118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived, we shall be led in prayer today by Reverend James Bledsoe who is with Logan Street Baptist Church in Mt. Vernon, Illinois. Reverend Bledsoe is the guest of Representative Cavaletto. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Bledsoe."

Reverend Bledsoe: "In the words of former President James Knox Polk, 'Let us fervently invoke the aid of that Almighty Ruler of the Universe in whose hands are the destinies of nations and of men to quard this Heaven-favored land against mischiefs which without His guidance might arise from an unwise public policy. With a firm reliance upon the wisdom of Omnipotence, to sustain and direct you (sic-me) in the path of duty which you are (sic-I am) appointed to pursue...' So let us not trust in human effort alone, but humbly acknowledging the power and goodness of Almighty God who presides over the destiny of nations and who has at all times been revealed in our country's history. Let us invoke His aid and His blessings upon our labors. God and our maker and sustainer, above all we acknowledge that You are the Supreme Being who rules the affairs of men and whose goodness and mercy have always followed the American people. And we pray that You will not turn from us now, rather we humbly and reverently seek Your powerful aid. We recognize that only through the guidance of Your almighty providence can we hope to discharge our ever increasing burdens. We pray just as President Harry S.

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Truman once prayed before the Congress of these United States. 'As we have assumed our heavy duties we humbly pray, Almighty God, in the words of King Solomon, "Give therefore Your (sic-Thy) servant(s) an understanding heart to judge these (sic-Thy) people that we (sic-I) may discern between good and bad; for who is able to judge this (thy) so great a people?"' We ask only to be good and faithful servants of our Lord and of our people. So I ask You, Almighty God, to bestow the best of blessings on this House of Representatives and on all whom they represent. May no one but honest and wise men and women ever rule under this roof. Endow with Your spirit everyone whom in Your name we entrust the authority of governing this great state. there may be justice and peace in our cities and that through obedience to Your law we may show forth Your praise among the nations of earth. Give each one a firm reliance on the goodness of Your power which providentially and mercifully protected our nation at its infancy and has since upheld our liberties in various manners to this present day. Look down upon each Representative and dispense Your providence... of Your providence blessings on our beloved country and state. Please reveal Your will for the direction of this governing Body and give each one the wisdom and fortitude to accomplish it. May You be honored and pleased with our labors as You have been of the labors of founders and others who have served before the... before It's in Your holy name that we pray, Amen. May the Lord bless you and protect you. May the Lord smile on you

118th Legislative Day

- and be gracious to you. May the Lord show you His favor and give you His peace. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Howard."
- Howard, et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Graham and Mendoza are excused today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Stephens is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'present', a quorum is present and the House is prepared to do its business. Representative Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am very, very proud to introduce and to present to you the students from the International Culinary Arts Program at Thornton High School. We have Chef Shane Elliot Parker, Assistant teacher Mindy Tracy, students Jamoni Jackson, Shannon Moore, Brandon Harris, Taylor Hart, and Andriana Banks who

118th Legislative Day

- are here for Career and Technical Education Day. Please give them a round of applause. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Acevedo: "Speaker, yesterday on House Bill 4866 my button was inadvertently pressed 'yes'. Let the record reflect I strongly oppose this legislation and wish to be recorded as a 'no'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6415. Representative Smith, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5633; and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Fritchey, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4658; Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5523; Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6450 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6477. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Services, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5304; and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5565. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation, Regulation, Roads & Bridges, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4877; Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5555; Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 6239; and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6380. Introduction of Resolutions: House Resolution offered by Representative Eddy. House Resolution 1046, offered by Representative D'Amico. And House Resolution 1049, offered by Representative Acevedo. These Resolutions are referred to the Rules Committee."

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

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm feeling a bit under the weather today, but I stand corrected once again. The House Bill is 4886, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect your intentions.

Acevedo: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, Hou... Members of the House of Representatives, it is the intent of the Chair to go to Bills where Amendments have been approved by committee to come to the floor, and we're going to put those Amendments

118th Legislative Day

- on and move those Bills up to Third Reading. So would Members, if I call your Bills, be ready to briefly explain your Amendments that have been approved and we'll put those on. The first Bill is House Bill 5394, Representative Connie Howard. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5394, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook on Floor Amendment #2."
- Howard: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #2 limits the... just a second please... limits the eligibility of sealing only to those records that have been dismissed or discharged."
- Speaker Mautino: The Lady's moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Representative Howard, you have House Bill 5401 on Second Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5401, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Connie Howard on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5401. Out of the record. Representative Reboletti, you have House Bill 5640. Out of

118th Legislative Day

- the record. Representative McAsey, House Bill 5932. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5932, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative McAsey."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 5932."
- McAsey: "Thank you. I would move for the adoption of the Floor Amendment which... What this is, is an Amendment to the rights of crime victims and witnesses, providing that in certain circumstances children... a guardian ad litem may be appointed for children in certain circumstances if there's a parent or guardian or third party who's being prosecuted for a violent crime, if the child is an alleged victim or a witness to a crime, or if there is a conflict of interest between a child and his or her parent. And I would move adoption."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Seeing no discussion on that all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Leave that Bill on Second Reading, we... Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #2."
- McAsey: "Floor Amendment #2 clarifies that in... if a child has a conflict it's not just with one parent, but a conflict with

118th Legislative Day

- either parent. It's just changing parent to parents... or the opposite..."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5932. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes; opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Flider, House Bill 5947 appears on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you bring that Bill back to Second Reading. Are there any Amendments pending?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5947, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Flider, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Flider on Floor Amendment #2."

 Flider: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation actually was up on Third Reading and we had a discussion. I pulled it out of the record and effect... essentially the purpose of the Bill was to create a restraining order, people who would be incarcerated from contacting victim's families while they were in prison. And we found a better way to draft it at the suggestion of Representatives Careen Gordon and Representative Reboletti. So we drafted this, presented it to the committee and came back with an approach that essentially goes through the Prison Review Board at a

118th Legislative Day

- parole hearing or the court at the time of sentencing to obtain that restraining order. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Seeing no discussion, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Ramey, is seeking recognition."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege." Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."
- Ramey: "Today in the gallery we have with us some students of mine from West Chicago High School right up here behind us.

 They're here with their teacher Peggy Peach and Nancy Blume. They're part of the Cooperative Work & Training & CT Legislative Day. We have with us Tegan, Karen, Jennifer, Kelly, and Jenny. Would you please give them a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Howard, House Bill 6460. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6460, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6460."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 makes... changes the waiting period to have an expungement of retail

118th Legislative Day

- theft from five years to two years and brings parity to retail theft."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Burns, House Bill 6462 appears on the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6462, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burns, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burns on Floor Amendment 1 to House Bill 6462."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 Floor Amendment #1 will become the Bill. This is Cook
 County State's Attorney Anita Alvarez's major package on
 ending child sex abuse and child prostitution in Cook
 County. I move to adopt the Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "...has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1.

 Seeing no discussion, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

 The 'yeses' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration, but Floor Amendment #2 remains in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative D'Amico, House Bill 6463. Read the Bill."

118th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6463, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative D'Amico, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative D'Amico on Floor Amendment #1."
- D'Amico: "Yes, I just wish that Amendment 1 be adopted. This
 Bill has to do with speeding on the highways excessively,
 doing 40 miles an hour over the posted speed limit."
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Seeing no discussion, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Verschoore, House Bill 6464. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6464, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Verschoore, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Verschoore on Floor Amendment #1."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment passed out of committee on a leave 7-0-0."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6464. All in favor say 'yes';

118th Legislative Day

- opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Reis, on Second Reading is House Bill 4837. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4837, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Reis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis on Floor Amendment #1."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2... or #1 simply lowers the threshold from 5 million down to \$500 thousand. And it also requires an audit every four years as opposed to no audits at all. Ask for your consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved pas... moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but a Fiscal Note and a State Mandates Note have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading. On Second Reading is House Bill 6195, Representative Jefferson. Out of the record. Representative Smith, House Bill 5787? Out of the record. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, is seeking recognition."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair." Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry, Sir."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Black: "Would... would you take under advisement a question to the House Parliamentarian? I would like research done on what the state law is regarding cable television coverage in the City of Springfield? I got to the apartment early last night and went through the channels a hundred times University of looking for the Illinois/Kent basketball game and went next door to my neighbor who's lived here longer than I have and she said they don't ... Comcast doesn't carry ESPN-U, so you won't be able to watch the Illinois/Kent State game. Now we play Wednesday night and if Chief Legal Counsel Ellis would check the statutes, perhaps there is some way by Resolution or sense of the Body that we could impose upon Comcast their duty to the State of Illinois to let us watch the University of Illinois take on, I believe, Dayton on Wednesday night. there is any such law or rule I would like to know that and then Parliamentarian Ellis could so rule and we could perhaps get that game on local television."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Black, I would be delighted to pass that inquiry on for you."

Black: "We would appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis, on the Calendar you have House Bill 5301. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5301, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill.

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

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis."

118th Legislative Day

- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Floor Amendment #2 becomes the Bill and it makes an agreement for the dive plates amongst all parties. So I ask for your consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but a Home Rule Note and a Judicial Note have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Leave this Bill on Second Reading.

 Representative Osmond, House Bill 5571? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5571, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rose, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe this Amendment should actually be Representative Osmond's but neither here nor there. The Amendment, as approved by the committee, would put a freeze on all nonessential advertising publications of the state. That discretion would be retained within the… the department's heads."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Fritchey: "I think he's hiding, Speaker. There he is. He's

back again. No, now he's gone again, Speaker."

Rose: "Go ahead, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Are you staying with me this time?"

Rose: "Yeah, if I may, Representative. You have questions?"

Fritchey: "Well, now here be... before you do, let me say this.

Over the years I have thought and have been somewhat dismayed even at the volume of mail that I get, not just from third party entities around the state, but from within the state itself. And I had always deliberated and never followed through on filing some type of legislation which would allow Legislators to maybe state at the beginning of a term, yes, I want to get these materials, no, I don't. Yes, maybe you can send me these electronically because the volume of paper that we go through and the amount of things that actually get tossed out in my office on a daily basis is incredible. And if you multiply that by 177 you can see how it adds up, not just in terms of cost but in waste as well. My concern though, and I guess the reason I prefaced it the way I did is, I'm with you. I get what you're trying to do. I don't know though that we can do it by deeming something to be 'nonessential', quote unquote, and even trying to define it as not being necessary to the health, safety and welfare because the reality is that we can look through all this literature and really make an argument that most all of it is somehow essential to the health, safety and welfare of somebody in our state. So..."

Rose: "Well, if I may, Representative."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Fritchey: "Please."

Rose: "This is the 2010 IDOT Work Zone Safety Calendar, which is very nice and many pages here. And in case you don't have a use for the wall calendar, they have also sent a pocket calendar all mailed at an expense to the taxpayers of \$1.90. I would suggest that that is nonessential. I would also suggest that the Illinois Department of Insurance, that for \$2.24 in mailing, sent me their very nice SHIP calendar for my wall is nonessential. We are broke. We have no money. We can't pay our teachers. And I respect your question, Representative Fritchey. Mr. Lowder, on your staff, and I went around and around on this because you'd like to be able to create a definition to truly encompass everything that is nonessential, but the definition itself is almost impossible. So what we did..."

Fritchey: "Well..."

Rose: "...is we left it to the discretion of the department heads to say that."

Fritchey: "But, yeah, but they've got the discretion now. If we want to ban calendars that's one thing, but I mean they have the discretion now. You know, I'm wary of us legislating to tell somebody, guys do you really need to be sending this out? Do you really not? Because it's not just a matter of calendars, it may be certain bulletins, it may be items that really have maybe no bearing in my district, but those are mailings that may be relevant to constituents in your district..."

Rose: "And all I'm saying, Representative..."

Fritchey: "...and vise versa."

118th Legislative Day

- Rose: "...is if they're going to make that case, they can make that case. I don't think this... I don't think this is this hard. It should be just common sense. Don't be using the state taxpayer money to send out pocket calendars for the work zone safety. You know."
- Fritchey: "Well, Representative, I've got two vouchers. I think you and I discussed this. I got two vouchers from the Comptroller's office for me to sign off on last week for two cents each. I got another one for fourteen cents. Those three vouchers totaling eighteen cents are going to cost a significant multiple of that to process and then I'm actually going to be issued checks for two cents and two cents and fourteen cents because of statutory requirements of..."
- Rose: "Well, complying with the statute would obviously be essential, Representative."
- Fritchey: "Well, and I understand that, but I guess I'm getting to the bigger point is there's a lot of things that we should be doing here, I just don't know that statutorily telling somebody to use common sense... Speaker, it was worth a try. I appreciate it. I get the point. I just think trying to put somebody on the line and I'm worried that for political reasons that a director will be held up to say, well, why did you deem this to be essential, but this not essential. We're on the same page. I wish people were paying attention to what page that is, but thank you for hearing me out."
- Rose: "Well, Representative... If I may, Representative Fritchey, we struggled with the definition with Mr. Lowder from your

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

staff, but ultimately it does come down to common sense. And all we're saying is that, you know, at the time we're not paying teachers, IDOT should not be mailing out two different copies of the work zone safety calendar, both a wall calendar and also a pocket calendar. Needless to say, Department of Insurance sent the SHIP calendar out for \$2.24 in mailing. I bet you right here is probably close to \$10 that could have gone to pay a teacher. So I appreciate your concerns, Representative Fritchey"

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost. And I would ask that the Members of the House please bring down the noise level so you may hear the debates."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's Amendment. I don't think this is as difficult as many try to make it out to be. All we are asking, and we're giving simple language to our administrators of these agencies, is to thoroughly look over their printing and what is essential and what isn't essential. If those directors are incapable of doing that, maybe we ought to replace those directors. This is commonsense language. They probably shouldn't have to be done... it probably shouldn't have to be done because they should be doing it on their own anyway. But this gives them power. It actually gives them an out, so now they can make a decision on whether it's essential printing or nonessential printing and they can actually save the state Another option, if we don't want to support the Gentleman's Amendment is that okay, fine, we'll say all printing is nonessential and it must be brought before this

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Body and approved. Now that is a way we could actually, if you want to micromanage everything. I think the Gentleman has done a fine job in presenting an Amendment that allows the heads of our agencies to move forward and save money in a sensible way. I think you... it deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say... Representative May is seeking recognition."

May: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield? So this is for calendars and other nonessential printing, correct?"

Rose: "Yes..."

May: "You know, I agree with this. I really support this because I've been talking to departments one on one. We've got to deal with some of the little expenditures. In February I got a calendar that cost \$2.41 to mail to me."

Rose: "Right."

May: "And I've been standing up on this also.

Rose: "Exactly."

May: "So, I think that this is an excellent Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor
Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The
'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further
Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Reboletti,
House Bill 5640. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5640, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Representative Reboletti, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DuPage."

- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for coming back to this.

 This Amendment cures some of the concerns of Representative

 Lang and Hamos, where circuit clerks would be able to

 communicate with case participants on a voluntary basis and

 they would have to check off some type of box or fill out a

 form so they could receive electronic email instead of

 actual snail mail. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor
 Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The
 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted.
 Representative... Excuse me. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Flider is seeking recognition."
- Flider: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Flider: "Yes, I'd like to let you know about a group of people that we have here from Decatur, the Advanced Placement in Government Class from Eisenhower High School along with their instructor Mike Rusk. Please give them a welcome. They're in the Republican side there in the gallery. There they are. Please welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to Springfield. Representative Yarbrough on Second Reading is House Bill 6317. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

118th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6317, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Yarbrough on Floor Amendment #2."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 2 to House Bill 6317 was adopted in committee. There was no opposition to the Bill. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Mautino: "Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2.

 No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Jefferson, on the Calendar appears House Bill 6195. Out of the record. Representative Golar, House Bill 3631. Representative Golar? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3631, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Golar, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook on Floor Amendment 2."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker). Floor Amendment #2, be adopted."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes';

118th Legislative Day

- opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but notes have been requested on the Bill and have not been filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Leave that Bill on Second Reading.

 Representative Jefferson. Representative Jefferson, on the

 Calendar is House Bill 6195. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6195, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jefferson, read... Excuse me.

 Place that Bill on Third Reading. Representative

 Jefferson, House Bill 5424 appears on Second Reading. Read

 the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5424, a Bill for an Act concerning state government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Take this Bill out of the record.

 Representative Beiser, you have House Bill 6349. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6349, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Beiser, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Madison."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted in committee unanimously. I'd ask it be adopted."

118th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor
 Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The
 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative May, House Bill 6030. Return that Bill to Second Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6030. The Bill's been read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative May, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative May."
- May: "Yes, thank you. Floor Amendment 2 actually makes it a grant fund, instead of a revolving loan fund at the request of DCEO."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment 2.

