very good question, and I...

I would say that it would be law enforcement authorities of
the State of Illinois should there be a complaint. Could
be a state's attorney."

Eddy: "Yeah. And the State Board of Education, it's... the way the... the way the Bill reads, a legislative scholarship of any nominee shall be revoked upon a determination by the State Board of Education after hearing that the nominee knowingly provided false or misleading information on the document. So, does the person receive any type of due process? Do they have the opportunity to dispute the facts? I... is... is the State Board of Education set up to be the tribunal? The... just kind of wondering how it practically would work."

Flider: "Yeah. I think that's a very good question. I... I think that they would actually have to establish rules so that they could be the tribunal."

Eddy: "So, the State Board of Education itself, those people who are appointed are... are the folks who would then vote

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

after hearing facts related to a particular allegation that a scholarship was awarded to an individual who did not meet the requirements? They... they would hear the facts. They'd kind of be like a jury, and they'd vote."

- Flider: "Right. After... if they were to make a determination that the nominee knowingly made false and misleading information, they, in fact, could make a ruling that that tuition should be repaid."
- Eddy: "So, would the person have the opportunity then, and it's your intent, that they would have the opportunity to have council present because this is... I mean, you're taken away a value, depending on where they were awarded the scholarship, it could be several thousand dollars. University of Illinois... would they have the right to counsel at that type of a... a trial? Maybe I shouldn't call it a trial. I... I don't know what it is exactly. The State Board of Education, are... are they trained in this type of procedure?"
- Flider: "Well, again, I... in answer to your question with regard to, are they entitled to an attorney. I certainly think that they would be entitled to an attorney. Secondly, whether they are trained or not, I... I think our Board of Education handles a lot of complex matters, and... and I think this is something that they could handle, as well."
- Eddy: "Ha... have you heard from the state board? Maybe that's the best way to ask this. Did... did they show any concern or... did they speak with you at all about their role in... in the process of removing a scholarship?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Flider: "The... No. We have not heard from them, nor have they expressed that they are opposed or supportive. They... we just haven't heard from them."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, Representative, again, I... I understand what you're trying to do here. You're trying to... to get to some activities in a system that you're... you know, maybe are scurrilous, aren't... aren't the intent of the scholarships. I... I do have some concerns about the State Board of Education being the tribunal being... I'm not sure that's their... they understand how to go forward. I'd hate to see someone be put in a situation where they don't have due process, but it looks likes maybe there is something in there. And I appreciate you putting that on the record."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Moffitt: "Representative, in committee we had a lot of discussion on this and I think, you know, a lot of people share wanting to improve the situation we have. I voted for the other Bill to eliminate them. At that time, we mentioned a threshold and according to our notes, you indicated willingness to continue to work on that. And a specific threshold was mentioned because on our reporting, we have names, and we have to report those, and the \$150 threshold, so we would have that list, and you indicated your willingness to work on that in committee. Have you done anything? Have there been changes to spell that out?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Flider: "Well, Representative, thank you for bringing that up, and we did have a good conversation, and I did state that I would take some of those issues under advisement and... and... but in my analysis and discussions with our staff, it... it seemed to me that what we'd be doing is creating some gray area that might make it even more difficult for this legislation. Where, right now, it's... it's really black and white, and it's pretty straightforward. And... and... so, one of the questions came up too, in terms of penalties or what the... ramifications would be, if somebody were in violation and, I think the important thing to recognize here is that the onus is really on the person who is filing the affidavit. So, that person would actually be knowledgeable about whether or not they've made a contribution, whether they would be able to qualify for this or, you know, and by signing that affidavit, they would know that they not ... cannot make a contribution. So, certainly, our effort at reform here, while it's designed to ensure that there is no political... there is no political basis for providing a scholarship, that the onus really is on the person who's applying for that scholarship."

Moffitt: "Then... and I asked that question dur... in committee, if you remember, if a... a form or a statement on the application, that the applicant is saying they or their family has not made a campaign contribution, that would be adequate as trying to establish that?"

Flider: "Yes. That would... I would believe... I believe that's to be the case. I think it's a simple straightforward

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

question, and with regard to a... the applicant or an immediate family member."

Moffitt: "You also remember... in... if the whole burden is on the applicant, that helps. And again, I use an independent I don't know who's applying, but I mentioned committee. something else, you know, that with the case of a lot of blended families, it could be that the name of the applicant, the last name of the applicant's different than any contributors that you have, and it'd be pretty difficult in some cases to know that that, in good faith, you're trying to abide by this if it becomes law with the ability to know that that that that the stepdaughter, stepson, of some contributor, you... you could... it'd be one of those things that could be missed. And if the burden is on the applicant then, I guess that removes that problem. Would you agree?"

Flider: "Yes, I... I think that's the case. Yes."

Moffitt: "Now, it does mention for five years. How do you track... How you going to keep track... you know, what's the tracking procedure to... for five years that that family can't, you know, the day it was awarded it was fine, but they're not supposed to contribute for five years after that, is that the way this would work?"

Flider: "That's correct."

Moffitt: "And who..."

Flider: "Yeah. I..."

Moffitt: "...who's... who would the burden of responsibility be on that? I mean, that would be kind of difficult to track for the..."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Flider: "Right."

Moffitt: "...Legislator."

Flider: "Yeah. I think, the way I certainly would... would see this being done is that, you know, again, the onus is on the person who's filling out the affidavit, and they would know if... and hopefully, be able to record for their own records when... and when they could not make a contribution. Now, I... I would say probably, a vast majority of recipients are not contributors. And so, this probably is not going to be an issue or a problem, and... but at the same time, I think, again, the onus is on that person to recall. But I think, certainly, as Legislators, if we were to know if, say, we were in the fourth year and, you know, somebody were to contribute or... or an immediate family member were to contribute, and... and we were to have knowledge of that, I... I think each of us would probably step forward and... and tell that person, hey, now is not the time and, you know, you're not qualified yet under the provisions of the scholarship law to..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Sponsor may finish his answer, and then the Gentleman's time is expired."

Flider: "So, I... I think that we, of course, if we had knowledge of that, would for inform the applicant and do our best in terms of our due diligence, as well."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. I agree with those who thought the right course was to eliminate the General Assembly tuition waiver. We are not, as people have pointed out, financial aid counselors. We have no

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

particular expertise in deciding who should be the recipient of this opportunity, and who should not, but I also think that if that doesn't happen, it would be a mistake for us to pass up the opportunity for some reform in the granting of tuition waivers under the General Assembly program. I believe taking baby steps is better than taking no steps at all, and what this measure does is, first of all, it makes sure that a student who is given the waiver has already been admitted to the public university, avoiding the possibility that we give the waiver and then pressure the school to take the child in and second, it says that pay-to-play has no place in the awarding of a General Assembly tuition waiver. People who make campaign contributions, their children, their spouses, will not be eligible for a tuition waiver. When you read the scandals about this program, that's the biggest scandal. goes out and they finds that Representative so-and-so gave a tuition waiver to the child of someone who made a \$5000 campaign contribution, Senator so-and-so, the same. taking that out of the General Assembly tuition waiver program, to me, is a reform, is a step forward and may prevent yet one more scandal from tainting this So, while I don't think this is the ... this institution. Bill is the best thing since sliced bread, I do think that a step toward reform is better than no step at all. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to figure out exactly what this does. So, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Mulligan: "I'm sorry, I was in different parts of it. I looked at the actual text of the Bill, and I could not decide if the text of the Bill was totally new and then amended with other Sections, or... It appeared to me that, in the Bill, it says... in the body of the legislation it says that you could give your scholarships away to an entity that would either test or do something in order to get those scholarships, but that they would remain in your area. Was that an old Bill or was that a Bill that was passed and then changed? Because when I read it, I wasn't sure that I had ever seen that before, because that to me would... would have been one of the suggestions I would put into a reform for the simple reason that I've always liked the fact that what this does is it divides money up across the state evenly into 118 districts."

Flider: "Yeah. To my knowledge, the point you're referring to is not a... a change in this legislation, but it's existing law. So, I'm trying to... Now, what is... what is your..."

Mulligan: "Well, I had never heard bef..."

Flider: "...proposed reform?"

Mulligan: "Some of the things that are proposed in this Bill we were already doing, because I thought that was the law and we had to do them, and that I would like to go through with you. The other part of it, when I looked at the actual text of the Bill, and not the highlighted part which meant the new part, was that... we could have in the past, which I

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

have never heard before, advocate our ability to choose ourselves and give it over to an entity, an educational entity in our district or at the university, to test people, but to then selectively give that many scholarships to people in just your district, so that you would no longer be associated with it but that the people in your district who are looking to go to college and I don't just say young people, 'cause it's not always young people, would then have the ability to... you have eight scholarships or however you want to divide them up, into your district, because you've advocated the role of putting your name on it but given it over to a university or an educational entity."

Flider: "Well, I... I think there have been various proposals to modify how we would be able to distribute those, but I... I do think that right now, you know, we have great latitude in terms of how they're being awarded, and I don't know... Are you suggesting that we would sort... sort of limit that latitude if this..."

Mulligan: "No, I've..."

Flider: "...program continues?"

Mulligan: "One of the reasons I was for it, and I've been...
there's been some discussion of my being for it, was that I
thought... First of all, I've always felt that we've done a
good job and we've never been... had anything egregious. But
the other reason was, I thought it was an interesting way
to have scholarship money divided up evenly across the
state for students in each district, and that the text of
the Bill, aside from what is being added, said that we

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

could have advocated our right so, it wouldn't be me as a Legislator. It would just say that I've given over the ability for so many scholarships to be divided into my district to an entity that would either test or go over the information, and that's part of what's the text of this Bill before the addition. So, I want... I was wondering if that was already the law, and that you were just... that Bill just added to it?"

Flider: "No. My understanding is that's already what was in the law."

Mulligan: "Because I have never heard that before. All right.

And then... You seem to be indicating in this Bill, which I always thought was the right... a definite right to not... to not distribute them, which many Legislators have done on their own, but are they just reiterating it in the law?

And then, I thought, also, it was already that we... that when we had amended this before, it already was a given that the student had to be accepted at that school before you could award it so that people didn't think they could get in because you awarded them the scholarship."

