142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 10:25 having arrived, the House shall be in order. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and for the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Mr. Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most kind God, the giver and the sustainer of life, Father, we invoke Your presence and Your blessings upon this august Assembly. Father, I pray Your strength upon the Leader of this House and upon all of its Members. I pray that during these tough times that they will lean not toward their own understanding, but God, rather that they would pray and ask You for direction and ask You for guidance in making their decisions during these tough times that affect so many lives. I pray today that You would grant them the grace to be bold and courageous and wise during these tough times, when they are feeling pressure and voices from every side. I pray that their decision would bring a calm to many fears and uncertainty that so many across this great state are feeling. I pray that there is a willingness to compromise, that the faith of this great state and the confidence of this great state would be restored in those who they have sent here. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Mautino: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley."

Riley - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

142nd Legislative Day

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call for Attendance. Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Colvin, Gabel, Careen Gordon, Hannig and Washington."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Sommer and Representative Jerry Mitchell are excused from the Republican side of the aisle, and everybody else is here, ready to do the work of the people. We're so glad to be here."
- Speaker Mautino: "Delighted to have you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 answering the Roll, a quorum is present, and the House is ready to do its business. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive, reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 49, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 744, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1215 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3215. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services, reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted House Resolution 1024. Representative Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration, reports the following committee action

142nd Legislative Day

- taken on May 26, 2010: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 333."
- Speaker Mautino: "Correction of the record. We have 111 Members that answered the quorum and a quorum is present. Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Yeah. Thank you, Speaker. Please... please add to the record of excused absences Representative Dugan."
- Speaker Mautino: "Record will reflect. On page 4 of the Calendar under Senate Bills-Third Reading appears Senate Bill 3537. Mr. Clerk, place that Bill on Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment. Mr. Clerk, any Motions pending?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3537, the Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy on Floor Amendment #1."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 3537 amends Article 2 and Article 18 of the Pension Code affecting the General Assembly and the Judges Retirement System. This will bring it into line with the other changes that we had for all of the other systems that we've changed to date. The only ones we haven't changed are the police and fire Articles. This will change the COLA on both the survivor annuity and the member annuity to three percent or one half of the CPI. Originally, these two systems had the full CPI and we felt that it was in the issue of fairness to bring

142nd Legislative Day

- it into line with all the rest. So, it'd be one half of the CPI or the three percent, whatever is lesser. So, I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1. And we also have a technical Amendment #2 that clears up another issue with the maximum salary."
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Seeing no one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 remains in the House Rules Committee. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, leave this Bill on Second Reading.

 And take this Bill out of the record. On House Calendar...

 Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Bill 333. Mr.

 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 333, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Take this Bill out of the record. On page 7 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 80, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 80 basically is the culmination of the work done by the... the task force that was looking into existing mandates, and it contains, basically, some minor changes to three current mandates, and I would ask you for your support. The work of the task force will be ongoing,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

but this does give school districts some relief from mandates going into a difficult budget year."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate... Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. Representative Eddy, do you wish to take this out of the record for a moment?"

Eddy: "Yeah. I think #4 becomes the Bill and that's the concurrence."

Speaker Mautino: "And those Motions are still pending in Rules."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you. Page 7 of the Calendar appears
House Bill 537 under the Order of Concurrence.
Representative Lang moves the House do concur with Senate
Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. These Amendments comprise a long negotiation that's taken about four years to reform the payday loan industry. I'm sure you're all aware that this has been an ongoing process. And before I proceed, I would like to thank several people, several groups for their involvement in this. First, the Egan Coalition and their hard work over the years as well as the office of the Attorney General. There are certain Legislators that have held the ball on this various times over the years, Representative Boland, Representative Miller, Representative Hamos, when she was here and a big shout-out to Senator Lightford for all of her hard work in the Senate to help make this happen. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an agreed Bill. For many years it was contentious,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

for many years we had some trouble even getting people to the table, but sticking to it, working hard at it, getting people to the table over a long period of time, we were able to negotiate an agreed Bill to reform the payday loan industry. And I would ask your support."

- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman has moved concurrence. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Tryon: "Thank you. Representative Lang, I, too, commend you on the work that you've put together to come up with an agreed Bill process. We know how difficult that is especially on an issue like this. But for purposes of clarifying the legislative intent here today, is the intent of this Bill to limit and restrict license in the areas of title holding, civil litigation funding in pawnbroker shops to be?"
- Lang: "No, none of those areas are meant to be affected by the Bill."
- Tryon: "Okay. So, in committee yesterday we had testimony regarding the types of licenses and who could hold those license. And if I am licensed under the Payday Loan Act, can I hold a license under the Consumer Installment Loan Act for the purposes of making auto title secured loans?"
- Lang: "Representative, lenders may hold both a Payday Loan Reform Act license and a Consumer Installment Loan Act license, but there are limitations. A lender who holds a

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Payday Loan Reform Act license would be permitted to make payday loans and payday installment loans, but would be prohibited from making any loan other than an auto title secured loan if they also hold a Consumer Installment Loan Act license. House Bill 537 prohibits lenders from offering loans authorized by the Payday Loan Reform Act and loans authorized under the Consumer Installment Loan Act other than auto titled secured loans. Lenders could not hold dual licenses for the purpose of making payday loans, PLRA and small consumer loans, CILA."

Tryon: "Okay. Then and... and so, really this gets at the heart of the consumer protection issues that surround the issue of payday loans and consumer installment loans being flipped around, correct?"

Lang: "Correct, Sir."

Tryon: "Okay. And there has been solid agreement in the industry that there's also some desire to sit down over the summer and continue to improve on what you've already done, is that not correct? And you're willing to do that?"

Lang: "That is correct. We've indicated to the parties who believe that there are still some changes, some tweaks that they would like, that as long as we continue the agreed process we are happy to sit down and have further conversations."

Tryon: "Thank you, Representative Lang. And I certainly appreciate the work you've done on this and I plan on supporting this and would urge an 'aye' vote from all of our colleagues on the House Floor. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative Lang. I know this has been an issue that we've all looked forward to since the original Bill was passed five years ago addressing the loopholes. Is it... does the payday loan part of this ensure that the payday loans are paid in full after 180 consecutive days?"
- Lang: "The actual payday loans remain the same. This closes the loophole on the installment loans, Representative."
- Bellock: "Okay. And how... can you just, I know you just tried to describe that. Can you just reiterate that one more time how it addresses the loophole?"
- Lang: "So, the installment loan portion of this was generally unregulated prior to this, even the prior Payday Loan Act that we passed previously had these loans unregulated."
- Bellock: "Right."
- Lang: "So, this would put a cap in place that it was negotiated by the Attorney General and all of the parties including the lenders."
- Bellock: "Right. Okay. Thank you. And just to the Bill. I appreciate all the efforts of everybody involved. I think that this is a model throughout the nation that other states will look to in addressing this issue and the cycle of poverty. Thank you very much."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intent of the Chair to stay with Concurrence Motions for a little... for a period of time now?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Yeah. We'll be doing those for a period of time..."

Black: "Okay."

- Speaker Mautino: "...as I'm looking for Members who are ready to present."
- Black: "I think it would be wise then for Members to pay particular attention to the order of business because this is a classic example. This Bill had 49 'no' votes when it left the House, but it has come back from the Senate changed considerably. So, if you're just going to rely on your vote from when this Bill left the House and you're going to rely on that vote, I think you might be missing the point. Having said that, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

- Black: "Thank you. Representative, as this Bill has come back from the Senate and the reason I think you have filed a Motion to Concur, most of the opposition, if not all, have been removed by the Senate Amendments, fair statement?"
- Lang: "Not only is it a fair statement, but all the previous opponents signed in, in support of the Bill."
- Black: "So, what we have in effect now is really an agreed Bill on a situation that has been particularly vexatious to our constituents and to this Body for a number of years. We're attempting to do something about loans and well, I should

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

be careful what I say, advertising gimmicks that were entrapping some people in almost impossible situations to repay?"

Lang: "That is correct. And we were entrapping some people in a cycle of debt they could not exit. And with the caps in place here and with the other consumer protection provisions in this Bill, that will not happen in the future."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Boland."