 All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Moffitt, House Bill 5183. Representative Moffitt on Floor Amendment #1."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. This has been one that we've worked on for several weeks and it will set standards for critical care transport. There are no standards. This doesn't make anyone have to do it, but set standards for transport. It also tries to make the Department of Public Health more

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

self-sufficient. The State Fire Marshal's office has been providing about 1.4 million annually for EMT testing and this would help them become more independent. And a third provision I want to be sure to mention, there are some EMT licenses that are still out there for convicted sex offenders and they want to be able to remove those, and so we've been working on this. There's perhaps some more to do. We've identified the Senate Sponsor that all the stakeholders are comfortable with, but with this we'll move the Bill out of the House."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of House... Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5183. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5183, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Read the Bill and place it on Third Reading.

 Third Reading. Representative Burns, House Bill 5783.

 Place that Bill on Second Reading. Representative Burns,

 Floor Amendment 2."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5783. The Amendment is a technical change to the Bill requested by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulations. It does not relate to the hair braiding Section of the Bill, but to the mobility of licenses between states."

118th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Phelps, House Bill 5917. Read the Bill. Representative Phelps on Floor Amendment #1."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just a technical change. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves... Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5917, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Phelps, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Winters, House Bill 5603. Out of the record. Representative Mulligan, House Bill 4924. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4924, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Two Floor Amendments have been

118th Legislative Day

- approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Mulligan."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 outlines and adds to the Bill on what would happen with a cochlear implant on that Bill. Mainly... and there should be an Amendment #2 that changes slightly, but this is still in a negotiating stage. I'd like to add the Amendment, but I don't want to move the Bill off of Second."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mulligan."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mulligan on Floor Amendment #2."
- Mulligan: "That makes a small change to speech pathologists."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Leave this Bill on Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. Representative McAsey, you have House Bill 4037. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4037, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 2, 3,

118th Legislative Day

- and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative McAsey."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey, on Floor Amendment #1."
- McAsey: "I would like to adopt Floor Amendment #4. So I would table... I would withdraw... I would withdraw Amendment..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey, Amendment #4 is a gut and replace Amendment, so you may go directly to Amendment 4..."
- McAsey: "Four, okay."
- Speaker Mautino: "...and adopt that. So, Representative McAsey on Amendment #4."
- McAsey: "Thank you. Amendment #4, the gut and replace Amendment that I would ask be adopted, is an Amendment regarding early voting to make sure that voters have more access to early voting. In..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey, can you hold for just one moment? Representative McAsey, just for proper procedure, you should request to withdraw Amendments 1, 2, and 3 and request Amendment 4 be placed on the board."
- McAsey: "I would request to withdraw Amendments 1, 2, and 3 and move to adopt House... the Amendment #4."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #4."
- McAsey: "Thank you. And Amendment #4 is a gut and replace. It has provisions related to early voting, requiring at least one central location for early voting and also speaks to election authorities that designate permanent voting, permanent early voting locations with regard to provision

118th Legislative Day

- of hours during the early voting period and additional hours on the final weekend of early voting."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #4. And on that question, Representative Mitchell. No one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Representative Saviano, on the Calendar is House Bill 5745. Excuse me. House Bill 4037, move that Bill to Third Reading. Representative Saviano, House Bill 5745. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5745, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Saviano, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Amendment simply adds psychologists to the Bill which we... we're not enhancing penalties, but we're moving health care professionals into a category of paramedics, police and fire, when they're victims of crimes when they're known to be health care professionals. I ask that Floor Amendment #1 be adopted."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1, on that, Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Under House Rule 18(g), I move the

118th Legislative Day

- discharge of House Resolution 991 from the House Rules Committee."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Mitchell, you were not recognized for the purpose of a Motion. We're currently debating a Bill. Do you have a question on the Amendment?"
- Mitchell, B.: "Well, you'll call on me after this?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Once we finish this order of business..."
- Mitchell, B.: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "...I will come back to your Motion.

 Representative Saviano has moved adoption of Floor

 Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

 'Yeses' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Collins, House Bill 5914. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5914, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Collins, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Collins on Floor Amendment 2."
- Collins: "Yeah, I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 and on that question, Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Point of personal privilege here, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Mautino: "We'll return to that order shortly. We're in the middle of a Bill. No one seeking further recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it

118th Legislative Day

- and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Representative Colvin, House Bill 4781. Out of the record. Representative Howard, House Bill 5401. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5401, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Howard on Floor Amendment #1."
- Howard: "Yes, that Amendment just provides a definition of overdose."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Amendment 1 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege.

 Yesterday I hit the button by mistake on House Bill 4886.

 I would like to be recorded as a 'no', please."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman... your wishes... the record will so reflect. Representative Mitchell, the Gentleman from Macon."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Under House Rule 18(g), I move for the

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

discharge of House Resolution 991 from the Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 41(9) in Article 4, Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall by... any vote shall be by recorded vote whenever five Members shall so request. There are at least five Members on my side of the aisle that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge the measure from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved discharge committee House Resolution 991. This Motion requires unanimous consent. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "I object, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "There's been an objection to the Motion to Discharge; and therefore, since it requires unanimous consent the Motion fails. Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We specifically requested a Roll Call vote on my Motion, pursuant to the rights granted by the House Rules Committee and the Illinois Constitution. This breach of rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion. We simply... the House Resolution simply calls for a nonpartisan early release investigation committee. I think last summer I was in Decatur, at the Decatur prison, and then I went to the Lincoln prison when the Governor announced his early release program. At that time I warned, way back last summer, that we could possibly have a

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

dangerous situation here in Illinois with the release of violent folks out preying upon innocent law-abiding citizens. Unfortunately, that's what happened. At least a 187 of the meritorious conduct push parolees were taken back to the Illinois Department custody, about half of them for violent offenses. The Associated Press analysis show that the parolees still free include more than 80 prisoners included... convicted of violent crimes, including one who went to prison for murder conspiracy, 70 who committed weapons violations and four convicted of sex crimes. particularly horrifying case involved a homeless man who attacked a woman and her boyfriend on the streets of Chicago. Jennifer Hall was brutally attacked by Derek King who beat, stomped, and kicked Hall in the head, face and knocked her... all her teeth out, putting her into a druginduced coma with 85 staples in her head. In October, King was sentenced to three years in prison. Just 18 days later, King was paroled as a part of the Governor's early release program. This is Miss Hall. This was a person and the gentleman, and I call him gentleman loosely, 18 days later he was out on the streets of Illinois committing crimes. We simply... we simply... this Resolution just simply wants to investigate. What, I think, the people of Illinois want is accountability: accountability by Members of the General Assembly, accountability on people on second floor, including the Governor, the Director of Corrections. This is something that we should insist on. competence. That's something in short supply here under this dome and unfortunately, in the Governor's office. We

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

need this Resolution reported out so we can debate it on the floor by the elected Representatives of the people of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under House 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair, and therefore... that there be no recorded votes to discharge House Resolution 991 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has made a Motion to Overrule the Chair, and the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' Under the House Rules there are two minutes allowed for discussion of that Motion, two minutes for response, and then one minute to close. And on... in... on response the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. And while I'm respectful of the Sponsor as well as his intention, I would be remiss if I didn't ask the Body to be mindful that from a procedural matter, what we are supposed to be debating here and what is debatable pursuant to the House Rules, is the Motion itself. We have heard talk from the other side from the other side of the aisle about the many pressing needs facing this state. The Rules are very clear about when a Motion to Discharge can be made, and then an objection renders that Motion as a failed Motion. The Motion has been sustain the Chair or overrule the Chair, procedural Motion and should not be one that that should have made into the substance of the underlying issue taking us away from substantive work to be done before the House. That is not to take away at all from the import of the Gentleman's Resolution, which I acknowledge. However, I would hope that this is not going to be precursor to us

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

spending extensive time today with moot arguments over procedural matters that are very clearly set forth in the Rules. The Rules are not ambiguous. At any given time certain Members may not like those Rules, but it is also not to be used as a backdoor attempt to debate Motions that have not properly come before this Body. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mitchell, you will receive a minute to close, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to Representative Reis."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis to close."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This should not be a partisan issue at all. At the end of the year I asked the Governor's office for a detailed information on this very important issue. I think the people of Illinois deserve the right to know what's going on. We ask that we form an investigative commission to get to the bottom of this. I called again on the Governor's office because they had not responded to my questions. He responded; he said he'd like to have a private meeting with just me. This issue is way bigger This issue needs to be discussed in public with than me. the General Assembly so that the people of Illinois know who ordered the early releases, who followed through with the orders, and where these people are at, if they're being monitored, exactly how much time they served. Derek King, fourteen days, put 85 stitches in a girls head and kicked her teeth out. He served four..."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "I'll allow the Gentleman to close."

"This should not be a partisan issue, as I said, and I understand we have procedural things that go on here. You should be standing up with us demanding that a bipartisan investigation go on, that the Governor and the Director of Corrections be forthright with which ones were released, where they're at, how they're being monitored, and what's going to go on to prevent this from the future. unbelievable. I know we're doing procedural things here, but I think you should stand up with us, demand that the Governor's office come clean on this. This is an outrage to the people. We're hearing about this. We're not hearing about judicial appointments. We're not hearing about many of the things that we talk about, but they are talking about this. I ask that you rise to stand and not sustain the Chair so that this bipartisan commission can be formed so we can get to the bottom of this and find out truly what's going on with these early release criminals."

Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. And the Chair is... on a vote of 69 voting 'yes'; 45 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present', the Chair is sustained. It is the intent of the Chair to go to House Bills on Third Reading and on page 18 of the Calendar is House Bill 5053, Representative Bradley. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5053, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

118th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "One of the most medically underserved areas in the State of Illinois is psychiatry, particularly child psychiatry. And unfortunately, it's not included on a list of approved health care occupations for people that go to rural or impoverished areas and so this would just add psychiatry to that list of practice areas under that program. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5053. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."
- Black: "Representative, I notice it is not subject to appropriation and the department estimates an annual cost, first year cost of \$125,000. So is it your... is it your intent then to make sure that that is appropriated to the required agency?"
- Bradley: "I mean, whether we put subject to appropriation into these or not, at the end of the day they're subject to appropriation so..."
- Black: "That's probably the most accurate statement I've heard here in a long time."
- Bradley: "Yeah, I don't... We had a situation a few years ago in my area and other areas in Southern Illinois where we had a... we have no child psychiatrists, virtually, down in that area, and we had a child psychiatrist from our area who wanted to come home and practice. And because of a

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

technicality they were unable to come back because they weren't included in this statute. We can't do anything about that situation, but the idea was to do something going forward. I don't know if it actually has a cost because we don't know that we'll actually be able to recruit anybody, but if at some point in the future we do, then they would be eligible for this program. So I don't even know that it costs that amount."

Black: "All right. I'm sympathetic to what you're trying to do, I had a similar Bill a year or two ago. The situation is critical, particularly in the area of the state in which you and I live. I have no mental health beds left in my legislative district. The need doesn't go away, but the ability to get adequate and timely treatment is disappearing, and it just leads to additional problems. And I appreciate your indulgence to the question. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5053 and the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor for 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bellock, Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 5053 is declared passed. Representative Acevedo."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, this day is not going well for me at all. On the last Motion to Reconsider the Vote my button was inadvertently pressed 'no'. I wish to be recorded as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. Representative Black, on the Calendar on Third Reading is House Bill 6213. Would you like to run this Bill? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6213, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Bills like this are a disadvantage for someone like me who is not an attorney. This Bill originated from a particularly vexatious case district and it was only thanks to Representative Gordon and Representative Reboletti that I was, in fact, able to get this out of committee. What... what the Bill attempts to do is in the case of a conviction of someone who ends up murdering or seriously injuring a minor, anyone under the age of 18, and the trial court says that was a result of child abuse. If I remember what Representative Gordon and Representative Reboletti told me, was, the judge may then have what is called like another trial, a mini trial or even what I as a layman would call a sentencing hearing. And if the evidence, and it would have to be overwhelming evidence, suggested that the child died as a result of the person's action and it constituted child abuse for which that individual has already been convicted, there shall be

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

an extended sentence imposed on that individual. I'll do the best I can to answer any questions that you might have."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Fritchev: "Representative, I'll try to keep this brief because I believe that most everybody will likely vote for this anyway, but I want to make sure that they understand what they're voting on. Let's use an analytic situation where we've had crimes that were actually committed amongst two minors. So lets say that we have a 17 year old defendant and a 15 year old victim, lets say it was a fight. I guess my con... how is child abuse defined under this Act? You know, is it simply go... You know, we think of child abuse as somebody you know in the care of a young child that, you know, either, you know, beats a baby or whatever heinous crime they may commit. But if we're talking about abuse of somebody that is under 18, could we wind up in a situation here where there's an additional charge brought because, lets say it was even a gang related incident, and you have a 17-year-old perpetrator and a 16-year-old victim. Would that be something that's... you would intend on being subject to this legislation?"

Black: "Representative, I don't interpret it that way, but to be very honest with you that is the type of a legal question, I don't know what the answer is. I... maybe

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Representative Rose or Representative Reboletti can help me on this."

Fritchey: "And I would be happy to defer to any of them. As I said, I fully get what you're trying to do. You know, you and I tend to actually read these things and you know I want to make sure that we know what we're doing here. You know, is it a child abuse situation, one, in which it's a child that's in the care of the defendant? So it would be, you know, a parent, a guardian, a babysitter, that type of thing? I think, you know, we've got to look at the line that we're drawing between having a heightened penalty where the victim happens to be a minor or child abuse, which I think as a lay person or a Legislator, we consider to be a different type of crime than a crime where the victim is simply a minor. Does that make sense, Bill?"

Black: "It would make sense to me if I had sat for the bar.

I'm not sure it makes sense to me in not being an attorney."

Fritchey: "Bill, let me ask you this."

Black: "I think I know what you're getting at."

Fritchey: "I'm doing this reluctantly, especially with you.

Would you mind pulling it out just so I can come talk to
you for a second? I don't think there's an issue."

Black: "No, that's fine."

Fritchey: "I'm almost sure there's not."

Black: "That's fine. Mr. Speaker, take the Bill out of the record, please?"

Speaker Mautino: "Take the Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. On page 27 of the Calendar appears

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 57. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #57 has been read in full three times."
- Speaker Mautino: "On House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #57, Speaker Madigan."
- "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Madigan: this Amendment to the Constitution is concerned with the judicial article. Today, to be eligible to serve as a judge or an associate judge under the current Constitution a person must be: number one, a United States citizen; number two, a licensed attorney-at-law; and number three, a resident of the unit which selects that particular person for the judicial position. This proposed Amendment would add a fourth eligibility requirement. Under the proposal, a person seeking election or appointment to the Office of Judge must have been a licensed attorney-at-law for a minimum of 10 years to serve in the Circuit Court, 12 years to serve in the Appellate Court, and 15 years to serve in the Supreme Court. The additional qualification would ensure that all sitting judges have at a minimum 10 years service as a licensed attorney. The Amendment is supported by the Illinois State Bar Association, Chicago Bar Association, Lesbian and Gay Bar Association, the Women's Bar Association, and the Cook County Bar Association. Mr. Speaker, I request a favorable vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 57. And on that

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Black: "Representative, the 10 years would be 10 consecutive years of having a law license, correct?"

Madigan: "There could be interruptions."

Black: "I'm sorry. Include..."

Madigan: "There could... there could be interruptions."

Black: "That was the heart of my question. If this individual had a license suspended for a relatively minor offense; he comingled escrow money, for example. And the judicial board decided that that license... his license or her license would be suspended for two years. The license was then subsequently reinstated after the two year suspension. That individual would not be precluded from becoming a judge then, correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes. Let me hasten to add my own personal opinion that I don't consider comingling of funds a minor matter."

Black: "Well, I don't... I don't either, but I didn't want to offend any of the lawyers in the group. I think anything that a lawyer does extraneous to the law is a serious offense that erodes the confidence and good will that we should all have towards people who practice law in the great State of Illinois. Was there a particular reason why you did not include or perhaps make the Amendment, this has been talked about for years, where we simply go to a merit

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

selection of judges. I know the ballot in Cook County has been the subject of repeated news articles over the years, that it is so long and so cumbersome and most people have no idea of who that person is running for judge even if it's in a sub-circuit."

Madigan: "Mr. Black, two points. Number one, historically I've been opposed to appointment of judges. I've supported election of judges. Let me just add my personal opinion that when Cook County went to the sub-circuit system, I think that was about the end of the modern day effort for appointment of judges."