Flider: "I... I do believe and know that it is the... at the discretion of each of us as Members, whether or not we want to award these and... and the approach that we... that we want to go forward in terms of how we would give them out. But this legislation does, in fact, provide a new provision that the person must already have been accepted at a state university and... and I think as the previous speaker had indicated, perhaps, this has been used in the past as a means to encourage a university to accept somebody who had

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

not previously been accepted by virtue of the fact that they..."

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

Rose: "Thank you. First of all, Mr. Speaker, could we have Representative Bost excused for the rest of the day?"

Speaker Mautino: "The Clerk will… will record that. Thank you, Sir."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Rose: "Thank you. Representative Flider, first of all, I note in here that... that a Member of the General Assembly may forfeit. They can already do that though, correct?"

Flider: "Yes, they can."

Rose: "Yeah. Okay. Representative, a couple of thoughts here; one is, on the forward looking prohibition, how... how is, you know, hypothetical Legislator A, supposed to know four years from now that somebody's nephew... that somebody at a fundraiser had previously given a scholarship to their nephew?"

Flider: "Well, this would be for immediate family members. So, in terms if immediate family members..."

Rose: "So, what's your definition of immediate family?"

Flider: "Well, immediate family... my estimation would be parents, and... and children..."

Rose: "And is that..."

Flider: "...in the family."

Rose: "...in the Bill?"

Flider: "The immediate family definition is, yes."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Rose: "That... the definition in the Bill is parents..."

Flider: "Immediate family is. I... I guess I would say that we probably all know what an immediate family is, and we would use our..."

Rose: "Well, actually..."

Flider: "...judgment accordingly."

Rose: "...in the Civil Code of Procedure, there's a different definition in dealing with like wills, trusts, and estates. You get into all kinds of definition of family. That's why it's important. So, your... yours says spouse, parent, or any person living with a parent. Is that right? Page 4, line four."

Flider: "Yes."

Rose: "All right. Thank you. So, Representative, let me ask you something and, first of all, I don't know why we don't just get rid of these things, but... If you want to keep this around, because I... some of the criticism has been that this is the only thing that guarantees that kids from certain parts of the state get help going to college, why wouldn't you just create a program to have the only Board of Higher Education administer a grant program to give every kid from every district in the State of Illinois four scholarships, and let them administer it? I mean, why keep this in our hands?"

Flider: "Well, Representative, I... I think it's a very good observation. In fact, since the time I've been a... a Representative, I have not awarded these because of some of the kinds of insinuations that have been made by previous elected officials in our area or about them, so I've never

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

awarded them. So, I voted for the Bill to abolish them, so I dis... I agree with you on that aspect. With regard to the..."

Rose: "Right, but I... I'm for..."

Flider: "...why would we..."

Rose: "...abolishing, but if... if you're coming up with a compromise, why a compromise that leaves it in the Legislators' hands?"

Flider: "Well, in answer to your question, why not create an independent authority to give these out, from my standpoint, a couple of points I'd make. First of all, the legislative scholarships in fiscal year '08 have cost universities \$12.5 million. It's free tuition really is what it is. It's a tuition waiver. We call it a scholarship."

Rose: "Right, and this..."

Flider: "So, secondly..."

Rose: "...doesn't change that."

Flider: "...so, secondly, the... with regard to whether we should create a new program, I... I think that we should not. I... I supported the first Bill, but my contention here is if this continues, we need to take the politics out of the program."

Rose: "Well, and I guess, Representative, I... you know, first of all, your first point, that's... that's exactly right. That's why we should end these. This Bill, your compromise, doesn't change it. To your second point, that is nonsensical, and leaves it in the Legislators' hands. Why not create a separate authority? If... if people want to

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

keep these things, to guarantee repre... geographic representation of scholarship funds, create a separate authority, put it in the authorities hands, and make sure that every district in Illinois gets four scholarships. Or here's one; why don't you give them to school districts to hand out?"

Flider: "Well, again, my contention is that, I would not want to create a program that extends this program because it costs universities twelve and a half million dollars. So..."

Rose: "Well, this extends that though, Representative."

Flider: "So... but if..."

Rose: "I mean, that doesn't..."

Flider: "...but if you'd like..."

Rose: "...make any sense."

Flider: "...to introduce that legislation, I think you should."

Rose: "Well… well, Representative, look, we all voted last week to end the programs. Right? You did, I believe. I did. That's great. We voted to end them. You came back and made a statement today that you wanted to seek some compromise, and… and you've brought forth this. And I'm just suggesting, maybe if you took this out of the record, we could come up with an Amendment that would take it out of the Legislators' hands all together, and put it in an independent commissioner. Give them to… give them to school districts."

Flider: "I think my statement was that in... in the event that the Senate does not pass the legislation that we pass, then we would at least have this leg... reform legislation, which I think the public would appreciate."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Rose: "Well, and I think... I see my time's coming up. I'll briefly conclude..."

Speaker Mautino: "You want to finish your statement, Sir?"

Rose: "Yeah. I'll just briefly conclude. Well, thank you, Representative. I... I guess, you know, my only point is I... I... in the event the Senate doesn't do that, I think this could be done better, as the Majority Leader said, baby steps are sometimes better than no steps. But you know, again, Representative, I think, you know, if you're going to do this, you should take it out of the record, and take it com... come back with an Amendment that takes it completely out of our hands and puts it in IBHE because as you said, this \$12 million unfunded mandate remains even in your current proposal. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Our final speaker is the Gentleman from Cook.

Representative Dunkin."

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

I'm not sure if you... you know this, Representative, what if

a... I'm a town... township committeeman or elected to another

office, am I... do you have an answer for that, more or

less?"

Flider: "So, with regard to this specific piece of legislation it's... it's pretty clear... or are you referring to whether this is..."

Dunkin: "I said... I'm saying, if I'm a committeeman..."

Flider: "Right."

Dunkin: "...and I'm a State Representative..."

Flider: "Oh."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Dunkin: "...am I eligible... or how would that qualify me in receive... in allocating a scholarship from my legislative office or is it separate categories or is that sort... or is that too gray in the Bill?"
- Flider: "Well, to my knowledge, we are the only Body, the House and the Senate, the General Assembly, that issues these legislative scholarships. So, with regard to... you know that... that's who this legislation applies to, those people who we would provide these scholarships to."
- Dunkin: "Okay. I'm not. Again, it appears as if it's a gray area here, so if I'm a committeeman, and I'm a State Representative... and as a committeeman someone has made a contribution to my committeeman's campaign fund, does that make me... that... that recipient eligible or ineligible or they're separate funds? I mean, if you don't know the answer that's... I understand 'cause, you know, that's..."
- Flider: "You know, Representative, I think... I think I understand your question now. I think... you know, it basically says to your political committee as a... as a State Representative, as defined in the Election Code, you know. So, I think, you know, I would just say the spirit of the law would be, that you as a Legislator receive a contribution in any way that would benefit you as a elected official, in a case that you have two offices, you'd probably have to get that clarified. It could... it is a gray area, but I think, in my... from my standpoint, we're talking about your role as a State Legislator."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Miller is seeking recognition."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Miller: "Just following up with the previous speaker's question. I think what he's trying to say... Representative you're a former mayor, if somebody has given you a contribution under your role as a mayor, and then you got elected as a State Representative later on, are they precluded from a contribution because... are... are they precluded from the scholarship because they gave you a contribution as a mayor, or only in your role as a State Representative?"

Flider: "Yes. And the way I am looking at this language, it would be in any capacity as an elected official. So, you know, if... if you had been a mayor or a committeeman and then you became a Representative or a Senator, then that wouldn't be included in the definition of a contribution to a political committee."

Miller: "I'm sorry. Can you repeat that. I cou... I'm sorry,

Representative."

Flider: "So, if... if you were in another elected office and you received a contribution to a political committee, that was designed to help you get elected, then that would be included within the definition of the five-year period. So, my... the way we're reading this language here is that any contribution in a capacity as a elected official would be included within a five-year period."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Miller: "Okay. And then... and that would include if you are...
that we have a number of elected officials who are also
committeemen, wherever their jurisdiction is, that would
preclude them being contributions towards their
committeemen account or towards... in my case, my former
State Senator was also a... a village mayor at the same time,
concurrently. So, that would preclude them from either a
con... a contribution from either account, if they were two
separate accounts."

"Yes. That... that's my interpretation, but of course Flider: that's subject to somebody else's interpretation. But the way I would view that is... first of all, I want to point out, again, that there is... this law, or this provision will not apply until this legislation is enacted. So, that would be at the point that this legislation is enacted that to be... to be the period preceding the granting of the scholarship would be given, that would not begin until this law is enacted. So, for example, three years from now, if this law's in place, you know, if a mayor received a contribution from somebody and then became а Representative and then had the ability to offer these scholarships, if I were that person, I would not grant a scholarship under those circumstances."

Miller: "No, I understand. I mean, many of these reform measures that are already in here, I... I do on my own. So, it's not... just a sense of clarity. The last question is, there's certain elected officials that may run as a slate as you know, and somebody... and then my... in some of my municipalities they'll... they'll create a... a reform slate or

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

whatever the slate may... you know concerned citizens for whatever the village is. And that... that sitting mayor, in my case, had formed that. Now, if a person gave to that committee with the purp... with the candidate's... or the state elected official's name on it, would those individuals also be precluded from a... from a schol... from applying and getting a scholarship, if they gave in the ca... and the person was part of it, a different slate under a different name?"

Flider: "Well, I believe that I would, if it were... if it was up to me to make that determination, I would air on the side of caution and look at this language as precluding the ability to grant that scholarship, if, in fact, the contribution was made to a campaign committee that benefited my election or reelection efforts frequently."

I understand and I'm not... this is where I think Miller: "No. some of the gray is, is because what you may do may not be what was... what's written here. I mean, I'm going to support this, but I just want a sense of clarity as we move forward in this and... and just some thoughts, at least for the record in regards to, if these scenarios that come up real political life, what wou... what would the implications be? And what would be the recourse, and what would be intentionally known because there may be, you know, under a slate scenario, they may want to give to whoever is running as county clerk... or the clerk on that particular slate and you may never know about it and then find out about it when their child or themselves apply for a scholarship."