Boland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield? Leader Lang, I want to first of all thank you very much for your work in this area. Having been chair previously of the Financial Institutions Committee and dealing with this issue, it's a tremendously complicated issue, very hard to deal with some massive players from outside of our state that are involved in this. And so, I want to compliment you on that and also for, in particular, getting the Illinois Credit Union Association behind your legislation. Now, I just have one question and that is, what difference or what major things have changed from the House Bill to this Bill with the Senate Amendments? In other words, some of those things that I liked in that original House Bill I thought were quite... would strengthen our ability to rein in this particular industry, which an awful lot of people in my area and probably other parts of the state get wound up in that cycle of indebtedness and can't seem to get out. So, could you just clarify for me, was there... is this Bill... are

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

these Amendments, have they weakened the Bill... the original Bill, which I thought was very good?"

Lang: "Well, we don't think it weakens the Bill at all, And rather than tell you about the Representative. specific changes, let me just outline briefly what the Bill I'll... let me hit the most important points. maintains reasonable rates for short-term loans, ensures all payday loans are paid in full after consecutive days of indebtedness, creates amortizing payday product with no balloon payment, keeps loans repayable by limiting monthly payments to 22 and a half or 25 percent of a borrower's gross monthly income, eliminates additional fees such as post-default interest, court costs, and attorneys fees, sets a cap of no more than 99 percent on some of the products that were totally egregious previously and I think that's the most important part of the Bill. Throughout all of the debate, throughout all of the negotiations, the advocates and the Legislators, particularly Representative Lightford and I, who had... or Senator Lightford and I, who have been negotiating this, we said, all things are negotiable except the cap. And we said there will not be a cap higher than 99 percent, despite the fact that for a long time many in the industry wanted it substantially higher. So, that is the most critical part of this Bill."

Boland: "Well, thank you very much. That is crucial; that's a main concern of mine. Like some of you probably I've had people come to my office and previously being charged astronomical amounts of interest. One lady, in particular,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

had come and she had taken out a \$300 loan. And within a few years was deep into several thousand dollars and probably with her income having been somebody who worked cleaning houses and so forth may never have gotten out. So, I think this provision alone if you had done nothing else, if there was no other improvements, this is absolutely tremendous and... and to be applauded. And I think it will finally get Illinois up past some of the other states that... that have moved ahead of us in previous years. So, I thank you for the Bill. And... and we still have some things to do in the payday loan industry regulation area, but this is a major, major step forward. Thank you very much."

Lang: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Iroquois, Representative Cultra."

Cultra: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Cultra: "Payday loans from 13 to 20 days and installment loans from 112 to 120 days, looks like to me the maximum APR is at 435 percent. Is that correct?"

Lang: "I believe that's correct, Representative."

Cultra: "Tell me why this is consumer friendly? Why would we allow that kind of percentage rate?"

Lang: "Representative, this Bill, which again is agreed with the lenders, is one that has substantial numbers of consumer protections in it. There are many who would have suggested that the caps and the rates be even lower, but I think we have to recognize that these businesses perform

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

and provide a service in the State of Illinois to people who have trouble getting credit elsewhere. And so, if these businesses were to disappear, we would have many consumers in our state who would not be able to have any opportunity to borrow money to fix a transmission or to fix a leaky roof and so the compromises had to be made. We did put a cap in at 99 percent, that was something we insisted on, but certainly if you extrapolate out that the... the dates and you make it appear as if it's a very large interest rate, you can do that, but the truth is that this is a very consumer friendly piece of legislation."

Cultra: "Well, I think it's probably a step in the right direction, but it just seems like to me that to allow a lender to charge 435 percent interest, we could have done better. The loans you're talking about are small consumer loans for 180 days over is capped at 99 percent. It seems like to me that, you know, if we're trying to really help people that need these kind of loans that this is still way too high a interest rate."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a conflict of interest, I'll be voting 'present' on this legislation."

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Mulligan: "Representative, is this Bill pretty comprehensive so that we don't continue to have to do umpteen rules in JCAR, which this has been a sore point for several years now?"

Lang: "We believe it is a comprehensive Bill. I'm certain the department will have some rulemaking to do, but as I understand it, the department's on board. They think this is a good piece of legislation as do all the advocates."