Black: "Well, I can understand that, but I want you to know, Speaker, on behalf of the Republican Caucus we are unanimous in our support to appoint you to the Appellate Bench, immediately, wherever there's a vacancy. You would not have to wait. I think your legal expertise would be an absolute asset to the bench and I hope you would consider that because we... and I know there's a few Democrats, I won't mention any names, but there are a few Democrats who would join with us. And if you didn't want to go to the Appellate Bench, I think we have the votes to... that we could appoint you to the Supreme Court of Indiana. Well, given the fact that you don't look too excited about our magnanimous gesture, let me ask you a question that I think anyone who's been around here long enough should be able to figure out. There is one Constitutional Amendment already prepared to be on the November ballot. Now as you know, only two more can go on the November ballot. One of the Amendments that I would like to see on the November ballot

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

would be changing how we reapportion and redistrict the State of Illinois. We're the only state left in the country that if the parties can't agree to a map, and I don't believe we've agreed to a map in the last 30, maybe the last 40 years, then we're the only state left that draws something out of a hat or a fish bowl or a crystal ball or whatever, and then whatever party draws the right object out, draws the map. And I'm not saying that maps drawn by the Democrat Party have been unfairly drawn. map that you gave me when I represented Calumet City, those were wonderful people. Two hundred and eighty-five miles from my home, but I enjoyed the trip. The Republicans, the year we drew the map, probably wasn't the most fair and equitable map that could have been drawn. And I have filed for the last five or six years, a Constitutional Amendment, and I know you'll find this shocking, the Rules Committee would never let my Constitutional Amendment out for a hearing that would basically follow the Iowa model. independent commission would draw the map after 30 days if we failed to do so. And I realize, demographically, we're not the same as Iowa, so it would have had to have been tweaked considerably. My fear is, in all honesty and in all respect to you, Sir, is that there are so many Constitutional Amendments on the Calendar, is something that you have really been concerned about for the many years you have served here or am I just paranoid in thinking that we're going to fill up the Constitutional Amendments on the ballot so that a fair map Amendment would have no place to go?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Madigan: "Number one, Mr. Black, the fair map Amendment is a citizen's initiative."

Black: "Well, I think our caucus also has a Constitutional Amendment that we would like to present. I'm not sure that that's been let out of Rules. I may stand corrected on that, but I think it's being held under advisement until Mr. Ellis completes his next book, which is sometime in the spring of 2011 as I understand it."

Madigan: "Correct. So there's a citizen's initiative underway which will proceed without regard to the constitutional restriction on the number of articles..."

Black: "Correct."

Madigan: "...that can be amended. In terms of this Amendment to the Judicial Article I felt for quite awhile, for several years, that there ought to be minimum standards in the Constitution in terms of the number of years that someone has been practicing law, the number of years that someone is licensed to practice law in the state. I don't think that it is an owner's requirement. I think it would help the qual... the overall quality of the judiciary. I think it would help the general citizenry have a better level of confidence in the judiciary if they knew that the people they would be appearing before and who would hold their fate in their hands had at least 10 years or more as a licensed attorney in the state."

Black: "Has there been instances where someone has been elevated to the bench with far less than 10 years of experience?"

Madigan: "The answer..."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Black: "It doesn't happen down my way. I don't know up your...

up your way."

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Black: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for your answers. Mr. Speaker, to the Constitutional Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the acting Speaker, may I speak to the Amendment?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, you may, Sir."

"Thank you, very kind of you. I'm sorry, just a second. Yeah, I'm a little busy. I'll let him know. That was Governor Mitch Daniels from Indiana. He would welcome you, Welcome you with open arms to the Supreme Court of the State of Indiana, but this offer will be withdrawn in the next 15 minutes. And I think you'd make an excellent Appellate Justice or Supreme Court Justice, and perhaps we could even ask Justice Greiman to step aside and have Speaker Madigan take his place, but I don't think that's going to happen. And, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect and in all seriousness for a change, I don't think any Republican on this side of the aisle is necessarily opposed to this concept. I think it's a reasonable concept. I think it does make good sense, good judicial sense, but I think there are some of us who just feel that perhaps knowing how difficult it is for a citizen initiative to get the required number of signatures and they have very little time left to do that, and if they do, then it can go on the ballot regardless of how many other Amendments may already be there. But there is just some reluctance, I think, on our side of the aisle to what is early in the process, vote

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

for the second Constitutional Amendment to appear on the ballot and there could easily be a third Constitutional Amendment brought up yet this week by your side of the aisle and then that would effectively block off any attempt that the Republican Caucus would like to at least have the opportunity to move a fair map Amendment if it appears that the signature requirement might fall short by the League of Women Voters, who are diligently getting those signatures as we speak. Again, let me reiterate, we are not opposed to this Amendment on its face. I think it makes eminent good sense and I know if I cast a 'no' vote... I've read every direct mail piece that's been thrown at me for years and years. I guess I don't have to worry about that in November of 2010. But it's not that we're opposed, it's that we have a very legitimate concern that what we're seeing may be an attempt to close off the ballot for a Constitutional Amendment that many on our side of the aisle feel very strongly about. And I think there are people on the Democrat side of the aisle who feel strongly about that as well. To Speaker Madigan, I appreciate his indulgence as always and thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Durkin: "Speaker, is there any reason why we are not... we've not made this request to the Supreme Court where they can do this by rule as opposed to going to the ballot? I think that's a better alternative. Would you agree?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Speaker Madigan: "Well, Mr. Durkin, I would just pose a question to you. Would the court have the ability to do something by rule which is constitutional? We're talking about constitutional requirements and as a general rule, you know, that if it's not in the Constitution then it's not there. And so wouldn't there be a legitimate question about the court by rule attempting to do something which should be done constitutionally?"
- Durkin: "I don't think so. And I'll just use the example of what the court did a few years back by setting up certain criteria for individuals to try capital cases. They set up protocol on experience and you have to be certified and I think it would be very similar to what we are doing with the judiciary. I don't think it's a constitutional question involved, but what I'm saying is that I think that there is a way to do this without going to the voters which... and I think it would be left... best left with the... with the Supreme Court by rulemaking."
- Madigan: "Again, Mr. Durkin, your quotations, your cite of requirements put upon lawyers in capital cases relates to the authority of the court to regulate lawyers. I don't think there's any dispute that the court has the ability to regulate lawyers without regard to the Legislature or the Executive Department. Again, this is constitutional."
- Durkin: "Okay. Well, I think we can agree to disagree. Now, I do think that there is merit to having years of experience, but I don't think it goes far enough and I'll give you an example. When we're saying we're using a hard and fast rule of 10 years to... to at least have your name placed on

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

the ballot for the Circuit Court, the practitioner who's done nothing more than work on real estate closings for 10 years would qualify, but the public defender or prosecutor who's tried in excess of 100 cases would not qualify. And when I look at what the fundamental role of a judge is, the judge is to rule on the admissibility of evidence. That is to me the most important thing, to rule on the admissibility of evidence and also to deal with very issues regarding complicated procedure who... practitioners, particularly when I use that example, going to be the public defender and the prosecutor are going to have a greater command for it. So I do believe that at the end of the day one of the most important functions of the court is to be the gatekeeper of reliable evidence. And I think you're going to have a situation where people I think, when you don't have a component which goes into the background and the experience of the individual, I think it doesn't go far enough. You know, I... if... you can respond if you like, Mr. Speaker, but I'm just making that point to you that I think there are going to be the situations where people who still with the 10 years are certainly are not qualified to serve on the bench based on the fact that they've done nothing except transactional work, real estate closings, something similar to that who've never spent a day in a court. I have nothing further."

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

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker, to the Constitutional Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, in deference to the prior comments as well, I would say a couple of things. Well, of course we're going to look beyond simply the amount of time that they have spent as a licensed attorney and we have a number of bar associations who do a very good job in vetting the qualifications and experience of those people seeking to go on the bench. What we're seeking to do here is simply raise the bottom threshold of experience. I've seen just generally in my tenure we had one individual that was out of law school for two years that got elected to the bench. The unfortunate reality is, oftentimes name and gender and ethnicity have more to do with experience in somebody getting elected to the bench. I think that this is a very reasonable and carefully crafted effort to make sure that we have a safeguard of experience and time with a law license to even qualify yourself to enter into that process, and when you think about what's at stake when one of our con... when one of our constituents goes before a judge, whether it's the survival of their business, whether they're a crime victim, whether we're talking about a capital case, we have an obligation to them to make sure that we're doing what we can to put qualified men and women on the bench and this is a significant step in that direction. With respect to the procedural questions raised and ulterior motives raised, I would submit that, you know, Springfield is a town that even on the cloudiest of days people will see shadows lurking around the corner. There are oftentimes questions why one Bill got called and

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

another one didn't, why one Amendment may move and another one may not. But to try to derail a laudable and sensible and needed measure on procedural speculation of what's... that there's something else afoot, is really getting to the point where we're cutting off our legislative noses despite our face. We cannot worry about what might have been or what could have been or should have been and or may be; we have a very reasonable and overdue Constitutional Amendment. Should it have been here in the past, probably, but it's here now and we have the opportunity to support that and I strongly urge we to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Chair would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and welcome the Honorable Attorney General for the great state of Illinois to the chamber, Lisa Madigan. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Constitutional Amendment. We should never take the filing or the passage of a Constitutional Amendment lightly, but this is an important issue. First, to the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle that suggested that someone might hold their votes off of this because there's some other issue they would like to be on the ballot. I think that's a wholly unnecessary approach. East item that's proposed for the Constitution should be judged on its own merit. This provision is meritorious. In Cook County we have seen more than a handful of judges who most of us, if we looked at their credentials, would find unqualified. Winning primaries and elected as judges in Cook County where

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

sometimes they've had only a very small handful of years of experience as a lawyer. This, in my view, means that many of them are probably incapable of (a) understanding all of the court procedures appropriately, and (b) understanding all the complex legal issues that come before them. appeared myself in front of some of these judges and certainly won't name names here, but find some of them to be appalling in their lack of vision and understanding of what the court system and what the adversarial process in a courtroom is supposed to be all about. This simply provides that all people who want to become judges have one... have at least a minimum level of experience as an Now to be sure, not every attorney is a attorney. courtroom attorney and so you could get some corporate attorney who decides to run for the bench. They wouldn't have had any courtroom experience, but at least they've had some experience with issues along the way, and at least they've had some experience with dealing with practicalities of how to be a lawyer along the way. can't be a good judge until you know how to be a decent lawyer. This Bill will at least take us many steps forward along the road of making sure that those who attain the bench are folks that know what to do when they get there, and I strongly recommend your 'aye' votes."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Eddy: "Speaker Madigan, just a quick question related to the practicality of this in some areas. I've had the question asked of me, what happens if there are no candidates with 10 years experience?"

Madigan: "The court... the Supreme Court could appoint a vacancy."

Eddy: "Until someone with the appropriate experience would become interested?"

Madigan: "Until the next election cycle."

Eddy: "So..."

Madigan: "Maybe there'd be somebody with 10 years of experience then."

Eddy: "At the next election cycle then, if in a... we have resident judges, county judges and this would apply to those appointments as well. My understanding is that on several occasions there have been instances where for some of those county resident judgeships there hasn't been interest for... by candidates with 10 years or more experience in parts of rural Illinois. I guess I'm just wondering, in that case, what's the practical application of this Constitutional Amendment for those people in those counties?"

Madigan: "As I said, the Supreme Court could appoint someone with the required number of years of licensure. And, again, as I said earlier there's a choice here. The choice for all Illinoisans under their Constitution is that when they go up before a judge on a matter, whether it's civil or criminal, those citizens will either have confidence that the person that judges them has been licensed for 10

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

years or more or the person does not have that required licensure. To me it's a question of what level of confidence should Illinoisans have in those that are administering justice, again, either civil or criminal."

Eddy: "And I'm not... I'm not arguing the merits of experience because I think it's important. I'm just, on a practical application matter based on questions presented to me by my constituents, wondering what the process is. And I think what you said to me was there would be temporary replacements named by the Supreme Court, and if there weren't people at the next election, they would continue with the temporary replacement until someone with 10 years of experience became available. I think that... that's the answer."

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you. Mr. Speaker, very briefly to the attempt to have this Resolution added. And you know, I'm looking through some research related to the number of Constitutional Amendments that are proposed to the General Assembly. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for those who are wondering whether or not there are motives related to taking up spaces... data... facts... in the last 40 years there have been 16, 16 proposals put on the ballot, in 40 years. This year, this year there are five proposals. I think anybody that wants to... to look through the smoke screen can see that this is about loading up the ballot, trying to hide the type of Amendments that people of the State of Illinois really want to vote on. How many people in here have had people call you and talk to you about the fact

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

that they think that there's a problem constitutionally in the State of Illinois with the appointment of judgeships? Raise your hand if you've had people call you. How many people have called you in this state if they have a problem with the way we map for elections? That's what we're hearing. We're hearing people who are concerned with the fact that in Illinois the Legislature gets to pick who votes for them, not the other way around. People... people are left out of that process, and I hear far more people who are interested in a Constitutional Amendment being placed on the ballot that has to do with how we map, than how we... how we appoint judges. Ladies and Gentlemen, the people of the state are not going to continually be fooled by these attempts to put them off the right track; the right track are Constitutional Amendments about things they care about? They care about how we map. They want a fair map Amendment. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that's what we should be debating. We should be voting up or down on whether or not the people of the State of Illinois are going to have a fair mapping process. I respectfully request a 'no' vote. Let's get something out here to debate that the people of the State of Illinois care about."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Reboletti: "Speaker Madigan, as I... I agree with you that we probably should have some mandatory minimum for these

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

positions. Where did these years of service come from? Was there some conversation with the Supreme Court or with other appellate justices, where these particular numbers come from?"

Madigan: "The 10 year requirement as, you know, Mr. Reboletti, is used by the State of Illinois, the Bar Association of the State of Illinois, the Chicago Bar Association, and other bar associations as a minimum threshold before they'll render a candidate as recommended. You know that."

Reboletti: "That's correct. Was there any reason then, Mr. Speaker, that you left off associate judges off of this Constitutional Amendment because my understanding would be that these elected circuits would then be able to appoint an attorney who had just become licensed, and then the same concern that you and I share for having experienced people on the bench may not really occur. Is there... was there a particular reason that the associates were not on here?"

Madigan: "The presumption was that if the Constitution talked in terms of 10 years that the circuit judges who select the associate judges would carry through and say, well, if it applies to us it ought to apply to them too."

Reboletti: "And I can understand that, but this wouldn't specifically make them have to serve 10 years to be an associate?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

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

Cross: "Thank you. Just an inquiry... will the Sponsor yield?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, just a couple questions. Why the ... why the

push for the move to pass this today?"

Madigan: "What's wrong with today?"

Cross: "Well, my question to you is, why today?"

Madigan: "And I would say, what's wrong with today?"

Cross: "Maybe I'll ask it in the context of a letter I sent to you on February 23rd in which I outlined, I don't know if you'll recall getting the letter, but I understood at that point there were four or five of these Constitutional Amendment Resolutions that had been prepared: one victim's rights, one on judicial qualifications, one on the abolition of Lieutenant Governor, one on spending, and we also have one on redistricting. And I think I was pretty clear in my letter that I said most of these have merit and we in fact may be for all of them, but we're limited in the fact that we can only put three on the ballot, cause under three articles, we have one on there already. request at the time was that we sit down, you, myself, Senator Radogno, Senator Cullerton, and prioritize all of these initiatives so that we can make sure and address the ones from a time limit standpoint that are most important. Is there any reason that we haven't been able to sit down or was there... is there a reason why there wasn't a response to that letter?"

Madigan: "You know I'm rather surprised that you advocate that the submission of Constitutional Amendments would be decided by four people. I thought that was contrary to your normal rhetoric."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Cross: "No, that's not what I'm saying, but go ahead, you can characterize it that way."

Madigan: "I'm finished."

Cross: "Was there any reason you didn't respond to the letter would be my question to you?"

Madigan: "No particular reason."

Cross: "This is an issue, if you support it, that we could do two years from now, is it not?"

Madigan: "Could have done it two years ago. We could do it two years from now."

Cross: "Correct and we could do it two years from now."

Madigan: "Again, what's wrong with today?"

Cross: "It is in fact though something we could do two years from now. There's not a timing issue on this issue. We may all agree with it and if we had three other issues on the ballot, we could do this in two years and still address the issue of qualifications of judges, is that correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is correct."

Cross: "We could take care of the abolition of Lieutenant Governor's office two years from now because we will not have another election for Lieutenant Governor or Governor for four years. Is that correct?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Cross: "So, I guess again it begs the question, why would we not address in this chamber and in the Senate the issue of redistricting that we really can't do for another 10 years or it wouldn't have any... wouldn't have any merit or it wouldn't have any significance because we do redistricting

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- every 10 years. If we missed this opportunity, we won't have another one for 10 years. Is that correct?"
- Madigan: "Well, Mr. Cross, I think you're very aware that in the Senate there's been very active consideration on the redistricting article. You know that. You've been invited to attend hearings over there. And so in the Senate they're working to prepare a Constitutional Amendment on redistricting, I've been working with them."
- Cross: "You must sit... I must be at different meetings, but go ahead."
- Madigan: "And the product of that will be offered to the General Assembly."
- Cross: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what if we end up passing this one and one of the other ones that you've moved out of Rules, won't we be precluded time wise? Why... again, the question is, why the rush? We have approximately a month and a half until we have to pass these."
- Madigan: "Again, what's wrong with today and requires the action of two chambers."
- Cross: "Are you making a commitment today or letting us know that the Senate's going to pass a redistricting change, Constitutional Amendment, that will be in effect for this next redistricting cycle?"
- Madigan: "I'm not in a position to commit what the Senate will do."
- Cross: "I thought you just said you'd been in the meetings."
- Madigan: "I don't think there's inconsistency in the two statements. I've been in meetings talking about redistricting, you've been in meetings talking about

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

redistricting. A lot of people have been talking about redistricting. Whether I can commit as to what action the Senate will take, I'm not in a position to do that. I can say on reasonable certitude that they will very shortly offer an Amendment on redistricting."