112th Legislative Day

- Flider: "Right. And the onus or the requirement to know, whether or not a contribution was made would be on the in..."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman... the Sponsor may be allowed to finish the question... finish the answer."
- Flider: "The... the onus would be on the person applying for that scholarship to fill out that form in the... a to determine whether or not he or she made a contribution or his family members made contributions."
- Speaker Mautino: "No more Members seeking recognition, Representative Flider to close."
- Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there are a lot of good questions around this and obviously this is a very serious issue, and very important issue and I think one where the public is looking at the Legislature to enact some meaningful, very important reforms and this is one way, when you look at newspapers who have editorialized, they would say let's abolish the scholarships. We passed legislation out of here that would result in the abolishment of legislative scholarships. But absent that, we have a reform measure where, if, in fact, the other Body does not act on our legislation or does not pass it, we at least can reform this system, take politics and political contributions out of this system and not only that, but if we pass this legislation today, we can have it on the Governor's desk enacted into law right away. This is a good reform measure and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. I hope that you will support this legislation. Thank you."

112th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 365. 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 Boland, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 85 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 365 is declared passed. Page 23 of the Calendar appears House Bill 5458, Representative Bradley. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5458, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you. So, I think I've addressed Representative Durkin's concern. Just to make it clear, whatever third party suit was initiated would be a separate suit from the Industrial Commission. The defendant would be afforded all the rights and privileges that any defendant would get under a normal case. They can defend themselves. It's not a no-fault situation."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."
- Durkin: "I'll be very brief. I agree with Representative Bradley. I wanted to make sure that it's in the record that, in that subsequent action, that defender would be able to insert defenses which otherwise are not available in the Industrial Commission or under the Work Comp Act, specifically, contributory negligence, intoxication, other issues which you're not allowed to use in that venue. So,

112th Legislative Day

- I appreciate your consideration and I will support this legislation."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I... I'm sorry for interrupting the debate. I just want to make sure Representative Black and Brady are excused from the Roll Call."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Clerk will add them to the Roll of those excused. No further Members? Mr. Bradley to close."
- Bradley: "I ask for an "aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, Dunkin. Mr. Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5458 is declared passed. Page 24 of the Calendar, House Bill 5495, Representative Burns. Out of the record. House Bill 5510, Representative Farnham. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5510, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mahoney: "Representative Farnham."
- Farnham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5510 amends the Illinois Domestic Violence Act of 1986. Provides that if an emergency order of protection is issued when the court is not in session, the judge who issued the order shall probably communicate or convey the order to the sheriff to facilitate the entry of the order by the Department of

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

State Police into the law enforcement agency's data system."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5510. 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. 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5510 is declared passed. Mr. Cavaletto, House Bill 5540. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5540, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. House 5540 is identical to the Bill I introduced last year, that passed this House. Bill would permit nonrule municipalities to borrow money from regional planning and development commissions, provided that the money's repaid within 10 years. Currently municipalities do not have a way to defer normal high costs associated with borrowing money to make infrastructure improvements to build design to help reduce these costs. This is an initiative of the South Central Illinois Planning Committee and Develop Commission. This Bill passed the House last spring; however, remained in the Senate Assignment Committee. With that, I ask for a favorable vote and would be happy to answer any questions." Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill

5540. No Members seeking recognition. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed

112th Legislative Day

- 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. 102 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the Bill is declared passed. Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Harris and Osterman are excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect that. Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I have a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Schmitz: "If the House would join me in giving a round of applause to a Member of our side of the aisle, who has added another year to himself today. Representative Connelly's birthday is today. So, please join in a round of applause."
- Speaker Mautino: "House Bill 5664, Representative Burke. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5664, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This matter would simply require fire sprinklers in all fraternity and sorority houses. Currently, our state commands that all dormitories for colleges and universities be equipped with fire sprinklers. This extends the

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

requirement to sororities and fraternities. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5664. On that question, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Sullivan: "Representative Burke, when you talk about housing in this... and I... and I bring this up because I... I went to the University of Illinois, I was in a Greek System. We have a separate corporation, called Zeta Corporation, that owns the fraternity where I was a member. Now, right now, my Chapter's not on... on campus, and this corporation, in essence, owns a private entity, a private house, that potentially would not be used in the Greek System. So, how would your Bill affect this incident... instance that I'm talking about?"

Burke: "Well, I might suggest that simply that any facility, any building that was used to house a fraternity or a sorority would have to comply with this law. Well, whoever may own it."

Sullivan: "So... so, if a fraternity wanted to move into a private housing that they bought, they would have to retrofit this building before they moved in?"

Burke: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Pritchard: "Representative, is there any funding in this Bill?" Burke: "No."

Pritchard: "So, this is in other words an unfunded mandate that we're placing on either private citizens, private corporations, or those that... you know, might not otherwise have financial backing."

Burke: "As I suggested in my earlier remarks, we now command that all colleges and universities have their dormitories sprinklers. This is a initiative to save lives."

Pritchard: "And... and I agree with your objective."

Burke: "And I would not describe it as an unfunded mandate."

"In every hearing that we have had in the Higher Pritchard: Education Committee, where universities have talked about unfunded liabilities and they're struggling to meet the cost of education without raising things beyond the ability of students to comply with, have command... have commented that this unfunded mandate is causing them great financial problems. So, now we're going to take a same policy that doesn't provide funding, and express this to private corporations or private individuals. It just is a far reach on the ability of this state in... in the problems that we have we're now imposing on everyone else. But Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This is just a... a far reach at something that I'm not sure is a significant problem. think universities around our state have talked about this issue with fraternity councils and they have installed them. I certainly was the President of a fraternity

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

corporation on campus, and when we had an addition, we used that opportunity to install a sprinkling system, but the rest of the house is 150 years old. To... to try to go in and... and retrofit that is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and I think this is just the wrong public policy direction for us to..."

Speaker Mautino: "Now, the Gentleman may finish his remark."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr..."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Reis: "I want to pick up on... on Representative Pritchard's comments. In fact, I passed the baton to him as President of the same fraternity. Now, if I understand this, this is just for new construction or is this for any remodel?"

Burke: "It's for any."

Reis: "I'm sorry, what?"

Burke: "For any. Any building that would house a fraternity or sorority."

Reis: "New building or retro..."

Burke: "New, old, semiold, it makes no difference."

Reis: "So, what if you're a fraternity that's, say, 40 years old, and you're not doing any construction, no renovation.

They would still have to conform as well?"

Burke: "Would you repeat that, please?"

Reis: "Say, they're a... say, it's a fraternity that they're not doing any renovations or any additions or anything like

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

that. Would they still have to have... be totally sprinkled?"

Burke: "Yes. Yes."

Reis: "Well, our analysis says for all new construction beginning in 2011."

Burke: "They are given until 2019."

Reis: "For all to be in compliance?"

Burke: "Would require fire sprinklers in all Greek housing by 2019."

Reis: "Okay. As someone who's gotten a call at 1:00 in the morning, with a fire, I... I understand both sides of this issue, but back to a question I asked Representative Feigenholtz before, many times these fraternities are on historic sites and it gets very hard to put these systems in. I understand with new construction, I understand with additions..."

Burke: "Let me... let me tell you what the cost of installing this system. It's approximately \$2.50 to \$3.50 per square foot. That's what the cost is, whether it be new or older facilities."

Reis: "But sometimes you change the conformation of a house or a room and then you become out of compliance as the national..."

Speaker Mautino: "You may bring your question to a close."

Reis: "Okay. To the Bill. You... you become out of compliance.

I... I understand with this, what they're trying to do with this, but at the same time, cost is very prohibitive, alumni donations are down, tuition rates are going up very rapidly, which puts pressures on alumni associations not to

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

increase room and board. I think this is a little bit far reaching. I think they need to be eased into this, and I think we've got a current system that allows that to happen."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Howard."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Howard: "In Chicago, there are a number of... of facilities that are the offices of black Greeks and they call them houses. There's a Sigma House, there's an Alpha House, there's a Kappa House, and they're all owned by... and they conduct business within them for those Greek organizations. No one lives in those places; however, so are we... we're excluding those kinds?"

Burke: "Yes."

Howard: "Thank you very much."

Burke: "Only residential."

Howard: "Only residential. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And I trust the Representative might want to respond. I was just... I've been trying to get the information here. As you decide what to do on this, in addition to saving lives, in addition to saving property or reducing property damage, when you put a sprinkler system in, you lower insurance costs. So, there's a return on that investment, on that

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

protection. I've seen figures, but I don't want to quote them because that's what I was trying to find here during the debate. But there's a significant payback in insurance savings to go towards the cost of the sprinklers, which is... you know, an additional benefit. If you have that, I hope you share it, but this is proven that it saves lives, saves property and when you look at the payback, reducing insurance costs, it actually is one that's going to pay for itself over time. I'd like to have that figure. I'm still trying to get it, but if you have it, I hope you'll share it. So, that's why I support this legislation."

Burke: "Thanks."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved... Oh... Representative Burke."

Burke: "Thank you. Representative Moffitt, the... the approximate savings is 40 percent on the insurance costs. And as you suggested, indeed, these systems would pay for themselves over a period of time. And then let me... let me remind those that are talking about this... this cost issue. The average cost of a funeral in Illinois is \$6 thousand. What would you rather pay?"

Speaker Mautino: "No further Members seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Representative Burke, would you like to close?"