Mulligan: "Well, I'm sure the advocates do and I'm sure everyone does, but it still, if you take the bottom line on a Bill like this, poor people are really paying a pretty high freight for small loans. And I think that that's part of the problem with this country. But I'm sure that you've spent a lot of time on this and the Senate spent a lot of time on this so I'm certainly going to support it. But I hope it's comprehensive enough so that when they do make the rules they'll be pretty clear-cut, and we won't have that constant argument that we've been having."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 537?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill

142nd Legislative Day

- 537. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Yes. I'm wondering if we could send the electrician to Mr. Frank's desk? A green light appeared and we're wondering how that happened?"
- Speaker Mautino: "I'm certain that'll cause great concern, I'll send him. Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- McAuliffe: "I'd like to welcome from my district the children from Saint Eugene's and we also have a special guest. We have Senator Jim DeLeo's lovely wife, Ann and his daughter... their daughter, Alexa. So, welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. On page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 917.

 Representative Hernandez moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Representative Hernandez."
- Hernandez: "Yes. Motion to Concur House Bill 917. The Bill allows providers to provide assistance to individuals in applying for medical assistance upon the request of the individual. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 917?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk...

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Representative Coulson, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 109 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 917. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2332, Representative Kosel, and the Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2332. This has been before us before and passed with a significant majority. It is an assessor's Bill. It is the Bill that takes away a eight-month lame-duck period for township assessors and clerks. In this day and age when records are kept on computers, when we have free qualified educated assessors, there is no longer a need for an eight-month lame-duck period. And I would ask for your approval of this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the House concur, and on this, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins."

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Questions of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates she'll yield."

Biggins: "Are there any assessors in Will County that are for this Bill?"

Kosel: "I am not aware of any that are."

Biggins: "Are there any that are against the Bill?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Kosel: "I have received some communication that there's some
 opposed to it, but..."
- Biggins: "How about all of them? How about the DuPage... Lake County? Are there any assessors in Lake County for the Bill besides one of your cosponsors?"
- Kosel: "I have a cosponsor that is for the Bill, yes, in Lake County..."
- Biggins: "And all the other assessors, I think there's 17 or so, are against the Bill as I understand it from all their communications to many of our Members here. Is that correct?"
- Kosel: "I don't know. I haven't seen that list."
- Biggins: "Well, do you want to suspend the Bill and I'll give you the list and we'll get back to this later?"

Kosel: "No, that's fine."

Biggins: "So, what you're doing is... to understand taxes, the lien date is January 1. The value of the property on January 1 is what the assessors are responsible for. The books have to be turned in by June 30. Now, they take office on January 1. This law will change their taking of office 'til April something, whatever, depending on the calendar year and therefore, they will have 45 days upon assuming office to value all the properties in their jurisdiction. I don't know of any assessors in the state that are for the Bill, except one that I serve with. He's a fine man. But I do know all the rest of them are against the Bill. I know of one public official that took a position in support of the Bill, another township person, I don't know anybody else that's for the Bill. Township

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

officials are against the Bill. We all have township officials that we know. And so, I'm... don't think it's good public policy. I understand it's a personal issue with the Sponsor and I think personal issues belong personally and not in legislation that changes legis... laws that are on the books for scores of years. So, I am against the Bill and I would hope my colleagues listening agree. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just rise in strong support of the Lady's effort. This affected very negatively an area that the two of us both serve in the Frankfort Township area. And... and I don't know about all those other elected officials, but I know we have quite a lot of support for the change in our area there. So, I compliment her and I would ask that everyone look at this and give it a favorable vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that is a good government cleanup Bill. You have a situation where assessors throughout the state, there's been four separate instances where assessors in their lame dunk... duck period have decided to do things that are improper, potentially corrupt. And if my Lake County assessors want to side with the or be on the side of corruption, sobeit. I do want to point out one thing in regard to the opposition, in that, they want to have assessors start on January 1. First, the State of Illinois does not certify values to assessors until about the end of

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

April. This year I got my certified values the first week in May. So, the reality is assessors cannot even start their work until the end of April, early May, so asking them to wait two more weeks is not an overly burdensome procedure. Second, originally we moved the start date for assessors to January 1 because all the assessments were done by paper and pencil and it was very laborious to ... to get these things done. Nowadays, everything is computerized. And so, the argument that it burdensome for assessors just does not stand. There are many assessors opposed to this Bill. And I can understand them circling the wagons and trying to help one of their own, but every time an assessor abuses their power the way they have it is a black eye on public officials. If these assessors want to stand with potential corruption, sobeit. Our people... our constituents want us to act, want us to stop this abuse and so we need to pass this Bill. We need these assessors to start office the same time as the rest of the township. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Kosel to close."