Cross: "Will it apply to this redistricting cycle in process?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Cross: "Okay. Now will you allow, if it passes out of the Senate, a vote on it in the House?"

Madigan: "Mr. Cross, that's a little premature because there have been meetings, discussions. I don't know what would be in an Amendment that would come out of the Senate."

Cross: "Well, is there any possibility that our... I have a Constitutional Amendment sitting in the Rules Committee, is there any chance that that's going to be able to be sent to the floor for a vote?"

Madigan: "Probably not."

Cross: "Okay. All right. Are you supportive of changing the way we do redistricting?"

Madigan: "Well, I'm prepared to support changes in how we do redistricting."

Cross: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, we were given a suggestion by one of our first families up front that if you serve in the

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

General Assembly for 20 years you can run for judge. Do you support that?"

Madigan: "No, I would not support that."

Davis, M.: "We under… well, we know that a number of years ago we passed the sub-circuit legislation to make sure that people of color were given an opportunity to run. Will this legislation in any way affect or limit those who can run in the sub-circuit?"

Madigan: "This would apply to every... every person in Illinois who seeks a judgeship, whether it would be countywide in Cook County, whether it would be in a sub-circuit in Cook County, whether it would be outside of Cook County. The... the new eligibility requirement put in the Constitution would just apply right across the board."

Davis, M.: "Do you find, Mr. Speaker, that those who usually run in the sub-circuit have 10 or more years of experience."

Madigan: "There have been instances where... there have been instances where people who are candidates in the subcircuit did not have 10 years of licensure."

Davis, M.: "But the majority of them do?"

Madigan: "In all likelihood the majority do."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill. I think it's an excellent opportunity for the voters to know that those who are going to make judicial decisions on the lives of their families, their friends, for those who have committed acts of violence will be justly adjudicated. I was very disturbed to find that in the State of Illinois over 300 or 350 men and women from the northern part of Illinois are brought south to Joliet

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

to be placed into the different prisons. Imagine that, Ladies and Gentlemen, 300 or 350 people a week. Our judicial system, in my opinion, must find better ways to deal with those who've committed acts that are not violent, but usually drug offenses. I think this legislation gives us a great opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to pick judges who actually have a great deal of experience in dealing with the law. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had a very good debate and I think everyone understands the issue. I would... I would really find it disappointing if people were to decide not to support this Amendment simply because of calculations in terms of suppressing the number of Constitutional Amendments to be considered by the General Assembly. And, again, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 57 pass?' This does require 71 votes. 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? Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, can we put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has requested Postponed Consideration. All in favor... The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, is seeking recognition."

Bost: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Members of the General Assembly to repre... to welcome Mr. Paul Plunkett and the Trinity Christian School that are in the gallery with us to Springfield today."
- Speaker Mautino: "On page 20 of the Calendar on Bills on Third Reading appears House Bill 5838. Representative Burke, would you like to move this Bill? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5838, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This simply would remove the requirement that AEDs be provided at fitness facilities when there are outdoor activities undertaken that are further than 300 feet of the building that houses an AED. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5838 and on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Eddy: "Representative Burke, just for clarification purposes.

For school districts for example: if the activity that...

maybe it's a track for track and field or football field or

a softball/baseball that's more than 300 feet away from the

building, the requirement for an AED would no longer... is

that what you're..."

Burke: "That's right."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Eddy: "Okay. So this is kind of relaxing the mandates so that those school districts that are having trouble meeting that type of mandate will have some relief."

Burke: "Yes, as you understand when these institutions organize their physical activities, their sports programs, and there may be several different activities going on at the same time in a relatively small area, so if we were to require an AED at every team exercise, it would become a very serious burden for that school to comply with."

Eddy: "Well, Representative, I appreciate the fact that we're relaxing this, especially now for districts. I wonder if there's any more that can be done especially now related to this issue. And I know that a lot of folks are concerned and rightfully so about having some type of equipment available in the case of an emergency, but I think this is a good step forward in trying to relieve..."

Burke: "Well, as you know, Representative, for the last couple of years and certainly as we anticipate there being new needs, new concerns, we will be prepared to address those as they come forward, but we have organized, we have brought together all of the stakeholders in this particular subject such as, the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association, the Chicago Park District, the Chicago Public Schools, the downstate park districts. All of the entities that would come under this mandate and we've asked for their input."

Eddy: "Well, is this for all school districts in the state?"

Burke: "Yes."

Eddy: "So this is not just for the Chicago Public Schools?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Burke: "No."

Eddy: "So schools in all areas of the state would have the same relief from this, as amended."

Burke: "We would have no opportunity to simply talk about just Chicago Public Schools."

Eddy: "Okay. I think our analysis indicated at one point or another that it was for Chicago Public Schools. Well, maybe that..."

Burke: "They are the ones that brought the initiative to us."

Eddy: "That's where the initiative was brought from."

Burke: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay, thank you. Again, I do appreciate the fact that we're thinking this way, and I hope we can continue to think this way. If nothing else, as we move forward with the committee that the State Board of Education's established, to look at maybe some type of relief like this in other areas of mandates at least for a period of time. And I appreciate the fact that you've been sensitive to this issue."

Burke: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5838. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Riley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 5838 is declared passed. Representative Bellock, House Bill 5241. Read the Bill."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5241, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading... Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 remains in the House Rules Committee. No Motions... No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on Second Reading. Representative Black, House Bill 6241.

 Out of the record. Representative Burns, House Bill 5951.

 Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5951, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Burns."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I wish to present House Bill 5951. House Bill 5951 is an initiative of the Attorney General's office. This takes our Whistleblower Protection Act and brings it into compliance with the federal False Claims Act. As a consequence of making these changes to our law and bringing it into conformity with federal law, we'll be able to draw down additional federal Medicare funding. I know of no opposition and I would request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5951. No one seeking recognition, question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, Bost, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

'present', House Bill 5951 is declared passed. Representative Colvin, page 21 of the Calendar is House Bill 6018. Out of the record. Representative Davis, House Bill 5289, Representative William Davis. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5289, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Excuse my running here. House Bill 5289 is an initiative to try to help public libraries. Currently, we know how libraries are funded; unfortunately, there are some libraries that are suffering because of the lack of property tax revenue in their communities. And so, we presented this particular Bill, which we've amended once, and essentially what it does is provides essentially a grant to the libraries based on \$20 per resident based on the libraries and the libraries also have to have... meet a percent poverty level threshold within communities. And based on those calculations, particularly with the threshold, based on those calculations there are four public libraries that would be affected by this. They are in the Village of Ford Heights and Pembroke, which is in Pembroke Township, the William Leonard Library District in Robbins, which is in my district, and the Village of Dixmoor, which is in my district as well. Based on the calculations, the total I believe is approximately \$129,000. Each library will receive a grant based on these calculations. This is subject to appropriations. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5289 and on that question, the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a point... a quick point of clarification with the Sponsor."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, go ahead."

Reis: "Representative, your Amendment made the Bill subject to appropriation, is that correct?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

Reis: "And that removed all the opposition?"

Davis, W.: "Well, that was just the one concern... that was a concern in committee and so we... the Bill originally was subject to appropriation, but so that we didn't have any confusion there was a second Amendment drafted that made clear what the dollar amount was, what the poverty threshold was, and made it subject to appropriation."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Miller: "I just need some clarification that the... that the residents will be charged \$20 a piece?"

Davis, W.: "No, no. The residents will not charged."

Miller: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "This will be a calculation based on the number of residents in the community in which the library district serves and the money will come from GRF."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Miller: "Okay. In terms of the... the money from GRF, that goes directly to the library district?"
- Davis, W.: "It'll be a grant to that library district."
- Miller: "Okay. Is there any indication within that library district how that money would be used? And the reason I'm asking is you may know that Ford Heights actually does not have a library. That actually the library district is in Glenwood, which also takes care of Lynwood too, where I reside. So would this additional dollars have to be targeted towards the citizens of Ford Heights or could they use and decide... the board of directors at a library decide to use it any way they see fit?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess the way it's originally drafted that the libraries would be able to use it in any way that they see fit. I'm not opposed to making such a change because as you indicated the Village of Dixmoor would be impacted by this and they are served by the Harvey Library."
- Miller: "Okay, so as you can see that would be a problem if the citizens of Dixmoor or the citizens of Ford Heights are being calculated into an equation to get a school… a library district more money, but not being utilized for the purpose that it was intended to."
- Davis, W.: "Well, again, the idea is just to support the library and give them additional resources to continue to provide services for the communities that they represent. So I don't want you to get the impression that there's some ill-intent behind this..."

Miller: "No, no..."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Davis, W.: "...in that respect, but I do understand what you're saying about trying to make sure that if the residents of the community are impacted by this that they get the benefit of the resources. Well, so going back to your original point, I just want to make clear that this is not being charged to the residents."

Miller: "No..."

Davis, W.: "So the Ford Heights residents are not asking to pay an additional \$20..."

Miller: "No, I understand that..."

Davis, W.: "...to keep it open."

Miller: "But I guess..."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, I'll take this out of the record, briefly."

Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 5282, Representative Connelly, would you like to read the Bill? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5282, a Bill for an Act concerning real property. Third Reading of this House Bill."

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

Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5282 amends the Code of Civil Procedure. It modernizes the Joint Tenancy Act to allow married couples in Illinois who opt to use a revocable living trust for estate planning purposes to continue to benefit from owning the property as tenants by the entirety. They currently have this option with land trusts. This Bill is supported by the State Bar

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Association. There's no known opposition and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5282. No one seeking recognition, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, do you wish to be recorded. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5282 is declared passed. On page 19 of the Calendar, Representative William Davis, appears House Bill 5407. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5407, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5407 is an attempt to provide a multitude of resources for individuals suffering from the various complications associated with diabetes. In full disclosure, we talked about this being an insurance mandate which it certainly may be and in this particular Bill we are still working on it. We've made one change that broadened the language so it wasn't specific to any particular complication of diabetes, but a broad variety of complications related to diabetes. But we are still working on this Bill. There was some opposition from one of the insurance companies and we are currently trying to come up with language to work that issue out so if this Bill does pass out of this chamber and goes over to the Senate, we will certainly

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

continue to work on this over in the Senate. I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5407. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Franks: "Representative, I understand what you're trying to do here. My concern is we saw just today that President Obama has signed into law the new Health Care Act requiring insurance. How would this Bill effect... or I guess how would the Federal Bill effect this?"

Davis, W.: "Unfortunately, Representative, we didn't have an opportunity to make that assessment based on what happened with the Federal Government so I don't have a specific answer for you. But you should know that there is a companion version of this Bill that is now, from the Senate, that is now in the House that I have picked up and so we will certainly try to answer that question relative to moving forward with that particular... with this particular Bill."

Franks: "And I appreciate that and that was my concern because my concern is I don't want to continue to add mandates at the state level... it would... that could be greater than that at the federal level until we see what the federal level does. That's my one concern. I'm wondering if maybe we might be premature with this Bill at this time."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Davis, W.: "Well, certainly you can... you can hopefully understand that at the time this Bill was of course drafted...

Franks: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...you know, the Federal Health Care Bill was in debate and, you know, fortunately came to a vote over the weekend. So, again, we unfortunately don't know what that impact will be but I'm committed to answering that question for you."

Franks: "Thank you. I appreciate it."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5407 and on that question, Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I don't know if the Members know that today is American Diabetes Association Alert Day and this Bill, I believe, is apropos to exactly the interest of this. Diabetes, as you know, is a deadly disease and yearly strikes 24 million children and adults in the U.S. Nearly one quarter of those with diabetes, 5.7 million don't even know that they have it. An additional 75 million or one out of five Americans have pre-diabetes which puts them at a high risk for developing type 2 diabetes. And so I can go on and on, but the point is, is that anything that can help relieve or help deal with this tragic disease that is treatable, is a step in the right direction and I would ask for support of this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5407. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Fritchey, Dunkin, Bost, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5407 is declared passed. Representative Dugan, House Bill 6101. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6101, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 6101 just clarifies statute. Right now, transmitting a false report to the police is currently a Class 4 felony. However, in different places in the state 9-1-1... it has to do with 9-1-1. The Appellate Courts have said that the false reporter must communicate directly with the police and in some parts of the state 9-1-1 is a police department, but in other parts of the state 9-1-1 is actually a dispatch center to the police. So this is just to clarify that any 9-1-1 call is considered a false report. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 6101. No Members seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Franks, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 6101 is declared passed. Representative Brauer, House Bill 5688. Read the Bill."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5688, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Brauer."
- Brauer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that back to Second for the purpose of putting on an Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "Place that Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk... Representative Brady, House Bill 5197 appears on Third Reading, would you like to move this Bill? Out of the record. Representative Eddy, House Bill 6041. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6041, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry, my drawer tried to eat my Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 6041 with regards to a school district's authority to create a working cash fund. The working cash fund that's created is maintained consistent with the limitations of statutory articles. What this does is it eliminates one step that school districts have to take in moving money from that fund to a different fund. It's been the subject of some considerable costs to districts in defending that authority. It just eliminates a step. Had no significant opposition and got out of committee 17 to 1. We amended it, as was agreed to in committee, to take a part that had to do… that inadvertently a requirement that it be published in a local newspaper was left out. We've amended

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

the Bill and I'd appreciate your support and attempt to answer any of your questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of 6041. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Excuse me. Representative Froehlich, with a question."

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

Froehlich: "Representative Eddy, this Bill is unusual in that it's both prospective and retrospective. I haven't seen us be retroactive very often. Maybe it's happened, but I can't recall it. Your Bill would have the effect of granting a form of amnesty, wouldn't it, to school districts that didn't follow the law as interpreted by an Appellate Court decision. Is that correct, that it would be kind of a retroactive hold harmless clause for some school districts?"

Eddy: "I think that is... that's a correct interpretation. I think it would take care of some issues in the past that were confusing to districts. They operated this way really without... and with approval, really, of everyone involved. There was a technical issue though, that at the appellate level was caught. I think it takes care, though, a lot of confusion to allow for all of those cases to be cleared up this way."

Froehlich: "And my last question, would this Bill, if it becomes law, would this prevent some property owners who have based on the mistakes, which may have been made in

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

good faith, I don't dispute that, but would this prevent some property owners from recovering tax refunds?"

Eddy: "Representative, I think that would be up to the court involved if someone decided to go to the court and use the argument that this was not allowable retrospectively. A judge would have to decide that. I think the intent of the General Assembly would be part of that decision, there's no question about that, and I think that's what this Bill is intended to do is to clear those things up. And hopefully, what it will do is save school districts a lot of money on some objections that are generally found to be in favor of the school district because of the confusion related to this. And I hope that's what happens because I think at this time, especially districts have limited funds and continue to defend this type of thing, is difficult. money could be used on I think far more appropriate school expenses."

Froehlich: "So your intent is to say they couldn't get refunds that they might have already been in the process of seeking based upon this error?"

Eddy: "I think the court has to decide that."

Froehlich: "Well, but I'm asking for what your intent is as we deal with your..."

Eddy: "Well, the intent is clear that they take this into consideration if the intent of this law is to clear that up."

Froehlich: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No Members seeking recognition, Representative Eddy to close."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Eddy: "I simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 6041. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommer, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 6041 is declared passed. Representative Davis, House Bill 5289. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5289, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You heard some of the debate earlier on this particular Bill. I've committed to the Gentleman that asked a question earlier, to see if there's a way we can solve his particular concern, which I do certainly, certainly understand. But if there are any additional questions on this matter I'll be more than happy to answer them."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5289. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 100 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5289 is declared passed. Representative Fortner, House Bill 5755 appears on the Calendar. Read the Bill."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5755, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Kosel, on page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 5483, would you like to move this Bill? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5483, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Mr. Speaker, could we move that back to Second for an Amendment, please?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Place this Bill on Second Reading.

 Representative Leitch, you have House Bill 5685 on Third

 Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5685, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does is require in instances where insurance claims have been paid in case of mine subsidence that that shall be recorded with the recorder's office in that given county. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5685. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Representative Chapa LaVia, do you with to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5685 is declared passed. Representative Flowers, on page 4 of the Calendar on Second Reading is House Bill 4679. Out of the record. Representative Flowers, on page 9 of the Calendar appears House Bill... under the Order of Second Reading is House Bill 5473, do you wish to move this Bill? Representative Flowers. Out of the record. Representative Fritchey, House Bill 4982 is on Second Reading, would you like to move this Bill, Sir? Read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4982, a Bill... 4982, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Floor Amendments. No Motions have been filed, but a... #
 Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Representative, would you like to read the Bill for a third time? Run the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4982, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey on House Bill 4982."
- Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a Bill that originally started as a request from a constituent that had an issue and then concurrently the City of Chicago and the Secretary of State were taking a look at the issue as well. What this would allow to happen is that an individual with suspended driving privileges can be able to have those

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

privileges reinstated once they've entered into a payment plan for any outstanding fees or penalties. In the event that they were to default under that payment plan, then their driving privileges would be re-suspended by the Secretary of State after 14 days of default. We do have the support of everybody from the Secretary of State's office to the City of Chicago to the Cook County Public Defender to the State Bar Association, the Illinois Association of Court Clerks. We know of no opposition to the Bill. I think this does the simultaneous goal of letting people get back to work or whatever they may need their vehicle for, while at the same time, ensuring that the municipal bodies of the state are getting their fines and penalties that are owed to them, paid back to them. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 4982, and on that question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Durkin is seeking recognition."