Burke: "Let me close. Ladies and Gentlemen, just as we require these sprinkler systems in college dormitories, this is just an extension to the fraternities and sororities. Let me remind the Body, also, that in the last 10 years, 110 people have died in fires in sorority and fraternity

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

houses, the latest one in Decatur at Millikin University. Can we not afford the same protection as to those who reside in fraternities and sorority housing as we do to college dormitories? I would say it's a natural, nobrainer. Please support this initiative. It's a lifesaving initiative. Thank you so much."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's moved passage of House Bill 5664. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take... Representative Ford, do you wish to be recorded? Take the record. 97 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill is declared passed. Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Just to add one more person to those excused for the remainder of the day, and that is Representative Ford."
- Speaker Mautino: "5666. Read the Bill. Representative Gordon."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5666, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill.
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gordon."
- Gordon, C. "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5666 very narrowly expands the hearsay excep... on marital privilege exception, and the hearsay laws in the State of Illinois. Right now, the marital privilege exception is... is very odd in that it is the defendant who has the right to keep their spouse from testifying against them. The only place where this is allowed is that when the defendant is then charged with the crime involving sexual assault, aggravated

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

criminal sexual assault, predatory criminal sexual assault of a child, criminal sexual abuse or aggravated criminal sexual abuse and the minor is a victim under 18 in either spouse's care, custody or control at the time of the offense, then the other spouse can testify. What this does is it make it... it makes it so the ... the spouse can testify during the course of the investigation. When this is going into play is usually during come а grand proceedings or when the police is... are... are questions. Usually, the situation that's going to occur is the child of these parents is going to go to the mother in most instances, even though we both know that either the mother or father can be the abuser, it's going to go to the mother, it's going to make admissions, the mother is even going to see some evidence of the abuse, and because of what's occurring, the mother's not going to be able to tell the investigators what that child said because the father's is... or is not going to be able to be... because is not going to be charged, they're not going to be able to repeat those statements, because it is the defendant who can assert their martial privilege. What this does is open up that privilege, so that during the course of the investigation the spouse can open up those statements in the same way they would, if the defendant was able to be charged. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the Lady moves passage of House Bill 5666. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Mr. Clerk. Representative Burns, Mathias, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 102 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5666 is declared passed. Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we please excuse Representative Mathias for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. On page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 5019, Representative Reboletti.

 Out of the record. Page 8 of the Calendar is House Bill 5080, Representative Lyons. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5080, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation has been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. On page 24 of the Calendar appears House Bill 5668, Representative Dugan. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5668, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Dugan."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 5668 just adds to the Firemen's Disciplinary Act the definition of paramedic and EMT. The Firemen's Disciplinary Act, of course, started in... was put in 1983. Since that time, of course, paramedics and EMT have become part of the fire service. So, this is an initiative of the firefighters and the fire service. So, I'd like an 'aye vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "Lady moves passage of 5668. Representative Feigenholtz.

Feigenholtz: "No."

112th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "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 Beaubien, Sente, Winters, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 86 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', this Bill is declared passed. Representative Lyons in the Chair."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sara Feigenholtz for a point of personnel privilege."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for purposes of an announcement. The Human Services Appropriations Committee will meet at 9:30 Tuesday morning, 9:30, not 9 a.m. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Page 24 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Third Reading, we have House Bill 5669. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5669, a Bill for an Act concerning public safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Tim Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5669 allows the special needs alert database for the… within the Secretary of State's Department. So, if somebody would like to notify the Secretary of State of any special need they have, which will assist a law enforcement in case of an emergency, they can do this on a voluntary basis. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

112th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation of the Bill. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5669 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 24 of the Calendar, Representative Ron Wait has House Bill 5673. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5673, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Boone County, Representative Ron Wait."
- Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5673 is a Bill that would help to save the county and the state money, just allow that in status hearings and minor things that they could do it by video conferencing rather than bringing the people to court. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5673 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Winters. Dave. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 101 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

declared passed. Representative Wait, you also have House Bill 5675. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5675, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation, which may be referred to as Bachman's Law.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Wait, you want that held?"

Wait: "Yeah. That needs an Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Well, what..."

Wait "So, I don't wish to call it at this time."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Wait, do you want that left on Third or do you want to move it back to Second?"

Wait: "We can leave it on Third for right now, if that's okay."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. We'll leave that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Take the Bill out of the record. Representative Elaine Nekritz, you have House Bill 5712. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5712, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to try to do a little better this time. We have a lot of construction on the rails coming between the Create Project and the High Speed Rail. And this legislation assures that the same due responsibilities for motorists and pedestrians and to stop and yield to... to trains, also applies to track repair equipment."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Lady's discussion... the explanation on House Bill 5712. Is there any discussion?

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

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

Davis, W.: "Representative, when this other equipment is on the tracks, and I assume you mean, like when... and... and I don't know if there's a technical term for it, pickup trucks that have the rail wheels underneath it and they ride along the tracks?"

Nekritz: "I think those are called hi-rails."

Davis, W.: "Hi-rails, okay. When those things are on the track, are the gates down? So, you're saying that pedestrians need to offer the same type of right-of-way that they would to a train, but are the gates down, when those things are on the tracks as well?"

Nekritz: "They may or not be, depending on how that... that equipment, whether it's... whether it's set to set off those. If it... This doesn't change anything. If it doesn't set it off, you know, I mean, it still is an oblige... I think whether or not that the gates are down, or whatever, everyone still has an obligation to look and make sure before they cross. But it doesn't... it doesn't change any of the existing law with regard to how the... how... what the duties, responsibilities are when the gates are up or down."

Davis, W.: "Well, but does this imply if one of those is on the track..."

Nekritz: "Yes it would. Yes it would."

Davis, W.: "...and the gates aren't down..."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Nekritz: "And the gates... I'm sorry, I didn't..."

Davis, W.: "And the gates are not down... If one of those is on the track and the gates are not down, am I supposed to proceed across the tracks or wait until the..."

Nekritz: "I think your obligation is to look and make sure that the way is clear."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, but that's what I am concern..."

Nekritz: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...if those are on the tracks..."

Nekritz: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...does that impede my progress?"

Nekritz: "Does it impede your progress? It's..."

Davis, W.: "I mean, well, maybe I don't understand exactly. You're saying, if track equipment is on the tracks, that we need to ask, but as motorists be mindful or yield to those kinds of things, if I understand what your Bill does. So, I'm just wondering if... if one of those is on the track, and I continue across the track, am I going to get pulled over by a cop, who's waiting on the other side of..."

Nekritz: "No. No. No. If... if... I see what you're saying. I... Okay. It... it doesn't change any of that obligation. If the gates are not down, and you're proceeding as you would normally in an automobile, it doesn't change... I don't believe it changes any of that."

Davis, W.: "Doesn't change any of that?"

Nekritz: "Right."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "I ask for your support."

112th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 5712 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, you have House Bill 5727. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5727, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Champaign, Representative Naomi Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5727 clarifies the municipal... Illinois Municipal Code regarding elections. It sets forth the procedure for placing specified candidates on the ballot for the General Municipal Election. It... there is... in the General Election one offers... officer's to be elected, then there should be two candidates who receive the highest number of votes in the Primary Election would be on the general election. And so this just goes up the same, if there were two to be elected, there would be four on the ballot and likewise. So, this really just clarifies the statutes for municipal elections."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 5727 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

112th Legislative Day

- all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Tim Schmitz for an announcement."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I apologize for that. Please excuse Repres... Representative Durkin from the Roll."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Continuing on page 24 of the Calendar, Representative Jim Sacia, you have House Bill 5728. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5728, a Bill for an Act concerning the transfer of real property. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an agreed upon Bill. There is no known opposition. It's an initiative of the Department of Natural Resources to transfer property to the City of Galena, Illinois, to extend the Galena River Trail. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5728 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jack Franks. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 100 Member voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

the bottom of page 24 of the Calendar, Representative Mike Fortner, you have House Bill 5755. Out of the record. Representative John Bradley, 5764. Out of the record. Continuing on top of page 25, on House Bills-Third Reading, Representative Will Burns, you have House Bill 5783. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5783, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Burns."

Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the I'm presenting House Bill 5783. What 5783 does is create a... a new license for persons who wish to engage in hair braiding. Right now, if one wishes to braid hair legally in the State of Illinois, one must be licensed as a cosmetologist. So, for the last year, I've worked with the United African Organization, the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, the Illinois Policy Institute, and the cosmetologists... and the Schools of Cosmetology, to figure out a way to create a license for persons who wish to engage in hair braiding. Very quickly, what this Bill does. If you are currently engaged in the act of braiding hair, and you have been doing do so for two years, within two years after the enactment of this Bill, you may be grandfathered in by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations, meaning that you would not have to go through any additional training, if you can prove that you've been engaged in the act of hair braiding.

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

You would also have amnesty during that period as well, according to the department rules. For persons who are seeking a license, they would have to engage in 300 hours of training, 230 of it, if applied, practice underneath the supervision of a licensed hair braiding instructor, 70 classroom hours. This Bill's a compromise. There's no opposition. It's been touted by the Chicago Tribune and other advocates as a way to move people out of poverty to opportunity to give folks an opportunity to start their own businesses. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation to House Bill 5783. This is on Short Debate. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Mary Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of Committee. Will them first of all, Im my name should be removed from this Bill. I asked you, and I think I even had the Clerk's Office to remove my name from this Bill. That's number one. Number two, in committee yesterday, it was my understanding that you were going to hold this Bill on Second until there was some type of agreement. Also, I talked to the director, and the director said that hair braiders has no business being in the Cosmetology Act because they are not cosmetologists. And to say that a hair braider have to have 300 hours is like saying that a Caucasian person to braid hair... that a Caucasian person have to have 300 hours to make a ponytail. That doesn't make sense. That is just something that is natural to African-American women. And what these people talked to me

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

about, they said they want to be licensed, but they are charged an astronomical fee without being notified that it was mandatory, that they pay upwards of \$5 thousand and there was a cease and desist on their place of business."

Burns: "Thank you, Representative, for your questions and comments. Let me begin, first of all, by stating, I don't believe that there's anything essential about being African American or African that would allow you to braid hair... braid hair..."

Flowers: "No, I didn't say you had to be. That's not what I said, but it comes natural, as natural as it would be for me to braid or either make a ponytail for my daughter's hair. I can do them both."

Burns: "I am phenotypically African American. I'm culturally African American, but I cannot braid my daughter's hair to save my life. Ask my wife, who frequently is angry when she leaves my daughter with me over the weekend and finds her daughter with a gigantic afro by Monday."

Flowers: "There's nothing wrong with that either."

Burns: "Question?"

Flowers: "My question to you, did you say that you were going to hold this on Second?"

Burns: "I... I made no commitment in committee to that fact because there was no opposition to the Bill. What I committed to in committee that we would work with the Department of..."

Flowers: "When I came before the committee... Okay."

Burns: "I'm sorry, Representative, you asked me a question, I'd like to answer it. You asked me if I made a commitment. I

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

did not make a commitment in committee. I made a commitment for the proponents to meet with the Department of Professional Regulation; they did that. The department believes that many of the changes that need to be implemented with this Bill could happen through rule, through the JCAR process. I have an e-mail from the proponents summarizing their meeting on my computer. I talked to... I checked in with folks, and when this Bill's ready to go over to the Senate. And I would appreciate your support."

Flowers: "No, I will not be supporting this Bill. And I think you're doing a disservice to the people who are just trying to make a living. And once again, hair braiding has no business being in the Cosmetology Act and that is according to the director."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... actually a little bit afraid of delving in between what just happened there. But if I could ask a question? Representative Burns, why would you need 300 hours of training? Are they already required to be a cosmetologist? 'Cause if they are, I'm against... I'm against that. I mean, that's ridiculous. You shouldn't need a license to braid hair."

Burns: "Thank you, Representative, for your question. Here's the issue. Under current law, if you wish to braid hair, you have to be licensed as a cosmetologist which requires 1500 hours of training, \$10 thousand a yea... \$10 thousand to go through the training to become a cosmetologist. The reason why you would want hair braiders..."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Rose: "That's ridiculous."

Burns: "...to be licensed and to have a process for licensing hair braiders is that if hair braiding is not done properly it can result in alopecia, which is baldness. consumer protection issues. There... that... those sorts of issues that are important. And so, that's why you would Most of the... most of the hour want some training. requirement under this Bill happens in a... in a salon under the supervision of a licensed hair braiding instructor. So, it's really about 70 hours in a classroom. It will cost several... several hundred dollars for someone to get the classroom training. It's far less expensive, far less prohibitive, lowers the barriers to entry into entrepreneurship and I think it's a good Bill."

Rose: "All right. So, basically you're going from 1500 hours to 300 hours, is that right?"

Burns: "That's correct."

Rose: "I mean, frankly, I still, notwithstanding your comment about the public health concern. I mean, it's like, are we going to tell kids they can't have lemonade stands. I mean, you know, I... I don't know why we are regulating hair braiding. I mean, that just seems real... relatively silly to me that, I mean, it's a... frankly, talk about economic development. It's a bear economic development, but I guess to the extent your Bill makes this better, I'll support you, Mr. Burns, but... Representative Burns, but I... I guess I would actually almost rather see the Bill that gets rid of this from the Cosmology Act altogether, 'cause I don't know why we would be in this business."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Burns: "I'd just like to... just to follow up very quickly.

 We've worked with some free market folks, the Illinois

 Policy Institute testified in support of the Bill. And
 there are many women who are never going to get licensed to
 braid hair. They're women who are going to go over to
 someone's house and braid their hair, but for someone who
 wants to open up a store, who wants to grow a business, and
 not worry about being shut down this gives them an
 opportunity to come out from the underground."
- Rose: "And that's... Yeah. That's what I'm all for. And I... I just don't think 300 hours is..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose, your time is up. If you could... Okay. Representative Ed Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a jobs Bill. Every day we come to this place and we talk about how we can bring more jobs to the State of Illinois. We have a Representative that is trying to help his community by making it easier for people to get jobs. Everyone say it with me, jobs. It's real simple. Please support this Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Randolph, Representative David... Danny Reitz. Danny."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reitz: "Representative, we... we had a similar Bill that was discussed earlier in committee, yesterday. And I guess in... in our discussions in... in committee we talked about working with the department on this Bill and... and looking forward to an Amendment coming back. Has that been addressed?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Burns: "Yes. The Illinois Coal... the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights and the United African Organization and the cosmetologists and Schools of Cosmetology met with the department and as a consequence of their meeting with the department, the department does not believe there needs to be a statutory change. There doesn't need to be an Amendment to this Bill, that any of the issues can be dealt with through rule."

Reitz: "Okay. So..."

Burns: "There's no Amendment..."

Reitz: "...from..."

Burns: "...no Amendment that's necessary."

Reitz: "As chairman, I guess, then my... my question... we were going to work with the department and we were looking forward to an Amendment. You're saying that we don't need an Amendment because the Department has indicated they don't want one and they can do this all by rule?"

Burns: "That's correct. That's correct. That's the only reason why I'm moving the Bill."

Reitz: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Burns, do you know the origination of African hair braiding?"

Burns: "I would submit it's probably in Africa."

Davis, M.: "Well, that shows your limited knowledge because, actually... actually. African hair braiding is all over the coastal areas where people were enslaved, and they learned

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

to braid hair without any chemicals, without any cutting. They just braid hair. All of us African-American women probably sat in someone's kitchen or on our mom's knee, and Sometimes hair is added to the got our hair braided. braid. There is absolutely no reason for a mother with a number of children, limited income, to have to go to 300 hours of a class. She's not coloring hair. She's not doing eyebrows or nails. She's merely using a long, traditional skill that comes from many of motherlands, be it Brazil, Jamaica, Caribbean Islands. There is no reason that anyone would need to learn to braid hair unless, of course, this, too, is a skill we will transfer to another culture. It is my sincere belief ... it is my sincere belief that this Bill, similar to what a Representative said, will start to decrease the opportunity for some people who are not immigrants, but who are African Americans who know how to braid hair. It's just... teenagers braid hair. College students braid hair. A college student may make \$15 for braiding her sister's hair. So, why would we want to remove this opportunity for people to earn a small amount of money, not having to pay for child care? I think that you..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, your time has expired.

If you could please conclude your remarks, we'll give you another minute."

Davis, M.: "I appreciate that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we want to take this skill from the people who brought it to this country, and I don't believe we need to license them, and I also think you should have kept your

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

word about... you should have kept your word about holding this Bill on Second. I talked to the director of the department, and he, too, says all we need to do is remove hair braiders from the cosmetology Bill. That's all. This should be a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Miller: "Just in regards to committee and just want to make sure we understand for the House Floor, that this particular license limits the fact that they, the hair braiders, will not be dealing with chemicals, and just wanted you to expound upon that."

Burns: "Yes. Hair braiding... the definition of hair braiding under this Bill specifies that does not include chemical treatments that are... now gets to a cosmetology... the act of cosmetology."

Miller: "And so, sort of pursuant to the… one of the former speakers in terms of the number of hours required, would you say that to earn a cosmetology license and a lot of the chemical would… usage would be the difference between the numbers of hours to obtain this license?"

Burns: "That... that would be correct, Representative."

Miller: "Okay. And in terms of continuing education, what is the requirement and who is the… who's to enforce the requirements for… to make sure they've… they've had their continuing education? Would it be dep… the Department of Professional Regulations?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Burns: "The Department of Financial and Professional Regulations will be responsible for reauthorizing the licenses, and it's 10 hours of continuing education, once you..."

Miller: "Wherever you..."

Burns: "...once you have..."

Miller: "Wherever you..."

Burns: "...once you have the license... to get the license again."

Miller: "For every two..."

Burns: "Ten hours."

Miller: "...for every two-year period. And is that any... I mean, and that continued education is just proof similar to other licenses and other professions in terms of... for them to maintain their license, and of course a fee?"

Burns: "It's the same as the Cosmetologist Act."

Miller: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "I certainly don't want to get involved with the concerns between the caucus, Representative, but I want to come back to the process. Did you say you were going to hold this Bill on Second until IDFPR has had their concerns addressed? It's our understanding, from our Members that that's what your agreement was."

Burns: "Representative, my commitment was to continue to work with the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations. The advocates met with the department this

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Wednesday. The department said that they can handle any of the issues in... with regards to implementing this Act through rule and JCAR, and that's the only reason why I'm moving the Bill."

Reis: "Have they..."

Burns: "They did not request an Amendment or any additional language changes to the Bill."

Reis: "Are those negotiations still going on?"

Burns: "The e-mail that I have, and in my conversations is that, they're going to be conversations about the rule making process and what rules will go through JCAR, but in terms of the statutory authorization for this Act, they're no more... there are no more negotiations about... Amendment language for this particular Bill."

Reis: "So, do you think this Bill will get amended in the Senate?"

Burns: "I do not believe that this Amendment will need to be amended in the Senate."

Reis: "Represent... This is why we're so hesitant to send Bills out and say we're going to hold them on Second... hold it on Second for an Amendment, hold it on Second to work. We never know... I think there's some concerns in the chamber that this is going forward and it's not a complete Bill yet."

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

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was... was he going to respond to that? Was that a question? Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Dunkin: "Representative, currently, what's the regulation, if any, of African hair braiders, or... or hair braiding shops in the State of Illinois?"
- Burns: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pull this out of the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "Speaker (sic-Mr. Clerk), take this Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Karen Yarbrough, on the top of page 25 on our House Bills-Third Readings, you have House Bill 5790. Out of the record. Representative Lang, you have House Bill 5820. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5820, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We all watched with great interest the spring Primary, and in that Primary, we noted that there was great dissatisfaction with candidates who had been nominated to the... to the Office of Lieutenant Governor. This Bill is a simple Bill, but I think a significant one. It would require gubernatorial candidates to run in a Primary with a chosen Lieutenant Governor candidate, so we would link these candidates in the Primary so that all the voters would know what judgment their gubernatorial candidate used in determining who their running mate would be. I think it's a good Bill. I think it's a timely Bill. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "So, Representative, give me an idea of practical terms how this works. What are the mechanics involved with your Bill?"

Lang: "Pretty simple mechanics. When a gubernatorial candidate would circulate petitions, they would circulate petitions with a Lieutenant Governor's name."

Eddy: "So, the petition itself would have the name of the gubernatorial candidate along with the person's whose name would also be listed on the ballot in the Primary, someone who would sign that petition, those candidates then all applicable election laws related to petitions would then apply to both individuals."

Lang: "That's correct. They would run as a team from start to finish."

Eddy: "And same... all the rules regarding Election Code, how they're placed on the ballot, the order, if there's five or six sets of candidates, everything would be substantially the same."

Lang: "Exactly the same, Sir."

Eddy: "Exactly the same. Okay. Now, could you... could you state in... you know, in some type of terms why you believe this is better public policy than the way we select those candidates now? I... I know we had some trouble recently, but has this historically been a problem? Is this something you see..."