Durkin: "Cook."

Speaker Mautino: "You're right."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "And proceed."

Durkin: "How does a Bill... how does a Bill get posted also in committee, Mr. Speaker? You want to take that under advisement? We can wait another few weeks. John, just one question, do the notorious 'red light' violations, do they qualify under this program? You know, from those..."

Fritchey: "Jim, I... excuse me..."

Durkin: "...the 'red light' cameras?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Fritchey: "No, no. Representative, I understand where you're going. I don't know of anything that would differentiate them from any other fee… or from any other ticket. You know, this deals with suspensions resulting from unfit… unpaid fines, tickets, or tolls."

Durkin: "So it's just not limited to moving violations cause the 'red light' camera violations are not designated as moving violations."

Fritchey: "No, this is..."

Durkin: "And they would be encompassed within this, correct?"

Fritchey: "This is... this is unpaid fines, tickets, and tolls. So it's, you know, whenever there's an obligation owed, and what happens sometimes in the situations we found in the past is, that somebody may be unable to pay their fines because they're unable to get to work. So this allows us to take care of both."

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

Reboletti: "I am in DuPage, so thank you, Speaker.

Representative Fritchey, who would make the determination of what the amount of the payment plan would be? Would that be the municipality if it was the City of Chicago? Would that be..."

Fritchey: "Me."

Reboletti: "You would make that?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "In your retirement?"

Fritchey: "Yes, Sir."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Reboletti: "Besides you, who would be the other ultimate authority who'd make these agreements?"
- Fritchey: "I think it would be the authority to whom the outstanding amounts are owed would have the ability to enter into a payment plan. I mean you, obviously, like anything else have two parties. You're going to have the obligor and the obligee. They we have to enter into a plan that was satisfactory and acceptable to both sides."
- Reboletti: "Does this require a certain payment up front, 50%?

 If you owed a \$1000 lets say in fines, you have to pay \$500

 up front and then agree to pay \$42 a month for the next 12

 months to take care of the differential or how is that... how
 would you anticipate that?"
- Fritchey: "Well, I... this doesn't prescribe what the settlement or payment plan would look like. Oftentimes it may be a 50% plan or it may simply be an agreement to pay the full amount over time, and there may actually be an incentive for the person that owes the fine, they may be more incentivized to be willing to pay the entire fine knowing that doing so will allow them to get those driving privileges reinstated and they make payment over a certain amount of time. So maybe they couldn't make that payment in 60 days but maybe they could do it over 180 days, and maybe it's easier for them to pay the full amount once they have their driving privileges reinstated."
- Reboletti: "And my understanding, Representative, is that the... is the tollway in this Bill or it's not in this Bill?"
- Fritchey: "Toll fines had been in this Bill. Now, Representative, I want to be... I want to tread carefully

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

here because there was some Amendments that had been made to the Bill. As I'm looking at this and bear with me, Representative, I apologize, I just want to make sure that I don't give you bad information because that was one of the issues that had been discussed at the time."

Reboletti: "I know. I had a chance to speak with the toll way also. I wanted to make sure if that was part... I'm looking here at the... the Bill also."

Fritchey: "One second, Representative. Representative, I'm going to tell you as I look at the original Bill and look at the Amendment, I don't see anything that took tolls out of the legislation. But I want to qualify my remarks because I don't want to give you misinformation here. I would submit that with or without the concept that we are going to be able to encourage individuals to enter into a payment plan, incentivize them to do that in such a way that probably allows municipalities to get more of their money back. It's probably a good thing."

Reboletti: "My conversation with the tollway, at least at this time, was it wasn't in the Bill, but they were going to be working on that because of the way the tollway collects their debts, goes through a debt collector, then they'd have to work out negotiations with the debt collectors first to see how much they had paid up front. So my district is surrounded by tollways with a lot of constituents who have some of those issues. They want to make sure that they would have the opportunity to make good on their debts and restore their driving privileges."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Fritchey: "Representative, I apologize. That was actually a timely phone call from somebody that's listening to the debate. The tollway is no longer in this legislation."

Reboletti: "That was my understanding. I would hope at some point and they told me and I believed them that they're working on this and that it would be sometime in the near future that they would be able to do the same thing that your Bill is trying to accomplish so..."

Fritchey: "I would not be surprised that they would see this as an attractive way to go."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Davis, M.: "Representative Fritchey, I'm sorry that I missed a little of the discussion. Now my understanding is that you're attempting to get the licenses back for people. Is that correct?"

Fritchey: "What this would do would be once they have entered into a payment plan for any outstanding amounts that are due and owing, let's say to the City of Chicago, if they owed fines and penalties, et cetera, that this would allow them to get their license back while they are in a payment plan. Now should they default from that payment plan, their driving privileges would be revoked again. But right now, this would allow them to get their license back. Representative, you have a piece of legislation that's somewhat analogous. Now this doesn't... this doesn't deal

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

with deadbeat dads, this deals with traffic offenders that owe traffic fees and traffic fines and saying, okay, we'll allow you... the only reason that your license has been suspended is because of nonpayment of these fines. Rather than remain a deadbeat, if you enter into a payment plan and stay current with that payment plan, we will allow you to reinstate your driving privileges as long as you keep making your required payments."

- Davis, M.: "Yeah. Do you think this makes it much safer for people on the road that we're allowing people to drive as they attempt to make commitments in reference to past violations?"
- Fritchey: "Well, I don't believe that this is a safety issue. This does not apply to licenses that have been suspended for safety reasons. Whether it was a DUI, whatever it may be, we are not allowing them to get reinstatement based... if the suspension was based on that. It's simply if your suspension was based on nonpayment of fines or fees, we are going to allow you to get your license reinstated so you can go to work, do whatever it is to help people get along with your life and get those fees and payments paid and stay on schedule."
- Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think it's an excellent piece of legislation. I think we should all be very concerned that people can get back and forth to work, that people can go and look for work. And I think we thwart the efforts of all families when we take away the opportunity for people to go to work, to look for jobs, and

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

I think this is a great piece of legislation and I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's moved passage of House Bill 4982. No one seeking recognition, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Beaubien, Black, Saviano, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 4982 is declared passed. Representative Mathias, on the Calendar is House Bill 5720. Out of the record. Representative Moffitt, on Third Reading is House Bill 4779. Out of the Representative Pihos, on Second Reading is House Bill 6034. Do you wish to move this Bill? Out of the record. Representative Fritchey, on the Order of Second Reading is House Bill 6072, do you wish to move this Bill? Out of the record. Representative Golar, on Third Reading is House Bill 5918. Representative Golar, would you like to call House Bill 5918 for Third Reading? Place this Bill on Second Reading. The Lady from Cook."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you move that back to Second Reading? I'm awaiting an Amendment, please. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "That Bill is on Second Reading.

 Representative Harris, House Bill 5691 is on Third Reading.

 Would you like to read this Bill? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5691, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill I bring to you at the request of the Illinois Psychological Association. It would add a continuing education requirement to the renewal for licensing for psychologists in Illinois. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5691. On that question, the Lady from Kankakee, Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Mr. Speaker, if I could, for the record, House Bill 5289 I had inadvertently voted 'no' and I wanted to be recorded as voting 'yes'."

Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect your intention."

Dugan: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition on House Bill 5691, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, Davis, Riley, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House Bill 5691 is declared passed. Representative Harris, on Second Reading is House Bill 5085. Out of the record. Representative Hoffman, House Bill 5515 appears on Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5515, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Hoffman."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5515 unanimously passed out of the Education Committee and this for a period of time, a limited period of time, through June 30, 2013 would allow school districts to transfer money from the school districts' life/safety fund to Operations and Maintenance Fund for building repair work. This would give school districts the flexibility to use excess funding and use it to help them in their General Fund for building repair work."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5515. On that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, we had this in Education Committee and I support the legislation. I think it's a good idea, especially now. There are a lot of statutes that have to do with life/safety funds. You're not altering those statutes, you're just allowing flexibility with the excess funds and you're doing it, I think the Amendment sunsets this, right?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it sunsets. It's only through June 30th of 2013. And no, we're not making any Amendments to any other areas of the life/safety funds or any of the provisions that stops some past abuses."

Eddy: "So if a school district has an approved life/safety plan with the State Board of Education, they're still expected to fulfill the requirements of that plan. If you have your 10 year life/safety survey, whatever the survey states that

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

you have to do as far as safety for children, you still have to do those things. This is only to the point where you have excess funds that you can move during this limited time period."

Hoffman: "Yes, that's correct."

Eddy: "Representative, I think it's a good idea, especially now. I urge my colleagues to support this, to help our schools during this difficult time."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Gentleman a question, if he would yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman yields."

Tryon: "Representative Hoffman, this is... this is just to allow a transfer of surplus money. This doesn't... this wouldn't exempt anybody in one of the counties that has, you know, a tax cap or is subject to PTEL does it. I mean, where they would be able to move a rate up or anything like that?"

Hoffman: "No, it does not. All this does is allow for a limited period of time from between now and June 30, 2013 to transfer from the school districts life/safety fund to the Operation and Maintenance Fund for building repair work. Gives the school district more flexibility with existing money."

Tryon: "Okay, so... so no tax implications at all. Strictly just the ability to move inter-fund money back, and they have... there's no requirement that they pay back any of the

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

life/safety money over a period of time or anything like that then?"

Hoffman: "No there's no requirement to pay it back."

Tryon: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no further questions, the Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5515. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Riley, Cultra, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 103 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5515 is declared passed. Representative Howard, on page 19 of the Calendar is House Bill 5402 on Third Reading. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, return this Bill to Second for an Amendment. Representative Howard on Floor Amendment #1 to 5402."

Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a line and page Amendment deleting the underlying Bill. In fact, it becomes the Bill and provides that if the offenses of robbery, armed robbery or aggravated robbery are committed to effect or attempt to effect a transaction at an electronic fund transfer terminal, then the defendant will receive an extended term."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5402. On that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Representative (sic-Speaker). Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she will."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Fritchey: "Representative, This... does this Amendment differ from the one that was brought up previously."

Howard: "Yes."

Fritchey: "How so?"

Howard: "We did not enhance it to a Class X felony as was the case before when you had an objection to it. We're now... we're now adjusting the sentence, the number of years and the sentence."

Fritchey: "So what would this make the adjustment to?"

Howard: "When the judge makes the... when the judge makes the determination about the sentence, it would be twice as much time given to the individual as the current law dictates."

Fritchey: "So a doubling of the sentence."

Howard: "Yes."

Fritchey: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we had some debate on this Bill when the... to the Amendment. We had some debate on this Amendment last time and I appreciate the Sponsor trying to improve what was done previously, but please keep in mind what this Amendment would do. This Amendment would say that if you were to rob somebody on their way to the ATM machine, you get one penalty. If you were to rob them after they left the ATM machine with their money, you get another penalty. If you happen to rob them while they are at the ATM machine, you would get double the penalty. I simply don't believe that while there are many vulnerabilities, whether it is somebody walking alone down a dark street, whether it is somebody that is elderly, somebody that is handicapped, whatever it may be, that this is something that would provide for an enhancement,

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

literally doubling of penalties. Everybody likes to come out of this building talking about us being tough on crime. And I agree with everybody that, you know, there are things we should not have a tolerance for, but this simply creates a patchwork that really is disconnected from reality. And I truly hold the Sponsor in high regards. This is not a reflection on her whatsoever, but there is a serious and significant question as to whether this is not only enforceable, but this is the type of policy that we want to pursue in the state where we're almost encouraging somebody to wait for somebody to leave the ATM machine to rob them or get them before they get there. Just don't rob them while they are there because all of a sudden you're going to do twice as much time. Our jails are going to be that much more congested for that much longer for essentially the same crime. Rob them as they take the money out, you do six years; rob them as they walk away from the ATM machine, you do three years. This is going to result in significant cost to the state. It is not going to be a deterrent for the crime, it is simply going to be another patchwork at a time that the CLEAR Commission has tried to streamline and make more logical our Criminal Code. is simply going to take us in the other direction. I would reluctantly, yet steadfastly, ask for a 'no' vote on the Amendment and, Speaker, I request a Roll Call vote. you."

Speaker Mautino: "A Roll Call vote on the Amendment has been requested and acknowledged. Representative Reboletti, the

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Gentleman from DuPage, further questions? Representative Howard."

Howard: "Yes, I want to remind the good Representative that... I wanted to remind you that the reason that we talked about this last time needing to be an offense that required more penalty is because of the vulnerability of someone who is standing at an ATM machine. Oftentimes they are on the street. The cubicles that they're in sometimes, once you step into the cubicle you are not able to move. If someone comes up to you then you for the most part are very vulnerable. It is... there is a difference in your walking down the street and having the ability to run in a direction and that's why I believe that this deserves to have a larger penalty."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you. And, Representative, I understand your belief and I respectfully disagree for a couple of reasons. I cannot think, in my district and probably yours as well, is proliferated with ATM machines. I cannot think of one that is in a walled off cube such as like you're talking about, but even if it were and I'm not going to be facetious with that example, that same example would apply to somebody being robbed in a bathroom urinal or in a bathroom stall. They have nowhere to go, they have nowhere to run. They are just as vulnerable. A victim is vulnerable at many times in many circumstances, depending on where they are, depending on the time of day, depending on who they are with or not with. So... but the reality is again, the ATM machine, you know, and this is not about

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

holding somebody and keeping them from leaving, this isn't an unlawful restraint, it's not a kidnapping issue, it is an issue of... I cannot envision an ATM machine and if other people can, let me know, where you walk into a three-walled area and you cannot get out. That vulnerability is not the test and what is also the problem here is you are now leaving it up to judicial discretion now, not the statute, as to whether the offender knew that this person was at the ATM machine. They may have been walking to it or from it. Go ahead, Representative, please."

Howard: "Yes, Representative Fritchey, I have never gone to a washroom to withdraw money."

Fritchey: "I'm not..."

Howard: "When people..."

Fritchey: "It was not about withdrawing money."

Howard: "When people go to the ATM machine it is understood that there's money involved. There's a difference. If somebody robs you in the washroom, chances are you may not have any money."

Fritchey: "Representative, I may have more money in my pocket walking to the bathroom than somebody has walking up to the ATM machine."

Howard: "I see."

Fritchey: "But the issue you're talking about is while they are at the machine themselves..."

Howard: "At the machine."

Fritchey: "...if it's about the money, why not... what happens if...

Let's take a young woman; she withdraws money from that

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

machine. She turns around and takes one step away from that machine..."

Howard: "And she can still run..."

Fritchey: "And she... as she gets..."

Howard: "...or get away."

Fritchey: "...as she gets. No, no."

Howard: "She's not distracted."

Fritchey: "Once she takes one step away from that machine, this Bill doesn't apply anymore."

Howard: "But the point is that she is not distracted any longer. As you know, when you go to an ATM machine you are focused on making certain that you are putting the correct code in, you're making certain that you're doing the right thing and you're focused in on what is on the board. So, I'm saying that's why it makes someone much more vulnerable because you are not thinking, you're looking around, probably not able to look around as much as you need to or to be aware of your surroundings."

Fritchey: "Why, I think the same actions involved in an ATM machine are the same actions involved at a gas station terminal when you're putting your informa... when you're putting your credit card in to get gas at the thing. You're focusing on putting your card in, having to put in your zip code, whatever the case may be. You're distracted and occupied then, as well, and as a matter of fact the physicality of a fuel pump is not that dissimilar to one of an ATM machine."

Howard: "Representative Fritchey, if I make a decision to take \$20 out and I walk away from the machine, that's one thing;

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

but if I'm standing at the machine and someone is saying to me take out more money than I intended to or give me all of your money, that is... that's a difference."

Fritchey: "I agree, but that's not what this Bill says."

Howard: "Well, I'm saying that at the machine you are more vulnerable than if you were walking away from the machine."

Fritchey: "But this legislation does not add enhanced penalties for somebody forcing you to take more money out than you would. This simply says, if you were taking \$5 out and they robbed you while you took those \$5, it's double the penalty."

Howard: "But you have... while you're at the machine, you can be forced to take more money than you had expected."

Fritchey: "But that..."

Howard: "In fact, they can empty your bank account at that point."

Fritchey: "Understood, but that's not what this... if, here, if the law said that we are going to enhance the penalties for forcing somebody to take more money out of an ATM machine and then robbing them, I don't even think there'd debate on the Bill, it would have flown out. That's not... that's not what the Bill says. And that's actually what I thought you were trying to get to, which is if somebody forces you to take more money out, et cetera, that's where I thought you were trying to go. This simply says if they rob you while you are taking your money out. I went there to take \$20 out, I took 20 out. They robbed me while I took the 20 out; they now caught double the sentence. That's a very different scenario than being forced to take more money out

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

or being forced to take all the money out of my account and then having that robbed from me."