Lang: "I think many have claimed for years that saddling a gubernatorial candidate of one Party, with a Lieutenant Governor candidate of that same Party that is not

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

necessarily of their choosing, is not a good idea. I think it's appropriate that we reform the way this office is chosen. I think many have come to me and said they support this measure. As you know, Speaker Madigan has a Constitutional Amendment totally abolishing the Office of Lieutenant Governor. I think... I think that's a good approach, but I think this is an equally good approach to make sure that, at least if we're going to..."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time's expired.

 Representative Lang, want to finish your..."
- Lang: "Thank you. At least we could be sure that if we're going to have the office, at least we, as voters, can judge the judgment of the gubernatorial candidate and the kind of person he or she wants to run with. And so, I think this is a good idea."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roger, you want one more minute to finish your question?"
- Eddy: "Yeah. Just... just very briefly. How do other states handle this, Representative Lang? I... just not that we have to do what other states do, but has there been precedent in other states that... How many states do this in this way?"
- Lang: "I can't tell you how many states, but I think there is a mix, Representative. As you know, there was a time in Illinois that... not... the gubernatorial candidate and Lieutenant Governor candidate ran totally separately all the way through the process, so you could elect the Governor of one Party, and a Lieutenant Governor of another Party. We fixed that some time ago, and now I think it's appropriate to take this step as well."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fritchey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Fritchey: "Representative, would it be possible under this proposal for an individual to run as the Lieutenant Governor candidate with more than one gubernatorial candidate?"

Lang: "No."

Fritchey: "What if in the opinion... and you said part of the reason for this... and I'm not being facetious, but part of the reason of this was for voter cells to be able to... can... infer... the judgment of the gubernatorial candidate by who they chose as their running mate, and maybe more than one gubernatorial candidate believes that a certain individual would be the best qualified running mate, and that running mate says, you know, I would be interested in serving as Lieutenant Governor should either one of these candidates win. And I'd like to run with either one of them and give the voters a choice of having either ticket A-B, or A-C. I mean, I think that we're unnecessarily limiting voter choice by not allowing that option, and obviously all the candidates involved would have to defend what their ticket looks like."

Lang: "It's an interesting point, Representative, but I think the approach of the Bill is a... is a better one, which says, pick somebody... but the possible Lieutenant Governor candidates would have to link with the person that they

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

felt was the most likely to be victorious, who they share the greatest in common with."

Fritchey: "Well, and that... and that may well be, but at a time when we look at these... at what the options may be, that, as I said, we may be depriving not only candidates, but the voters themselves from having the strongest ticket Party may be whatever... whatever the whether it's Republican, Democrat, Green, whatever the case may be. just... I don't know that it's a limitation that we should make and... and again, each gubernatorial candidate would have to defend or explain why they were willing to run with somebody that was also willing to run with somebody else. The Lieutenant Governor's candidate would have to say, well, I'm interested in serving, I think both of these individuals would be qualified. I just think that we're taking a choice away and maybe actually depriving, not only the citizens, but the state of having the strongest possible ticket. Because what I would see happening, potentially, is that the gubernatorial candidates, there would almost be a race to find the best qualified person first, and then all of a sudden, somebody that may be unequally, or better qualified as a qubernatorial candidate, may actually have a weaker overall ticket because they did not get..."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Fritchey, your time has expired. If you could hit… conclude your remarks, we'll give you another minute."

Fritchey: "Thank you. While... while this may sound convoluted,

I think when we look at what this state has gone through in

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

the last few years, there... there's no example that we can think of that is not within the realm of possibility. So... I mean, I got the... maybe it's more of a statement than a question, but I... I really wish it was something that would be... that would be considered. I understand what you're doing. I think it's vastly preferable to what we have now, but not as good as it could be. Thank you."

Lang: "Well, I'd be happy to consider that idea in the Senate, but I do have some concern about the same name appearing on the ballot in two different places for the same office. I think that's really awkward, but I'd be happy to take a look at it."

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

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

Fortner: "I... I think part of my concern was just raised with the previous speakers, 'cause I also think that, yeah, one might get the case where you have a particularly strong candidate who's well-defined to be one to run for Lieutenant Governor, and maybe more than one person might want to attach that. I also recognize that the... the states roughly divide half and half. It's not exactly, but it's pretty even between the states as to which method they use. I guess my question is, given what happened in 1986 with the Lieutenant Governor's position, I'm surprised this hasn't come up many more times frequently than we have just this election cycle."

Lang: "I agree with you, Sir."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Fortner: "So, I think this has been a long-standing problem. I can see that this has a lot of merit to improve this situation. There are holes as the previous questioner, I think, has pointed out, and I think if we can tweak that, it becomes even a better product."

Lang: "Thank you. I'm certainly happy to listen to all suggestions, and if improvements are necessary, we can do them in the Senate."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative, you know, I have the greatest respect and admiration for you and the hard work that you do, and the thoughtfulness that you give to all of your legislation..."

Lang: "Thank you."

Davis, M.: "...but I just have to ask this question. Your Bill states that the Governor will select his Lieutenant Governor. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That's correct."

Davis, M.: "So, if something happens to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor takes his place. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That's also correct."

Davis, M.: "If the Governor has corrupt or evil intentions, do you think the person he has selected to replace him might be ready to follow through with whatever he started?"

Lang: "Well, I'm not sure that this Bill would affect that. So, you still have a situation where, whether they run together in the Primary of not, a Governor and a Lieutenant Governor

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

are run together in the General, and if some Governor had, as you put it, evil intentions, you... the attorney... the Lieutenant Governor could... could follow those evil intentions or not. I don't think this Bill has any impact on your concern."

Davis, M.: "But I would think that if the Governor had selected his running mate, and if the Governor had evil intentions, or developed such, a person he chose to take his place, perhaps, would not be the best person to help clean up whatever was left in reference to harming our state."

Lang: "Well, I..."

Davis, M.: "In other words, you know, I could say to you... say we had a Governor and he did some corrupt things, and he had a best friend, and his best friend is accused of also doing some corrupt things, but that could have been his running mate, and that could have been the person we're with for Lieutenant Governor."

Lang: "You're... It seems to me, Representative... I understand your point. It seems to me you're more likely to be able to publicly vet the Lieutenant Governor candidates if they run together with the gubernatorial candidates as a..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, your time is expired.

Representative Lang will finish your explanation."

Lang: "Yeah. I... I think it's easier to vet them if they run together than independently. We just went through an issue in our Party where candidates weren't vetted because... even the newspapers didn't bother doing that, but if they ran together with a Governor, they would."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lyons: "One more minute, Representative Davis. That'll be it."

Davis, M.: "Yeah. Thank you. Just as I stated in my preface,
I do respect you. I'm just not sure this is the proper
thing for us to do, and especially at this time. When does
it take place? When does this begin? In the next
election?"

Lang: "Yes. It would be the next election."

Davis, M.: "In 2000..."

Lang: "2014."

Davis, M.: "2014. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5820 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Boland, Dugan, Joyce, McCarthy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 90 Members voting yes, 5 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'.
This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Sorry that I was not at my desk.

They... What I wanted to do was add to the excused list for the remainder of the afternoon, whatever is left of it, Representatives Joyce and McCarthy."

Lang: "The Clerk will so note, Representative. Thank you, Leader. On page 25 of the Calendar, Third Reading-House

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Bills, Representative Zalewski, you have House Bill 5832. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5832, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mike Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5832 adds aggravated... unlawful use of a weapon. What it effectively does is state that if the weapon is unloaded, uncased, and readily accessible, and the offender does not have a valid FOID card, they are not eligible for probation. Just as a matter of note, the analysis might state that this goes opposed by the... by the ISRA. That is, in fact... actually, not accurate. They are neutral on this Bill. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation to House Bill 5832. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, we had this conversation in committee regarding the FOID statute, and if a person came from out of state and didn't have a FOID card, would that person be able to be prosecuted the same way, or would that person be treated differently because they couldn't obtain a FOID card. So, they came from Indiana, where they don't have FOID cards, or Missouri, or elsewhere, how would that be handled?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative, for... for bringing that up. What we talked about, and what I explained to you in committee and then in our conversations about this Bill is, the FOID statute allows for nonresidents whose firearms and... are unloaded and enclosed in a case to be exempt from the FOID statute. So, in effect, if they are carrying it, an uncased, loaded, and immediately accessible weapon in the State of Illinois, they're already in violation of the FOID Act. And what we'd argue is that, if a nonresident is in Illinois and they are not obeying the... the statutes of... our gun statutes, that they're in violation of law, and they're subject to the same laws as Illinois residents and we... and this Bill would apply... this law would apply."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I know that they... I'm still concerned they would be treated differently because... the FOID card, in Illinois, you have to get to possess a gun in Illinois..."

Zalewski: "Sure."

Reboletti: "...but in other states, you don't have to. So, there's a concern that people will be treated differently under due process and equal protection. I know you and I've talked about it but you haven't talked about it, what the genesis of this Bill is."

Zalewski: "I... I'm sorry."

Reboletti: "You haven't talked about what the genesis of this Bill is."

Zalewski: "Well... Thank you, Representative. As the Body well knows, we... there... the City of Chicago lost a police officer named Officer Valdez in a horrible act last... last year, and the... the offenders were... had previous UUW viola..."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lyons: "You can continue, Representative.

Representative Reboletti, your time's expired. I'll give you another minute to finish this conversation."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Zalewski: "...in their background, and they'd been given probation each time. I know you raised the fact that we need to do a better job of... of enforcing the existing laws with respect to that, but what we need to do, in my opinion, in Cook County is... is not offer probation as a... as a viable option for those who are guilty of ag UUW."
- Reboletti: "Well, I'm not in disagreement of that part, but in that situation with Officer Valdez, it... it was a fact that the judge in that case watched and presided over three violations of probation for UUW and did not lock up the defendant, and did not sentence him, or send him to the Department of Corrections. Is that a fair statement?"
- Zalewski: "I think that's... Yes. I believe that's a fair statement based on what conversations you and I've had."
- Reboletti: "I... I'm just concerned about the wording. It's not that I don't support your legislation. I stand in support of it. I just want to make sure that we don't end up in an unconstitutional situation. So, I'll listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative Careen Gordon."

Gordon, C.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Gordon, C.: "Representative Zalewski, did you say that they're already in violation of the FOID card statute if they're carrying a loaded, uncased..."
- Zalewski: "No. Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Representative. Finish your question."
- Gordon, C.: "Did you say that they're already in violation of the FOID card statute if they're carrying a loaded, uncased, accessible firearm?"
- Zalewski: "What... what I said was based on my reading of this... what I meant to say is based on my reading of the statute, they are not... they are exempt from the FOID requirements if they are nonresidents who has a... has a valid card from another state. However, nonresidents whose firearms are unloaded and enclosed in a case are exempt from the FOID card statute as... are exempt from... required to have a FOID card in Illinois, as well."
- Gordon, C.: "If someone is carrying a loaded, uncased, and accessible firearm, are they in violation... and they're an Illinois resident, are they in violation of the FOID card statute?"

Zalewski: "No. They're in violation of the UUW statute."

Gordon, C.: "Okay. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Froehlich: "Yeah. Representative, do you have any idea what the impact would be on the Department of Corrections, if your Bill becomes law?"

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Zalewski: "I... I don't, Representative. I have exact numbers for you."

Froehlich: "Well, we..."

Zalewski: "What I... what I would..."

Froehlich: "Wh..."

Zalewski: "Go ahead. I'm sorry."

Froehlich: "Is it in the hundreds or in the thousands of additional inmates, potentially, if this becomes law?"

Zalewski: "I... I would argue that there could be a substantial uptake in the number of inmates who go directly to the IDOC as a result of... as a result to this statute."

Froehlich: "And, you know, I'm not sure that you've got a bad idea. I just wonder if a year, when we face a record deficit, it's a good time to enact a Bill that will predictably increase cost to the state prison system. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Oh, Representative, thank you for your notes. I would... I would say, Representative, that, again, we didn't receive any input from the Department of Corrections about the negative impact of this Bill. I... You know, I would, again, remind the Body, we've had that discussion about, you know, the compelling interest of making sure dangerous criminals are put in jail versus fiscal integrity. And finally, this... this will act as a deterrent. We... we need strong deterrents in this state for those who consistently violate our... our gun regulations. Both... both sides of the gun debate can agree on that, that we have to enforce

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

existing laws and make those who violate existing laws pay for their crimes. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5832 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Julie Hamos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 93 Members voting 'yes', 5 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Burke, you have House Bill 5842. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5842, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Danny Burke."

Burke: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This matter is an exemption regarding a liquor license in my district. It's a situation where an existing business serving food wants to also serve alcoholic beverages, and the school is located across an alley in the rear of this property. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's discussion. Is there any question? Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, has the school been contacted? Normally in these cases there's some type of letter that..."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Burke: "Yes. I... I have a letter of support from the local alderman and the principal of the local public school."
- Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much for putting that in the record, appreciate it."
- Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5842 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Boland, Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 59 Members voting 'yes', 38 Members voting 'no'. Representative Burke."
- Burke: "I'd like Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "On request of the Sponsor, Mr. Clerk, we'll put this... this Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Representative Marlow Colvin, you have House Bill 5854. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5854, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marlow Colvin."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5854 deals with giving the Illinois Finance Authority the ability to do multistate bonding. The Illinois Finance Authority often has the opportunity to do bonding and... for projects that require not-for-profits, other entities... not-for-profit entities in the State of Illinois that do multijurisdictional projects all throughout the Midwest and in other states. Oftentimes, they can't participate in

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

those very lucrative, competitive bond issues because, currently, the State of Illinois does not allow multistate bonding. This is an initiative of the Illinois Finance Authority. It allows them to be more competitive and, quite frankly, it... it allows them to do better financially. There's no known opposition to this Bill. It came out of committee unopposed. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Colvin: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, do we have a list of the projects? I mean, is this something that's funding some projects that have already applied, or is this just adding another billion to it, and let people apply as they come in?"

Colvin: "No. There is no list of projects that are currently underway because, right now, this is something they cannot do. If given this tool, they'll be able to compete in the... in the market in this respect, but currently, there is no list of projects that are pending, simply because it's not legal to do so."

Reis: "Is there any threshold on how far into another state we can go? And I understand there may be a situation where someone on a border town may want to open something right across the state, and Illinois workers could drive there easily but, you know, could this go to Pennsylvania? Could

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

this go to Texas? Is there any threshold on how far out of state..."

Colvin: "No, there is..."

Reis: "...these projects could be funded?"

Colvin: "No. Let me really... speaking to the intent I know when... when the Illinois Finance Authority contacted my office in regard of this Bill, the intent clearly was to help not-for-profit organizations and others here in the Midwest compete with these bond issues in neighboring states, where they have multijurisdictional not-for-profit operations in neighboring states. To your point..."

Reis: "I... I just don't understand why we would want to create jobs in another state. Help me out with that."

Colvin: "I'm sor... No, no, no. I... I think that's a little bit of a mischaracterization in terms of creating jobs in other states. What we'd like to do here is create the ability to do a... a multibond issue where Illinois may be included in some bond issue to build some new building for some notfor-profit..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin, you can continue your response and, Representative Reis, we'll give you one more minute to conclude your question."

Colvin: "...but so that they can participate in those bond issues, so that those physical plants that are being planned through a bond issue can also be built here in the State of Illinois. So, this creates... this speaks to job creation in the State of Illinois, and the Illinois Finance Authority being able to help finance those deals where they

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

maybe also doing business or construction projects in other states."

Reis: "Okay. I'm not going to go much..."

Colvin: "But..."

Reis: "...past my time..."

Colvin: "...but in..."

Reis: "...and I'll..."

Colvin: "...but..."

Reis: "...continue to..."

Colvin: "But only..."

Reis: "...listen to the debate on this. I'm a little unclear, as
I think several people are on the floor, on exactly what
your legislation does. So, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Colvin: "Yes."

Leitch: "Representative, very often in situations like this, there's a... there are reciprocal agreements among states who would accomplish this. Has any given... has any thought been given into requiring or exploring reciprocal agreements so that we have the cooperation of two states or more?"

Colvin: "In terms of... I... So, you're saying..."

Leitch: "In other words, if we had authorized this, would Indiana author... also have this authorized, or Missouri, or Wisconsin, or Michigan, or..."

Colvin: "As it relates to the Bill, I don't think there's anything in the Bill that relates to that."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Leitch: "I think it's a... I'm not opposed to your Bill. I'm just asking this question because I think it would be helpful if there were some kind of mechanism for reciprocal lending, but thank you."

Colvin: "Thank you, Representative."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you please exclu... excuse Representative Schmitz and Representative Pihos at this time."

Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk will so note. Thank you, Representative. Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just very quickly. I represent six counties right on the Indiana-Illinois border, and the way I read this, and the way I understood it, this has a lot of possibility if we extend the amount... the bond authorization that on my side, or our side of the border, the jobs that this could create may well be in Indiana, but this helps put together the kind of projects that those folks could travel to for those jobs. Is that..."

Colvin: "Well, I..."

Eddy: "...is that a fair characterization of this?"

Colvin: "No, I could tell you that what the Illinois Finance
Authority hopes to accomplish with this tool are those
individuals who are building physical plants, those notfor-profits and other entities that are building physical
plants, have... when they're participating in these bond

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

issuances, it's directly to... related to projects, construction projects that are taking place in Illinois, where they may be also doing something in Indiana, but the Illinois Finance Authority would like to participate in these deals. Not only are they profitable for the Illinois Finance Authority, but they go directly to those physical plants that are being constructed in Illinois, creating Illinois jobs."

Eddy: "And... and that's the way I read it. I just wanted to get that on the record..."

Colvin: "Yes."

Eddy: "...'cause it... I think it has a lot of potential for job creation."

Colvin: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "The physical location may not be in Illinois, but certainly the jobs would be in Illinois..."

Colvin: "Correct."

Eddy: "...and I think the fact that Representative Black is a chief cosponsor speaks to the hope that we have along the border that we can work in that manner to create those jobs here. So, I support your legislation."

Colvin: "I think you captured the essence of the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beth Coulson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Coulson: "I... I'm concerned that we are looking at this from the perspective of having some new bonding authority that the taxpayers of the State of Illinois are going to be

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

responsible for repaying for something that's being built outside of the state. Is that what this Bill does?"

Colvin: "No, absolutely not. The exact opposite. This is... The taxpayers do not fund any of this debt. These bonds that are issued are not financed by any General Revenue Fund, and... and I want to be real clear about that. I think what you have just suggested..."

Coulson: "I didn't say... I said they'd be responsible in the end for the repayment if there's a default."

Colvin: "The Illinois taxpayer?"

Coulson: "Yes."

Colvin: "No. Not at all. This... this legislation doesn't change any way how those bonds are being repaid currently, or in the future. The Illinois taxpayer's not on the hook for the bonds that are issued at the Illinois Finance Authority."

Coulson: "Okay. So, then, what about the question that was asked by the former Representative about the issue of having some reciprocity that other states would be willing to have reciprocity in here. Would you be willing to amend this in the Senate to try to make sure that other states are also doing this for us? Indiana..."

Colvin: "Well, currently..."

Coulson: "...Iowa..."

Colvin: "Currently..."

Coulson: "...Wisconsin."

Colvin: "...all those states are doing it. Every state, right now, in the Midwest... I can read the ones that are... are

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

doing it, right here; Indiana, Missouri, Wisconsin... I'm reading the states that border Illinois."

Coulson: "Right."

Colvin: "All these states currently participate in multistate bonding right now, but the list is longer than that.

Arizona, Colorado, Arkansas, Florida, Kansas, South Dakota, and other states are currently doing it, as well."

Coulson: "So... there is some reciprocity available?"

Colvin: "Absolutely."

Coulson: "Is that what you're saying?"

Colvin: "What this does... what this Bill will do is give the Illinois Finance Authority a tool to compete with those folks who are already doing this."

Coulson: "Thank you."

Colvin: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin to close."