Howard: "I believe that a person who is at the ATM machine is much more vulnerable and I, therefore, believe there ought to be a penalty that is much more serious."

Fritchey: "Representative, I respect you; I respect your belief..."

Howard: "I appreciate your respect..."

Fritchey: "I simply... I simply disagree on this particular issue and there's not many I disagree with you on. This does, unfortunately, happen to be one and I'd so request a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Howard: "Further discussion? And the Chair, since this Bill is on Short Debate, there have been a number of requests for speakers. We'll be using the timer and the rules for Short Debate. The next speaker will be the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for two minutes."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, when we talked I thought that we were going to make this a 'may' situation, I don't think we can do it as a 'shall'. And the reason for that is when a prosecutor charges something they have to put the elements of the offense into the charging document and with this, we'd be adding a new element to the offense saying that it was an ATM machine or near an ATM machine and that would be the reason for the enhancement and that you 'shall' then be sentenced to a second term. When I had had conversation with you, it was my thought that we would make this an

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

aggravating factor as we did in Representative Black's Bill where it would be a 'may' situation. So depending how egregious the event was, the judge could take into consideration that it happened at the Chase ATM, wherever it was at, that it was in a very well lit area, that he had preyed upon the person, et cetera. So I think that would leave more discretion to the judge then. And I think with that it would take care of any constitutional issues and maybe some of the issues that the previous speaker had."

Howard: "Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Gentlemen, while we're all about being tough on crime and it's very important to make sure that people serve the longest sentence and, you know, God forbid someone accuses of not doing the right thing. But what us the Representative, who is very, very good at her job has done with this Amendment has actually made the Bill worse than it was the first time that it was presented in making what... what... a legal impossibility. Because in presenting this Bill she's asking the judge to make a determination of what's actually in the defendant's head and making... asking the judge at sentencing to make a factual determination which is actually up to the jury, which is not legally possible to do. And so if this were ever challenged on appeal it would actually be tossed out immediately and you would not be accomplishing what we're trying to do here. This Bill needs significant work as the previous speaker

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- said. I thought that we were also going to put this under aggravating and mitigating factors, but to ask a judge to make a factual determination after a guilt determination has already been done is something that we cannot do. It's supposed to be done at the guilt phase and this is bad all around. If we are going to take a vote on this instead of trying to fix this, which we still have time to do, I would ask that we vote 'no' and do some more work before we move forward on this. This is not good law. It doesn't accomplish what we need it to accomplish and truly something that we don't want to do and put something in the statutes that just doesn't mesh with the rest of..."
- Speaker Mautino: "There has been a Roll Call vote requested on the Amendment and that has been recognized. Our final speaker is Representative Will Davis and Representative Lyons in the Chair."
- Davis, W.: "Hold on just a minute, please. Thank you. Hold on just a minute, please. Mr. Speaker, sorry about that. Representative, did you have an opportunity to explain your Amendment to the extent in which you wanted to?"
- Howard: "I'm not certain that there's much more I can say about it. My point is that I thought there needs to be something a little bit more than what we currently have on the books for similar situations."
- Davis, W.: "So, essentially, your Amendment was trying to address some concerns that had been previously raised before, correct?"

Howard: "That's correct."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Davis, W.: "Okay. I just wanted to make that point very clear, and essentially to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. understand some of the comments that have been made. Some folks feel that we're doing too much or, you know, every other thing that comes up we have to create something to it. And the reality, I think, unfortunately we're all subject to personal requests and with personal requests and personal... and personal complaints down here. And essentially... what essentially trying to say is that if one of constituents has a problem or is aggravated in some way, they're going to come to you and feel that something needs to be done to do it, and many of you are going to step up to the plate and try to address what your constituents needs are. Be clear about that. You're going to try to do that. Now when you try to do that and you're going to make the case because one of your constituents, something has happened to them, you're going to try to make that case. So should we treat you the way that you're treating this Representative who's simply trying to do something to help? I'm serious. I'm serious. She's trying to do something to address a concern that she has. That's all she's trying to do and we need to give her that opportunity to do so. if it fails on appeal or what have you, again, we always come back here and we readdress concerns that we have. all I'm simply trying to say is that she's trying to address a particular constituent need and she needs to have the opportunity to do so. If there's a concern we should be working with her to try to alleviate the concerns, to

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

try to make what she wants to do better, not just simply saying it's a bad idea and we shouldn't do it. So I would encourage you to support the Lady's Amendment, try to move the issue forward. I'm sure she's open to continuing to work on the issue to make it better so that she can address whatever concern has been brought to her. Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons in the Chair. It's my understanding the previous Speaker announced that Will Davis will be the last speaker, so Representative Howard on your Amendment."
- Howard: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it's sort of confusing sometimes when you hear various people speak. Sometimes they think that I am not hard enough on crime and sometimes they say, you know, they don't want to be soft on crime. So it's confusing as you listen to people speak. I am certainly... I was... I had been under the impression that what I did in the Amendment was in fact correct, and what people had suggested that I do. I would not have brought it back had I not done what I thought was what I had been requested. But I'm certainly willing to continue to work on it, and I would like to be able to get it passed out of the House so that I will ask the Senate Sponsor, if I'm able to get it that far, to assist in trying to get closer to what will be agreeable to this Body as well."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5402. A roll call has been requested so all those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Collins and Pihos? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill... on this Amendment there's 100 Members voting 'yes', 14 Members voting 'no' and Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Howard, you wish to call the Bill?"

Howard: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5402, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."

Howard: "Yes, we've had extensive debate on this and I just wanted to reiterate that I am willing to work to try to make this Bill more agreeable to some who expressed opposition."

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking discussion, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5402 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 Dugan, Riley, Verschoore? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there's 103 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dennis Reboletti, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, right before that Bill was called the previous speaker talked about working on issues that are important to somebody and their constituency. Well, I have worked with the gentle Lady on numerous issues and we were trying to do that today and I know she will work with the Senate Sponsor. But I found it interesting that when I ran a Bill about heroin, about drug dealers, I heard about how all I wanted to do is lock people up and I didn't care. The fact of the matter is there were 20 kids from the City of Elmhurst who went into treatment because of heroin That's all I was trying to do with the Bill and I was chastised on the House floor by some of those same folks that was talking about this Bill and helping the gentle Lady, which I did help here. So I'd ask that when we're working on Bills that deals with one another's constituency that we do keep that in people's thoughts. So, thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pat Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker), on the previous Bill I meant to vote 'yes'. I thought I'd punched my button and it evidently didn't record. So can I be recorded?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jackson, on page 20 of the Calendar you have House Bill 5846 on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5846, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Ed Jackson."
- Jackson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 5846 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code and Boat Registration and Safety Act and changes the boat trailer registration from one year to three years to be compatible with the registration and certification of the boat itself, which is three years. I'll entertain any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5846 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. Sara Feigenholtz, would you like to be recorded. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Ramey, you have House Bill 5093 on page 18 of the Calendar. Out of the record. Representative David Reis, you have House Bill 6158. Wish to call your Bill, Representative? Out of the record. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, on page 21 of the Calendar you have House Bill 5859. Out of the record. Representative Kevin Joyce, on

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

page 18 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5057. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5057, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kevin Joyce."

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5057 will set up the Illinois Investment Review Commission. It would give the responsibility for appointment to the commission from the president of the University of Illinois, and their job would be to look at the rating... investment rating agencies to make sure that they are reliable for all of our state investments. They would be required to report back to us, both the General Assembly and the Governor. Be happy to answer any questions. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, why are we choosing the University of Illinois to lead a commission to determine where we should be investing? And where I'm going with this is, you know, we have some of the greatest financial minds in the world within our borders. I'm not sure we'd want to limit it only to the University of Illinois. Perhaps we could talk to investment firms in the City of Chicago, for instance, to get other perspectives on the marketplace instead of

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

relying solely on academics. Perhaps those that actually deal with this issue everyday might be in a better position to advise us."

Joyce: So the commission is not consisting just of the University of Illinois, it is going to include economists from the University of Illinois. But the way we put the language in there, to address your issue, was the president has the authority to appoint anybody who he may deem appropriate. So it doesn't put a max as far as number of people on the commission and it doesn't limit the president to whom or where he gets those appointees from."

Franks: "I appreciate that. Is there any cost to this?"

Joyce: "There is not, only that the university would have... the commission would have the right to apply to university funds for reimbursement of any costs that they might have for meetings or such other things."

Franks: "Well, I appreciate the way you're thinking about this.

I think we need to have a more comprehensive view on how we do our investments and bringing in our greatest minds is a way to do it. So I appreciate the Bill and I'm glad to support it."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative Joyce, is there any funding included for this, to do this study?"

Joyce: "There's... there's no funding required in order to do this study. Actually, I talked to the people from the

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

University of Illinois, they have some economists that are very interested in being involved in this issue and looking at this issue and while they would like to see some money for it, there is... they understand that there is no money for it. And they have identified some..."

Rose: "Well, are..."

Joyce: "...economists that are professors at the University of Illinois that are very interested in taking this up regardless of the cost."

Rose: "The... our analysis indicates the U of I is opposed."

Joyce: "That's incorrect. Your analysis is incorrect."

Rose: "So they're in favor of this?"

Joyce: "I've talked to them this afternoon, Chapin."

Rose: "Okay. All right."

Joyce: "They've... this wouldn't have moved forward if they were against this."

Rose: "No, but if you've talked to them and they're okay with it, I'll take your word for it."

Joyce: "That's correct."

Rose: "Thank you, Representative."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, I... we're making a phone call now, but it's my understanding when I talked to representatives at the university just last week that they are in fact opposed to the Bill. They are laying people off. They're taking

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

unpaid furlough days and now they are expected to internally create the Investment Review Commission; I assume with existing business staff or accounting staff or somewhere in the college of business and to examine all of the investment funds from State Government. Now that's either going to take them away from class time or research time. We're already shorthanded, so I think the university feels that it would cost them some money and the university felt like it... why can't this be done with a state entity such as COGFA. They have people on staff who can analyze investment portfolios, investment risks and rewards. just think, unless my information has changed and I haven't heard from them, the University of Illinois just feels that in this particular financial climate they can't take on any more duties when they are in fact laying people off, asking them to take unpaid furlough days and have no idea what next year's fiscal situation will be for the university. So I'm... either I'm operating under some old information or they've talked to you since they've talked to me. Can you shed some light on that for me?"

- Joyce: "Yeah, I've talked to them today. They're fine with the Bill. I don't know who you've talked to..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentlemen, your time is limit... expired, but we'll give you another minute to finish this answer, Kevin."
- Joyce: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I talked to the University of Illinois today. Last week they asked me to hold it for a week. Held the Bill, was willing to take any Amendments, they came back today and said, you know, we're

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

fine with the way the Bill is, appreciate you holding it. If we have anything... other concerns can we come back? I said, sure. They said go ahead and move it out of the And they have some economic professors that are very interested in taking on this role. They view it is, in light of what's happened over the last couple of years, you look at all the terrible investments that have been made across... our pension funds across some of the state agencies and they feel a very deep interest. They're not looking for payment, so to speak, for service performed. I think it's an issue that a lot of economists want to look at, how somehow in the past, the rating agencies, especially the last few years, were providing unreliable information. Many of... much of that information was probably taken from some of our pension funds and other investment instruments to make decisions, very serious decisions that have had very devastating effects on some of the funds that we operate here in the State of Illinois. So, as far as I'm... you know, as far as I talked to the university, probably somewhere between the hours of 11:00 and 1:00 today and they are fine with the Bill. And I'm sure... hopefully you've had time to have them call you back."

Black: "Could you... could you tell me who you talked to at the university? Was it President Ikenberry or..."

Joyce: "No, it was not President Ikenberry. It was one of his designated people here in Springfield that comes here on a regular basis."

Black: "One of the liaisons or somebody..."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Joyce: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. We're trying to reach that individual now. I appreciate your indulgence. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just curious. Out of all the universities, this is the only one that is being considered under this legislation with review of its investment portfolio and some of the houses, investment houses? Is there a reason why just this one out of the other state universities?"

Joyce: "No. Which... well, the University of Illinois happens to be the flagship of our university system. And it's business school is recognized across the country as in the top 10, and the qualified personnel and economists and accounting and faculty members are at the University of Illinois, are widely recognized as being experts in their field, and this was a place where we could do it where it wouldn't cost the taxpayers money."

Dunkin: "So, have they done something wrong to prompt this level of review or have they done something... What prompted the review outside of it being a flagship university?"

Joyce: "I think you need to understand the Bill, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "I'm looking at..."

Joyce: "This does not affect the University of Illinois, this is asking the University of Illinois to do… set up a review commission to look at the rating agencies like AAA and look

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

at the validity of how they rated the financial instruments. So, we're asking the University of Illinois for help here to report that back to us. We're not... there's no one's saying that the University of Illinois is doing anything wrong here."

Dunkin: "Okay, I'm looking here at the text of the Bill."

Joyce: "Okay."

Dunkin: "Investment Review Commission. So we're looking at places like Fitch and some of the other bond rating houses.

Is that correct?"

Joyce: "We're looking at some of the... the products that are rated, so AAA, you know, Moody's, how they rate..."

Speaker Lyons: "...Gentlemen, the time has expired. We'll give you one more minute to finish this discussion, please."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You get another minute, Representative Dunkin.

You can finish this question."

Dunkin: "Okay. Again, I'm just... so where's the Treasurer's Office in this here? Don't they do some level of assessment or review since they invest most of our state's money, correct? And they utilize these bond houses, right or these investment houses, management funds?"

Joyce: "No, they don't invest our pension funds."

Dunkin: "They don't make recommendations to make placement of our state..."

Joyce: "Not... not of our pension funds."

Dunkin: "So this is solely for pension bonds..."

Joyce: "No, no, it's for all state... all public funds, all long term public funds including the State Treasurer, including

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

the State Board of Investment, state funded retirement systems. All were asking them to do is cooperate with the commission and provide any information relating their use of investment rating sources and tools that the commission may request."

Dunkin: "Okay and so we're asking..."

Joyce: "So for example if... if in 2007, from 2007 to 2009 the State General Assembly Pension Fund lost \$2 billion or \$3 billion, they... the people that were investing that money use some sort of rating agency to determine how they were going to invest the money, right? So why were those raters so wrong or did they ignore the rating advice? So what we want to do is make sure that the commission looks at... these economists look at how this money's being invested and make sure that it's being done in a right way and that a report is given back to us in the General Assembly and to the Governor. That's what this Bill does."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Final speaker will be Representative Mulligan and then Representative Joyce to close. Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Mulligan: "Representative, I'm still trying... I'm looking at the text of the Bill also and I'm still trying to understand exactly what it is you want them to do. Also, that they recommend people that... also to be on the board and that the university has to pay those people, not the state, correctly?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Joyce: "There's no pay... there's no pay called for in the Bill."
Mulligan: "Well, have you amended the original text?"

Joyce: "No, there's no salary in here. All's it... with regards to payment, it says the university and the members of the commission may be reimbursed for their expenses in connection with the commission out of any funds available to the university for that purpose. In other words, if there was another Bill to come along that said, hey, we're going to create a fund for this purpose, but there's no... there's no call for payment here."

Mulligan: "At one time, and I'm not as up on it as I used to be, at one time University of Illinois had the outstanding CPA School, one of the outstanding in the country which my son went to that particular college at the university. So I understand that, but he also has multiple degrees besides being an attorney and a number of financial degrees, and that's what he does for a living. So, I'm curious as to if that's still the area that the university excels in and are you asking them to rate the tools that our state agencies use in seeking a better bond rating for what we're doing. Is that what you're trying to have them do?"

Joyce: "Yes, kind... that's partial. What I'm asking them to do..."

Speaker Lyons: "Once again the time has expired. We'll give you one more minute to finish this discussion, then Representative Joyce to close."

Joyce: "I'll try to answer quickly, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to do here with the commission is to verify the validity and to rate the raters, if you will."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Mulligan: "Okay."

Joyce: "And to make sure that we're getting reliable information. You know, it was always accepted that Moody's or AAA, that these were solid ratings from these financial instruments."

Mulligan: "And that was a good thing for us to do."

Joyce: "Yes."

Mulligan: "All right, but the agencies that you're asking them to rate and how they're doing it do not have to seek their permission in order to go out for bonds or to do anything. This is just an advisory to take a look at how we're doing it and assess if we're doing it the right way with the right tools and if they could be doing it better."

Joyce: "That's correct and then report back to us so we..."

Mulligan: "I... cause I was trying to figure out... and that makes more sense. Thank you."

Joyce: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joyce to close."

Joyce: "Thank you... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply would ask for an 'aye' vote. I think it's a worthwhile look at our investments, at what's going on in all the financial world to make sure that we're being good stewards of public dollars because ultimately we're responsible for all these funds whether they be pension funds or any other funds. The taxpayers are responsible and we should make sure that we're making wise decisions through our pension funds or other state agencies and this might give us a tool to look and understand it a

118th Legislative Day

- little bit more thoroughly so we don't face the economic debacle that we faced in the last four years."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5057 pass?'