Colvin: "I think this is a real good jobs Bill. It's a real good revenue Bill for the Illinois Finance Authority. It gives them a chance to compete with other Midwestern states that are currently doing this, to compete in... in that very lucrative market. And I simply urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5854 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 26 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- passed. Representative Jakobsson, you have House Bill 5859. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Take that Bill out of the record. Representative Fortner, you have House Bill 5871. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5871, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate... this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Mike Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 5871 simply requires that when they're putting together the prior approval list for medications, they have to take into other factors such as gender. We know that there are many drugs that based on various genetic background and other factors have specific and different impacts, and this just says that that has to be taken into account."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion on House Bill 5871? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 96 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bob Flider, you have House Bill 5873. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5873, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flider."

Flider: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This legislation would provide transparency with regard to pensions of police firefighters and essentially, what it would do is require the Department of Insur... the pension boards of police and firefighters to submit their report to the Department of Insurance, who would then submit a report to us and the Governor on an annual basis beginning next year. genesis of this legislation was simply to provide some level of transparency, ensure that that information is public to us. Oftentimes, we hear from local elected officials that the General Assembly has created some problem for them, and... and in looking at this, I just found that it would be very helpful for us to have this information available to us, not only to have the information, but also to ensure that, as our state pension funds have seen over the last... beginning more than 20 years ago, you know, we've had some unfunding problems and... or nonfunding problems and so, I want to make sure that this doesn't happen to our firefighters and police pension. So, it's just a matter of transparency. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "There any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5873 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say... vote

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 96 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 25 of the Calendar, Representative Dugan has House Bill 5901. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5901, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Kankakee, Representative Lisa Dugan."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 5901 would allow DNR to issue special purpose permits to salvage dead, sick, orphaned, or crippled wildlife protected by the state to private educational organizations. I'll be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5901 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 95 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Walker, you have House Bill 5907. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5907, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this House Bill."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mark Walker."

Walker: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5907 is a probusiness Bill. It makes improvements to the Electronics Products Recycling Act to clarify the Act. It... it simplifies the reporting processes, removes them from retailers, simplifies them for manufacturers and lowers the fee paid by smaller businesses in this field. I think this is good for the state and good for this Body to vote for.

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on House Bill 5907. Is there any explanation (sic-discussion)? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lou Lang. The Gentleman does not seek recognition. No one further seeks recognition, Representative Walker to close."

Walker: "It's a good Bill; let's vote for it."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5907 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 96 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapin Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we please excuse Representative Connelly for the afternoon."

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- Speaker Lyons: "The record will so reflect, Representative.

 Representative Collins, on page 25 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5913. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5913, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Collins."
- Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're just asking for passage of House Bill 5913. What it does is changes the Department of Juvenile Justice so to... so that they can share services with any other agencies just... not just the Department of Corrections. And we ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation of House Bill 5913. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5913 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Collins. There you go. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 94 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Collins, you also have, at the bottom of page 25, House Bill 5916. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 5916, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Take that Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, for a very, very, very important announcement, the Chair

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

recognizes Representative Ed Sullivan. Very important announcement. Heads up, everybody."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In anticipation of Irish week next week, I would like to report that the Gentleman in the Chair is going to be bringing in food on Tuesday from Harrington's, the famous corned beef sandwiches. With that... with that, we will have our eighth annual Sullivan caucus fund-raiser on behalf of Ha... Haiti relief efforts that will be at Floyd's First... Floyd's Thirst Parlor from 5 to 9 p.m. Once again, we do not charge for people to come, but we ask for a donation and it will go to Haiti relief efforts. Rep... Mr. Speaker, I believe for a further announcement, we would like to send this over to Representative Will Davis."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis for an equally important announcement."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In furtherance of the celebration that's going to take place next week on Tuesday, after you're done celebrating with the celebrating a gr... good, anyway... celebrating with the Sullivan caucus, we invite you to come over to Oasis on 411 East Washington and celebrate in what we call... annually, we call Stone Jam, which is a great old-school disco party. Encourage you to put your dancing shoes on, take your ties off, and come out and enjoy some great disco music to the sounds of DJ MF. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1004, offered by Representative Howard. House

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Resolution 1005, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 1007, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 1008, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 1009, offered by Representative Washington. House Resolution 1010, offered by Representative Froehlich. And House Resolution 1011, offered by Representative Connelly."

- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'... 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Rose: "Mr. Speaker, would the record reflect that I intended to vote 'aye' on House Bill 5154. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The record will so reflect, Representative. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Joint Resolution 113, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, March 12, 2010, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, March 15, 2010 at 12:00 noon, or until the call of the President and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Tuesday, March 16, 2010, at 12:00 noon, or until the call of the Speaker.
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves for the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes';

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Seeing nothing further to come before the House of Representatives, the House will stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 noon, on Tuesday, March 16. So, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will stand adjourned until March 16, Tuesday, at the hour of 12 noon. Have a wonderful weekend, and a safe trip home. The House stands adjourned."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 6747, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 6748, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 6749, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Bill 6750, offered by Representative Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6751, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6752, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6753, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6754, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6755, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6756, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6757, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

appropriations. House Bill 6758, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6759, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6760, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6761, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6762, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6763, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 66... 6764, offered Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6765, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6766, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6767, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6768, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6769, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6770, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6771, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6772, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6773, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6774, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Bill 6775, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6776, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6777, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6779, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning... making appropriations. House Bill 6780, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6781, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6782, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6783, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6784, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6785, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6786, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6787, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6788, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6789, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6790, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6791, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6792, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6793, offered by Representative

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Madigan, a Bill for an Act making a... concerning appropriations. House Bill 6794, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6795, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6796, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6797, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making approp... concerning appropriations. House Bill 6798, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6799, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6800, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6801, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6802, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6803, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6804, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6805, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6806, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6807, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6808, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6809, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6810, offered by Representative

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6811, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6812, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6813, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6814, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6815, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6816, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6817, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6818, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6819, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6820, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6821, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6822, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6823, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6824, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6825, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6826, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6827, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

appropriations. House Bill 6828, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6829, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6830, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6831, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6832, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6833, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations and the House Bill 6834, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations and the House Bill 6834, offered by Representative Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations."

"Introduction of Resolut... Resolutions. Clerk Bolin: Joint... Correction. Senate Joint Resolution 87, offered by Representative Myers. This Resolution's referred to the House Rules Committee. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 333, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 384, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning State Senate Bill 575, offered by Representative Government. Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1840, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Senate Bill 2065, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2474, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2509, offered Representative Coladipietro, a Bill for an Act concerning

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

civil law. Senate Bill 2525, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2527, offered by Representative Walker, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2529, offered by Representative Welps... Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2534, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2554, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 2573, offered Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2605, offered by Representative Collins, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Senate Bill 2606, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2614, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2630, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning electronic records. Senate Bill 2797, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2959, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Senate Bill 2981, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2993, offered by Representative DeLuca, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3030, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3041, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3068, offered transportation. Senate

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3086, offered by Representative Flider, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 3118, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3139, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3183, offered by Representative revenue. Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3198, offered by Representative Careen Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Senate Bill 3264, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3281, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3288, offered by Representative Osterman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3387, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 33... Correction. Senate Bill 3638, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3644, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 3658, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3660, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3661, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3705, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3707, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

finance. Senate Bill 3726, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3733, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Senate Bill 3818, offered by Representative Dugan, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading, as amended, for House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #19, offered by Representative Lang.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT 19

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution a proposition to amend Section 8.1 of Article I of the Illinois Constitution as follows:

ARTICLE I

BILL OF RIGHTS

SECTION 8.1. CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS.

- (a) To preserve and protect a victim's right to justice and due process, a crime victim shall have the following rights:
- (1) The right to be treated with fairness and respect for the victim's dignity and privacy.
- (2) The right to timely notification of court proceedings and any related post-judgment proceedings.

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

- (3) The right to notice and to a hearing before a court ruling on an accused's request for access to any of the victim's records, information, or communications which are privileged or confidential by law.
- (4) The right to communicate with the prosecution.
- (5) The right to be heard in person or in any other reasonable manner convenient to the victim at any plea, sentencing, reduction or change in sentence, or other proceeding in which a right of the victim is at issue.
- (6) The right to review any written description of the offense prepared for sentencing, reduction in sentence, parole, early release or clemency and the accused's prior criminal history.
- (7) The right to be informed of the conviction, the sentence, any post-judgment decision, any reduction of the sentence, the imprisonment, and the release of the accused.
- (8) The right to timely disposition of the case following the arrest of the accused, including related post-conviction and post-judgment proceedings.
- (9) The right to be reasonably protected from the accused.
- (10) The right to have the safety of the victim and the victim's family considered in denying or fixing the amount of bail and release conditions for the accused and in deciding any parole or post-judgment release decision.
- (11) The right to be present at the trial and all other court proceedings.
- (12) The right to have present at all court proceedings, subject to the rules of evidence, an advocate, a

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

victim-witness specialist, or other support person of the victim's choice.

- (13) The right to restitution.
- (b) Definition. For the purposes of this Section, the term "crime victim" means a person directly and proximately harmed as a result of the commission of a criminal offense. In the case of a crime victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the legal guardians of the crime victim or the representatives of the crime victim's estate, family members, or any other persons appointed as suitable by the court may assume the crime victim's rights under this Section, but in no event shall the accused be named as such guardian or representative.
- (c)A victim, a lawful representative of the victim including the victim's lawyer, or the prosecuting attorney upon request of the victim may assert the rights enumerated in subsection (a) in any circuit or appellate court with jurisdiction over the case as a matter of right. The court shall act promptly on such a request.
- (d) The General Assembly may provide for an assessment against convicted defendants to pay for crime victims' rights.
- (e) Nothing in this Section or in any law enacted under this Section shall be construed as creating a basis for vacating a conviction. This Section does not create any cause of action for compensation or damages against the State, any political subdivision of the State, any officer, employee, or agent of the State or of any of its political

112th Legislative Day

3/12/2010

subdivisions, or any officer or employee of the court.

SCHEDULE

This Constitutional Amendment takes effect upon being declared adopted in accordance with Section 7 of the Illinois Constitutional Amendment Act. This has been the Second Reading, as amended, of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #19. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."