 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kosel? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair rec... the Chair recognizes Representative Eddie Acevedo for a point of personal privilege. Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the rear of the chamber to your right is a group from my district, St. Ann grade school. My son is, also, the classmates. They're here today with parents and their teachers Ms. Walsh and Mr. Doar. Please welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker Lyons: "Glad to have you. Enjoy your day at the Capitol. Representative Cole, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Cole: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 5057 that we just voted on I intended to vote 'yes' and I hit the wrong switch. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes.

 Representative Chapin Rose, on page 21 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5966. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5966, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

118th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We added the… Representative Hamos' Amendment yesterday to this Bill so, basically, it provides crime victim or violent crime victim the right to address the court prior to sentencing."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Grundy, Representative Careen Gordon."
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Gorgon, C.: "Representative, it doesn't... it doesn't just allow a crime victim to address the court, it allows multiple crime victims under the definition of family in the statute and it gives the judge no discretion to limit that number. Is that correct?"
- Rose: "It allows... lets... we'll be specific here, Representative, it allows the victim, the victim's spouse, guardian, parent, grandparent, or other immediate family member on that request to address the court, yes."
- Gordon, C.: "So any all and there's no discretion by the judge to limit that number? You're taking away all judicial discretion."
- Rose: "Well, Representative, the... as you know, the judge would have had discretion and typically and often disallow victims from addressing the court and..."
- Gordon, C.: "I'm not... no, no, no. Not typically. I never saw a situation where they were disallowed."
- Rose: "Well, I'll give you one, Representative, in Coles County, Illinois."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Gordon, C.: "Well, I know there's was one and so one situation and we have a knee-jerk reaction so we have to change the law so that now we have situations where we're going to have people come in and a circus may or may not occur where we're going to have 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 people now..."
- Rose: "If you let me finish my sentence, I might be able to give you a pretty good reason, Representative. The reality is..."
- Gordon, C.: "You've already... you've already given us the reason, Representative, where the judge you said didn't have a full... a full, factual situation to make his sentencing determination, but why wasn't that up to the prosecutor to give the full set of facts?"

Rose: "Representative, if I may, this..."

Gordon, C.: "Go ahead."

- Rose: "...is actually on behalf of... if you think about the situation that happened in Coles County was actually was involving a domestic and the grandparents had information that would have been useful to the court in sentencing the defendant. They were not allowed to present that information. The court..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the time is expired. We'll give you one more minute to finish your discussion.

 Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you. The court then sentenced the individual to probation. The individual then ended up holding the spouse and the kids hostage in a standoff in the town of Oakland, Illinois. Now I don't know what the court would have done and how they would have sentenced, but I suspect that had

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

they had the information the grandparents would have liked to have proffered, then perhaps the individual would not have been on the streets to begin with."

Gordon, C.: "Why didn't..."

Rose: "That's the reason for this change."

Gordon, C.: "Why didn't the prosecutor's office have that information to be able to present it and as opposed to the grandparents?"

Rose: "It depends on the circumstances, Representative. I mean, if the grandparents were not questioned by the original arresting police officer, then, no, the State's Attorneys Office might not have had that."

Gordon, C.: "Isn't it up to the prosecuting authority to give as much information about the factual background of the defendant and potential future violent behavior?"

Rose: "Sure."

Gordon, C.: "So one situation that had occurred and then..."

Rose: "Well, no, again, Representative."

Gordon, C.: "...we're trying to get into the judge's head of what..."

Rose: "Not one situation."

Gordon, C.: "...could have occurred and..."

Rose: "Not one situation, Representative. Grandparents anywhere in the State of Illinois care deeply about their grandkids and if they are in a situation where their grandkids are in harms way, they ought to have a right to say something."

Gordon, C.: "Right, but it's also up to the prosecuting authority to go into the defendant's criminal history and

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

you're assuming this judge would have done something different. So I appreciate what you're trying to do..."

Rose: "Well, I'm assuming the judge should have the facts."

Gordon, C.: "I appreciate what you're trying to do, but I also think that we're just going a little over the top in opening this up to so many abuses of the law, of law enforcement and holding prosecutor's offices up for abuse and the judicial system as well. So thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will my seatmate yield?"

Rose: "Seatmate yields."

Speaker Lyons: "Ask him. Yes, he'll yield."

Reboletti: "You said in the Bill it says that the victim or their representative could go. What were you meaning by representative? Could you appear then?"

Rose: "No, Representative, actually that's not changed. It's in the existing statute. It is, as I said a moment ago, the victim, the spouse, the guardian, the parent, the grandparent, or immediate family, or household member. That's in existing law."

Reboletti: "Right."

Rose: "All we're changing is 'may' to 'shall' and then the Hamos Amendment from last week that was attached yesterday, that cleans up the 'may' to 'shall'."

Reboletti: "In your situation in Coles County, did the grandparents speak to the prosecuting authority prior to sentencing and provide that information to the prosecutor

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

so at least they could tell the court about whatever that information was?"

Rose: "The grandparents have tried to talk to just about everybody they could talk to. But, again, Representative, and I can give you the facts in where this would be important for the judge and, again, I don't know how any judge is going to rule but they ought to have all the circumstances. Oftentimes, as you know having been a prosecutor, when you get into situations and you get in what's, you know, is psychologically defined as 'battered woman's syndrome' sometimes there's a certain amount of denial that the abuser... they're really a victim, and it's a very unfortunate and troublesome syndrome, and in such a it would be perfectly appropriate and I think necessary for the grandparents to be able to come in and say, hey, judge, look, this is what you also need to know and you're not being told by the party."

- Reboletti: "But now there wouldn't be any limitation whatsoever on the amount of people that could come to testify in the case. Is that a fair assessment?"
- Rose: "Well, no. It would be limited to, as I said a minute ago, the victim, the spouse, immediate family member that's already in the current law, grandparent."
- Reboletti: "And it's your thought that at least in this case in Coles County, had the judge had that information, would he have sentenced the defendant any differently? Was this a misdemeanor or was it a felony, Representative, if you recollect?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Rose: "You know, Representative, I'd have to check on whether it was a misdemeanor or a felony. I... off the top of my head I don't recall. And, again, I'm not..."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay, Representatives, your time is expired.

Give you another minute to finish the conversation, please."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'm not suggesting a judge would do, you know, something different or not do something different. I'm just suggesting that in the... if you go into a case as what's known as 'battered women's syndrome', sometimes having someone else come in and say, hey, judge, this is what the victim isn't telling you about what's going on at home. The court should know that and we get a better judgment."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose to close."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This empowers victims and their family members around the state, particularly in the case of domestic violence. It may be perhaps a young child or child of a victim, who may not be a victim themselves, allows a grandparent to come in and notify the court to some things that maybe are going on at home that the victim might not allow... might not tell them. So it's a good Bill to... for victims to... and make sure that any court in the State of Illinois has all the facts, truly has all the facts in front of them before they render a sentence. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5966 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed

118th Legislative Day

- vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sara Feigenholtz? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tom Holbrook, you have House Bill 4674. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4674, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Tom Holbrook."
- Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4674 is an agreement that's been reached for the educational opportunity for military children in the state. It allows us to join a compact under our state provisions. Provides many programs for their children and I want to, before I go any further, thank Representative Roger Eddy for his extensive work that made this possible. I know of no opposition to this Bill, and it's a good program for our military children."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4674 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 Frank Mautino, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Representative Bill Black, you have House Bill 6213 on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6213, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We took this Bill out of the record some time ago. We've been able to meet with Representative Fritchey who asked us to do so. think we've answered most of his questions. This deals within the with a situation of child abuse structure, not somebody outside. If they are adjudicated in a court of law to have been responsible for the death of that child, anyone under 18, this gives the judge an opportunity after the initial trial, after the conviction to have what I call, again, it may not be the correct legal term, almost like a sentence hearing... a sentencing hearing where additional evidence could be presented by the State's Attorney as to the factors of this child abuse situation that resulted in the death. And if the State's Attorney is able to prove that beyond a reasonable shadow of doubt, the presiding judge will then be allowed under this Bill to impose an extended sentence on the convicted individual that involves this crime. I'll be glad to answer any questions you have."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 6213 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 3 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Constitutional Amendment House Joint Resolution #19?"

- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #19 is on the Order of Constitutional Amendments Second Reading and has been read in full two times, as amended."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is Representative Lang on the floor? Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk. Move that Resolution to the Order of Third Reading and read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "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.

118th Legislative Day

- (2) The right to timely notification of court proceedings and any related post-judgment proceedings.
- (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.

118th Legislative Day

- (12) The right to have present at all court proceedings, subject to the rules of evidence, an advocate, a 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,

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

employee, or agent of the State or of any of its political 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."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk will leave that Resolution on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that on House Bill 6213 I inadvertently hit the wrong switch and would like to be recorded as voting 'yes'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The record will... the Journal will reflect your intentions, Sir."
- Harris: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kevin McCarthy, on the Order of Third Reading on page 19 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5419. I'm sorry, we have House Bill 6092, Representative McCarthy, my mistake. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 6092. Wish to move the Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6092, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kevin McCarthy."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 6092 is an initiative of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Universities. The... last year with Senate Bill 1828 we created the P-20 Longitudinal Data System. This basically allows the private colleges and universities to form a consortium to put their information together and then submit it to the state. It also asks the state, it doesn't demand it, but it asks them to look for possible grants that can help with the funding of this consortium. It also allows private colleges to keep their information here in Illinois. So if the P-20 Data System is being used in other states, some of the information is being shifted from Illinois to other states, this gives the right... the colleges the right to say we don't want to move forward with this. The Bill passed unanimously out of the Higher Ed Committee and I would appreciate an affirmative response on the vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on House Bill 6092. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bill Black."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "Representative, is it your intent to allow a for-profit institution to participate in this consortium?"

McCarthy: "For-profit like DeVry?"

Black: "Yes."

McCarthy: "DeVry would be included, correct?"

Black: "DeVry would be the only for-profit or could be just the harbinger of additional for-profit schools that would want to get involved in this?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- McCarthy: "I know that... I know DeVry supports this because they felt that they were included in the legislation. So it basically was... I think they were included before when we created it last year to tell you the truth, Representative. The... this just allows the private universities to prohibit their information from leaving the state if they feel that's necessary and also... or the information would be confidential. And is also asks them, asks the Board of Higher Ed, although there is no mandate that the Board of Higher Ed does that, but that they would look for some kind of grants that would allow them to forego the cost of this. But as part of the... I think I'd have to check with my Board of Higher Ed people and as far as whether it opens up to all the for-profits."
- Black: "Yeah, that was the only thing I didn't see was that it did not seem to prohibit other for-profits entering into this consortium."
- McCarthy: "I would certainly ask the Senate Sponsor to look very closely at that. In turning around and looking for some help... You know, all the time they have people back there bothering you, now you look for some help and there's no one behind me, Mr. Black. So... but I..."
- Black: "I know the feeling. Let me just ask you one other question. 'Shall seek' and 'may make available', that's a requirement of the Board of Higher Ed regarding grant funding to this consortium. So they shall seek and may grant. If they don't find any grants..."

McCarthy: "Then they wouldn't make them."

118th Legislative Day

- Black: "...or they don't find any sums of money and in this econ..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Time has expired. Representative Black, we'll let you finish your question."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So if they don't find the grant money, then obviously they aren't required to distribute what they don't have."
- McCarthy: "Absolutely, and that was changed under the first Amendment to the wording that the Board of Higher Ed felt comfortable with."
- Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy to close."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Question is, 'Should House Bill 6092 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 Black? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Debbie Mell, you have House Bill 5419 on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5419, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Debbie Mell."

118th Legislative Day

- Mell: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not often... or I'm not sure how often this happens, but the language in this legislation was actually enacted on a national level today when President Obama signed the Health Care Reform Bill. So his... the language in that Bill actually goes much further than the language in this Bill. But, you know, I just wanted to recognize that this will now be done on a national level, so we don't need to enact anything on a state level. And I would also like to recognize and thank Representative Flowers because she's been working on this way longer and way before I got here and probably before they were thinking about it on the federal level. So I'd like to remove it from the record and I'd like to thank everyone for their support. Thanks."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take that Bill out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. I'm going to be calling some Bills for the purpose of moving to Third Reading so Members, I'll go through this alphabetically. Representative Monique Davis, on page 16 of the Calendar you have House Bill 6450. Status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6450, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis on Floor Amendment #3."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 merely allows those who have no other restrictions on their

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

license to drive between 8 a.m. and noon in order to seek employment."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, could you repeat that. It says if they have no restrictions on their license, they can drive between 8 and noon. Can't they do that already?"

Davis, M.: "No, I'm sorry. You know, this is the Bill that allows people who owe child support, who've had their licenses suspended based on child... nonpayment of child support. And this Bill merely allows them to seek employment between the hours of 8 a.m. and noon, Monday through Friday."

Eddy: "So right now, if a person does not pay child support and they're behind on the child support, one of the things that can happen to them is they can have their license revoked?"

Davis, M.: "Yes, that's correct."

Eddy: "And so you think that that penalty for those people who have not paid child support should be eased, that there should be some reduction in that penalty? The people are getting a penalty because they're not paying their child support. I think you would agree that there should be a penalty."

Davis, M.: "Well, I think what happens is if you have a person who has not been paying child support, perhaps they now have earned or gained another family and then they've lost

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

their employment. Sometimes they don't have the ability to go and seek employment elsewhere. They... we had a case where these people lived in Beverly, he was going for an interview in Schaumburg, but he had no way to get there. So that meant two families without any income."

Eddy: "The permit that you're talking about, would that be an actual like a permit issued by the Secretary of State's Office?"

Davis, M.: "It's by the Family and Human Service Department."

Eddy: "Who?"

Davis, M.: "I think it's the Family..."

Eddy: "Department of Health Care and Family Services?"

Davis, M.: "That's correct."

Eddy: "So the Department of Health Care and Family Services under your Bill is going to be the issuer of the permit?"

Davis, M.: "Well, the permit can come from either... the Secretary of State issues the permit."

Eddy: "So the Department of Health Care and Family Services directs the issuance of the permit? They're the ones that tells the Secretary of State's Office?"

Davis, M.: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. So how does the Department of Health Care and Family Services determine whether or not an individual should qualify for this exception? Is there an application process?"

Davis, M.: "They have to file a motion and they..."

Speaker Lyons: "Your time has expired, but we'll give you another minute to finish this conversation. Go ahead, Representative, answer Roger Eddy's question."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Davis, M.: "They have to file a motion and they have to show there's no other reasonable method of transportation."

Eddy: "Okay, Representative, and I know maybe there's other questions on this. This is kind of a new concept. I don't know... I know what you're trying to do here and it seems like maybe they should be able to seek employment so that then they can make child support payments, but at the same time, I don't know how this would be, the process involved, how it would be handled. What would happen to a person if they were caught driving and they weren't seeking employment? I don't... I need to listen to the rest of the debate on this..."

Davis, M.: "I think..."

Eddy: "Although I know what you're trying to do, I have some real concerns about it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative... Representative Washington."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Washington: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Yes."

Washington: "So I guess in difficult economic times you are profiling people who might have the need to go from one point to the other to seek employment in order to meet an obligation, one of those obligations being child support payment. Is that correct?"

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

Washington: "And so these individuals who would need some flexibility in doing so, do they already have... What would

118th Legislative Day

- be the restriction already in place that they would have to overcome?"
- Davis, M.: "The restriction is that they cannot drive an automobile. Their licenses have been restricted. And the reason they can't drive is because they have not been paying child support. But with this legislation if they're seeking employment, if they're going from point (a), their home, to an interview or a scheduled interview, then they can seek a waiver and drive from 8 a.m. till noon, Monday through Friday."
- Washington: "So the waiver will be sought after they clearly have a legitimate possibility for employment?"
- Davis, M.: "Not necessarily legitimate, you know, exact location. But let's say for example a person is unemployed and they want to go for an interview that they saw in the newspaper and the interview is at a certain location. They would have the opportunity to go there for that interview."
- Washington: "But who would be the reporting agency that they report to, to show that that was a legitimate cause and that they actually pursued that in..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time is expired. We'll give you one more minute to finish this question.

 Representative Davis."
- Washington: "My question was who would be the person that they would report what they're doing and where they're going to show that that actually is an attempt to do so?"
- Davis, M.: "It would be the human service agency or the court if it were required."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Washington: "And if they're caught not being truthful to what they're trying to do, then what takes place?"

Davis, M.: "It would be revoked. The license driving privilege would be revoked."

Washington: "Okay. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Amendment, Representative."

Washington: "Representative Davis, I appreciate your intent. Sounds like a good Bill and I'm hoping that my colleagues will support it. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Jim Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, how long will this permit be good for?"

Davis, M.: "Well, the permit is from 8 to noon, Monday through Friday."

Watson: "I mean how many months, years, weeks?"

Davis, M.: "The agency would have that discretion."

Watson: "We're not going to make a recommendation?"

Davis, M.: "Well, the agency didn't make a recommendation. They would just have that discretion."

Watson: "Which agency?"

Davis, M.: "Health Care and Human Services."

Watson: "So Health Care and Human Services is going to decide how long somebody gets a driver's permit for?"

Davis, M.: "How long they can, perhaps, seek employment on this waiver. That's the group who enforces child support."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Watson: "Well, no, I understand the purpose of your Bill, but don't you, I mean, I guess I would recommend if you were going to go this way is that the Secretary of State should probably be the one issuing."

Davis, M.: "They do issue it. They are the ones who issue it, but the department oversees it. There are both groups involved."

Watson: "Okay and no expiration date, though?"

Davis, M.: "It's discretionary."

Watson: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Representative, is the Secretary of State's Office set up to do this?"

Davis, M.: "They are set up to do this and they're neutral on the Bill."

Ramey: "That was my next question. You read my mind, very good. What's the fee for the... for the certificate?"

Davis, M.: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Ramey: "What is the fee?"

Davis, M.: "There is no fee."

Ramey: "There's no fee, but there's going to be a process done..."

Davis, M.: "They already do this. They already do this. They...

they issue them for what, substance treatment, abuse treatment? And if you're actually working, they already do this."

Ramey: "But they don't charge anybody a fee for these?"

118th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "Not that we know of, no."
- Ramey: "Then isn't it a bureaucratic process that takes employees to create these certificates? Just like getting a driver's license, it's now \$20 because there's a process. They have to pay somebody to do that process. So right now you're saying we're doing all these certificates, these driving amendments, let's say, to their license to… without a fee or without… to pay for the process."
- Davis, M.: "Well, the Secretary of State has not stated that they needed a fee for this."
- Ramey: "How is... how is the date checked? You said that the Department of Human Services or Family Services... Health and Family Services are going to be checking up on these people that they're doing it properly?"
- Davis, M.: "The department can order records from those that are issued this temporary license waiver."
- Ramey: "They can order the records, you said?"
- Davis, M.: "That is correct."
- Ramey: "Are the police departments then let known that these people are on these certificates?"
- Davis, M.: "You're not required to notify the police at this time."
- Ramey: "All right, so if they pull somebody over at 10:00..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time is expired. Give you one more minute to finish your line of questioning.

 There's several other speakers waiting to be questioned."
- Ramey: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They're pulled over say, at 10:00, knowing that their license has been

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

suspended, but then they whip out this certificate say, I'm good till noon?"

Davis, M.: "That is correct. That is correct."

Ramey: "And if they are speeding at the time?"

Davis, M.: "Then they get a ticket and whatever the normal process is, takes place."

Ramey: "And then there's... the certificate is still kept, though, they keep driving?"

Davis, M.: "Well, the agency can verify through a diary or through phone calls, but the agency can do the verifications."

Ramey: "All right. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification of the vote if this Bill passes."

Speaker Lyons: "Will you request a roll call and then a verification? Okay, so noted. Representative Chapin Rose. We have four or five other speakers. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This being a Davis/Rose Bill it's assured to kill it, but this came to our committee and it actually makes a good deal of sense. It came from HFS who says currently they are allowed to issue driver's permits for work, but they are not allowed to issue them to look for work. So their request was to simply go ahead and let them do that, they handle these things all the time. They want to be able to do it to let them look for work and then once they have work, then they would convert to what is already in place under the existing law. Now with that, I think, answers many of the questions that just came up. I think it's a good Bill. My name's not up there, but I

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

think you added me so I appreciate it. So thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hope this Bill passes."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Black: "I appreciate the comments of the previous speaker. Representative, the biggest caseload I have in my district office is child support issues and I always get a little perplexed when the custodial parent wants to come in and starts yelling at me to put the noncustodial parent in jail. And all I say, if you put them in jail you're not going to get any child support. So I think I see what you're getting at; if they're out looking for work, I don't have a problem with that. Now, let's say that they find employment then how quickly... let's say they're going to work 8:00 to 5:00. Do they have to apply for a reinstatement of the license or can they get the temporary license? You know what I'm trying to say, so that they can drive like 8:00 to 5:00?"

Davis, M.: "There is also a process for going to and from work..."

Black: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "...but that's in current law."

Black: "Okay, so that..."

Davis, M.: "Our law merely allows them to also..."

Black: "To look for work."

Davis, M.: "...look for work. Yes, that's correct."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Black: "Right. With the number of child support cases my office handles in a month, anything that could enhance somebody going to work and trying to deal with the arrearage makes sense to me. It costs a great deal of money to... if the noncustodial parent makes no attempt to pay, that's very expensive. Anything we can do to help them find work and then hopefully go to work and make their child support payments, takes a lot of pressure off of state tax funds..."

Davis, M.: "That's right."

Black: "...that could be used for something else. I think you have a good idea and I intend to support your Amendment."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how would somebody be able to determine if the person was trying to find work or not find work? How would you make that application?"

Davis, M.: "The agency could request a diary from the person.

They could..."

Reboletti: "So... so they would just..."

Davis, M.: "The court... Excuse me. The court or the agency could require, when they get the waiver to drive, that they could... they could... it's up to their discretion to request a diary of where you're going and what time."

Reboletti: "And would the… would this new permit only allow them to go to and from a place of employment. Would it allow them to detour off of that route to go to McDonalds

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

or go pick up the kids from school or go visit their family?"

Davis, M.: "According to the law and what we're putting in place, the only new Section says they can have from 8:00 a.m. until noon to seek employment, not to pick up their children, not to go to dinner, but to go and seek employment and the court or the agency, when they give the waiver, can require a diary be kept by the person who is traveling."

Reboletti: "Would then the Secretary of State issue this, I guess it would a restricted driver's permit, or is the court going to issue this in a format of a judicial driving permit?"

Davis, M.: "The Secretary of State issues it from both the court or/and the agency."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, M.: "I just think this is a great piece of legislation that will allow unemployed people to find work and pay some child support. With the economic times that we're now living in, people are having to find different types of employment and sometimes from a greater distance from their home. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "All right, Members, there's been a request for a Roll Call Vote for Amendment #3 and a request for verification, so push your own switch. Mr. Clerk, Members... All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have

118th Legislative Day

- all voted who wish? Black, Brady, Golar, Rita. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill... on this Amendment, there are 72 Members voting 'yes', 38 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. Mr. Ramey, you no longer wish to pursue your resolution... the resolution... the adopt... Amendment #3 to Floor Amendment... to House Bill 6450 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jack Franks, hopefully you'll have a little better luck with your Amendment. What's the status of House Bill 4658? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4658, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Franks, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks on Floor Amendment #2."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We had this in committee today. What Floor Amendment #2 does is it brings the Bill back to its original form. I had good advice from my good friend, Representative Rose, who indicated that he thought the Bill would be better in the original form and that's what this does. I'd be happy to debate it if you'd like or we could do this on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's discussion on Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes';

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Dave Winters. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

Winters: "Point of inquiry."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

Winters: "Representative, I noticed when I was walking out the west hallway here in the chamber that one of the statues on the Capitol grounds is missing, the statue in honor of policemen. I was wondering if Representative Monique Davis might be able to give us an indication of where the policemen's statue might have gone off the Capitol lawn."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, your response is optional."
- Davis, M.: "I will tell him where the police statue is when he gets his side of the aisle to vote right."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, back to the Order of Second Readings. Representative Golar, you have House Bill 5836.

 Representative Golar, do you wish to move your Bill from Second to Third Reading? What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5836, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Golar, has been approved for consideration."

118th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recommendation to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5836. It becomes the Bill. The language, it clarifies that a school is still not liable for injuries resulting from self-administration of an asthma inhaler or an EpiPen, regardless of whether an authorization was given by the student, parent, or physician."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Beth Coulson, you have on the Order of Second Reading House Bill 5565.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5565, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Coulson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beth Coulson on Floor Amendment #1."
- Coulson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It amends the Bill to allow for implementation of the State Health Improvement Plan. We've had two health improvement plans and we would like to provide a

118th Legislative Day

- coordination council for implementing that health improvement plan, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Emily McAsey, you have House Bill 6477. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6477, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #1."
- McAsey: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment and what this Amendment then does is it's an Amendment to the Illinois Power of Attorney Act. It makes various changes relating the duration of agencies, the agent's duties, co-agents, successor agents. It's a clean up of the Act and clarifies. I would be happy to answer any questions or discuss the Bill when on Third Reading and would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk."

118th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative McAsey, you also have House Bill 6380. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6380, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Will, Representative McAsey, on Amendment #1."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment. What this Amendment does is changes the constitution of the Joliet Regional Port District by adding one member to the board and then makes changes related to quorum, veto requirements, and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Amendment #1. Any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Yarbrough, you have House Bill 5520... House Bill 5523. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5523, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor... Floor Amendment #2,

118th Legislative Day

- offered by Representative Yarbrough, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen Yarbrough and Floor Amendment #2."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 2 is an initiative we worked together with the opponents on this Bill. There was no opposition and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Mike Fortner, you have House Bill 5555. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5555, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Fortner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Fortner on Floor Amendment #2."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor Amendment 2 provides for a mechanism for the Village of Wood Dale to be able to annex a small parcel of land that they wholly surround but for a state highway. So it adds

118th Legislative Day

- the state highway, like other state properties, to be used as that remaining parcel to a fully bound state parcel."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative David Leitch, you have House Bill 5304. Representative Leitch. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5304, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Leitch, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Leitch on Floor Amendment #2."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much. This Amendment #2 was approved in Human Services this morning. It identifies about eight primary reforms that we hope to introduce in the Division of Mental Health and Division of Substance Abuse, and I would ask for its approval."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

118th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Bob Rita, you have House Bill 6239. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6239, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rita on Floor Amendment #2."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 just adds the provision for population 750,000 people, not just the Home Rules."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Rita, you also have House Bill 6415. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 6415, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rita on Floor Amendment #1."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 just extends the sunset date for two years instead of one year."
- Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Rita."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rita on Floor Amendment #2."
- Rita: "Yeah, you know what, I guess Floor Amendment #1 was the educational piece, Floor Amendment #2 was the sunset."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation, a correction on Floor Amendment #1 and the explanation of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jerry Mitchell, you have House Bill 5633. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5633, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Eddy, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy on Floor Amendment #1."

118th Legislative Day

- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 establishes a process whereby school districts that are going through a reorganization or part of a cooperative school situation consolidations are able to use a blend of the grant indexes that school districts are assigned for purposes of school construction. It takes care of an issue that I think we're going to see a lot more of in the future where districts are looking to reorganize, consolidate, come up with co-op high schools. There's really no mechanism to blend the grant indexes. This takes care of that and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and answer any questions you might have."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion on Floor Amendment #1? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should it be adopted'? All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative JoAnn Osmond, you have House Bill 4877. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4877, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Osmond, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative JoAnn Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm asking for the adoption of Amendment #2 which becomes the Bill. This is with...

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

dealing with cell tower sitings in unincorporated area, and what this does is put in a requirement of notice to the Senate and to the Representatives that... and the county board members where this siting is going to be for the cell tower. It's the first of the steps to making this a little bit more consumer friendly and understanding the locations and how they're being sited. Also, we're going to do a working group, do it in the summer to make better policy on these issues, and I ask for the adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Amendment. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, why do we want to do this when the original Bill seemed to be so much stronger?"

Osmond: "This is... this is for the unincorporated areas of the counties, and all the municipalities have all set up the regulations and we don't have any in place. So what we're trying to do is do the first step and ask for the opportunity of knowing where the siting of this cell tower is going to be 30 days before the building permit. And it's even happened in my district where I left on a Monday to come down here for Session and on Friday I found a cell tower right along the road. And a lot of people felt very strongly that they weren't given the opportunity to know it's coming."

Franks: "But even with this notice it's going to be going to the state rep... I can tell you what, I had the same problem

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

in McHenry County and what they did to try to appease me is they... is the county board, the planning and development would send to my office a notice. They wouldn't send it to They wouldn't send it to contiguous anvbodv else. landholders; they wouldn't send it to anybody in the precinct or the or the township. So I took it upon myself, I would get that information and I would, at my own expense, send it out to everybody. Okay. But they're not even doing that. Why don't you require them to give people notice? I mean, sending it to you, all that does is shift the burden to you, instead of to the entity that's going to be the final decision maker. And in every other zoning application, the person who was requesting it has that onus upon then, except for those that are siting cell towers. So why don't we put some more teeth into this and require if you want the information, which I think we do, is to require the county to actually have to send it out and also give a time for response. I think it's a great first step, but this doesn't go nearly far enough. I think it's not really even a baby step because all they're doing is shifting the onus to you to do their job."

Osmond: "Well, and I somewhat agree with you, but it is a baby step. It's the first thing because what we're going to do during the summer is we're going to do working groups to try to make a better policy. And the industries were all on board to start it this way. They do want to be at the table to work out some of these things, so I thought that it was the first step, but I can understand where you're coming from."

118th Legislative Day

- Franks: "I think we'd be better off not taking this because this is more of appeasement and I think if we're going to do something, let's actually do something. This won't do anything except to shift the burden where it doesn't belong and then if you don't put the notice out there, then you're the one who's in trouble. But to people who are voting on it and the one who has to make the decision, they're insulated. I think this actually makes it worse. I'd hate to codify something like this that would shift the burden to the non-decision makers to shelter those who ought to be accountable directly to the voters. So I would ask yet to go back to the drawing board and let's do an Amendment #3, and if we're going to have a notice requirement make the decision makers send the notice, not you because you don't have a voice in it."
- Osmond: "Well, and you know what, whoever picks this up over in the Senate I'd be happy to make that suggestion and I'd also be happy to have you invited to some of the working groups that we're going to have this summer."
- Franks: "I'd be happy to do so. But can we not move this mo...
 can we not move this Amendment right now? Can we do
 another one? I think because the only way we're going to
 go forward on this is to put some teeth in it. This is...
 this is actually a step backwards in my opinion."
- Osmond: "But today's the deadline and I'm not sure if it's in ten minutes or a half hour from now..."
- Franks: "Can we ask for extended consideration on this Bill?

 Can we move it to Third today and then we can ask to see if

 we can get extended consideration?"

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Osmond: "I think we're going to try to work in the Senate..."

Franks: "Okay."

Osmond: "...if you don't mind."

Franks: "All right, thank you."

Osmond: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate 642? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 642, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments have been filed, but none have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what's the status... Representative Flowers has House Bill 4679. What's the status of that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4679, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."

118th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately upon adjournment: Appropriations-General Services Committee will meet in Room C-1; the Adoption Reform Committee will meet in Room 122B; the Mass Transit Committee will meet in Room 114; the Financial Institutions Committee will meet in Room 118; the Public Utilities Committee will meet in Room D-1. At one half hour following adjournment: the State Government Administration Committee will meet in Room 114."
- Speaker Lyons: "And now seeing no further business to come before the Illinois House... Representative Brandon Phelps, do you have an announcement? Representative Phelps. Mr. Clerk, before we adjourn the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1044, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 1047, offered by Representative Dugan. And House Resolution 1048, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang 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' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Karen May, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- May: "Yes, I have an announcement, please, Speaker. The Green Caucus will meet tomorrow morning, 8:00 a.m., in Room C-1.

 Marcia Willhite, Chief of our Bureau of Water at our EPA, will be talking about green infrastructure projects. Thank you."

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. And now, seeing that no further business will come before the Illinois House of Representative today, Representative Lou Lang moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 11:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 24. So allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Lang moves to stand adjourned. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned till the hour of 11:00, Wednesday, March 24."

"House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports: Representative Joyce, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 6168, House Bill 6748, and House Bill 6749; do pass standard debate for House Bill 5024. Representative Hamos, Chairperson from the Committee on Mass Transit, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6... recommends 'be not adopted' Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6379. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 6412. Representative Collins, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities, reports the following committee action taken on March 22, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 4990 and Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 6208. Representative

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010: recommends be adopted House Resolution 934 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4871. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills: House Bill 6841, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. First Reading of this House Bill. Second Reading of House Bills, Bills to be read and held on the Order of House Bills... Second Reading. House Bill 6168, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 6748, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Second Reading of this House House Bill 6749, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. House Bill 5024, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of this House Bill. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 107, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 459, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 489, offered bv Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 2487, offered by Representative revenue. Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2632, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public land. Senate Bill 2986, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Senate Bill 3057, offered Representative Dugan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3660, offered by Representative

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3699, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3712, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6168, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6748, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 6749, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5024, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. These Bills are held on the Order of House Bills Second Reading. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 107, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for concerning regulation. Senate Bill 459... Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6168, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 6748, a Bill for an Act appropriations. concerning State Government. House Bill 6748, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 5024, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. These Bills are held on the Order of Second Reading. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 107, offered by Representative Reitz, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 459, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 489, offered by Representative revenue. Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2487, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2632, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public land. Senate Bill 2986, offered by Representative Beiser,

118th Legislative Day

3/23/2010

a Bill for an Act concerning land. Senate Bill 3057, offered by Representative Dugan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3660, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3699, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3712, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Committee Reports: Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules, reports the following committee action taken on March 23, 2010. Approved for the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading is Senate Bill 1946. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."