Kosel: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good government Bill, this is a Bill against corruption, this is a Bill to close down a time period where games have been played. This Bill does not affect assessors in Cook County as assessors in Cook County do not assess in the same way they do in the rest of the state. So, this is a great good government vote for all of you from Cook County. This is something that needs to be done. We have assessors who are opposed to it, I will agree with

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

you, but the people... this is a Bill for the people. This needs to be stopped; this needs to be changed. And I ask you, please, for your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2332?' This is final action. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Mr. Fritchey, Representative Sente... take the record. The Motion fails. It is a renewable Motion. Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "I will... I ask that we renew the Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "And on this question, there are 58 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having not received... the Motion fails. Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently selected a 'yes' vote. I'd like to reflect as a 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "Record will reflect your intentions. On page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2428, Representative May. The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Out of the record. Representative Bradley, House Bill 3869 appears on the Calendar. The Gentleman moves... Representative Bradley on House Bill 3869."

Bradley: "This is a Bill that came back from the Senate on concurrence. It was actually a suggestion of the committee here in the House. We moved it out with the understanding it would be amended in the Senate. The Amendment basically provides the court with an opportunity to provide treatment

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

in the cases of people that are doing huffing, sniffing glue, sniffing compounds, et cetera. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3869. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns, Feigenholtz, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 96 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3869. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2270, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is something that I believe we passed unanimously the last two years. This is the Special Education-Hold Harmless Extraordinary Circumstances. The formula, which changed several years ago... the formula has not worked. As a result of that, there are hundreds of schools throughout the state that really get targeted for dramatic decreases in funding under this program. It's special education funding. We'll put this on the Governor's desk and give him the option then to work within the budget to try to address this in the upcoming year. If we don't do this, we know that these hundreds of schools will be in an even worse position than

142nd Legislative Day

- the other schools throughout the state. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I stand in support of the Gentleman's legislation. Very quickly, this... this helps schools actually in a way that's fair, be treated the same as other school districts in regards to special education funding. This holds them harmless from decreases in the amount of special education funding that they... they would have received. Another example, I think, of how sometimes formulas don't work well and there are unintended consequences and the Gentleman brings a solution that affects literally hundreds of school districts around the state. This is not an additional appropriation. simply in a and I believe a fair way addresses a formula change that took place with some unintended consequences. And I would ask everyone to support this. It's the right and fair thing to do. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate...' Representative Black, the Gentleman from Vermilion."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."
- Black: "Representative, trying to clarify something here. Is

 Amendment #1, which is clearly a shell Amendment, was that

 adopted to the Bill? It just says, Section 5, the amount

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

of \$2 or as so much thereof is appropriated from the General Revenue Fund to the General Assembly."

Bradley: "Yeah, I'm looking. I'm looking. I think that was adopted and I think Senate Amendment 2 then guts and replaces everything. So..."

Black: "Thank you, Representative."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry."

Black: "I'm not sure... I'm not rising to... to oppose the Gentleman's Bill or what he's attempting to do. I think Representative Eddy made some very cogent remarks. However, it appears that the Bill is not in order to move at this time because I don't think Senate... I don't think you've concurred in Senate Amendment #1, I would hope you wouldn't want to, but I believe it's on the Bill? Something isn't right here."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes. What's the proper procedure... we're just proceeding on Amendment #2, correct? The Motion to Concur is on Amendment #2?"

Speaker Mautino: "Can we take the Bill out of the record for a moment while we get this sorted out?"

Bradley: "Certainly. Thank you for the question, Representative Black."

Speaker Mautino: "On page 8 of the Calendar is House Bill 4644, Representative Poe."

Poe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're concur on Senate Amendment 2. And this was the furlough

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Bill that we passed out of the House that would give... we're asking employees to volunteer furlough days. And this would give them a chance to buy their retirement days back. And what this does, the people in the last five years of their career it would help them make sure their retirement stays up. And Amendment 2 allows the IMRF and some Cook County elected officials who were entitled to a stipend to also buy in. So, I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4644. On that question, Representative Franks, the Gentleman from McHenry."

Franks: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? I'd like to ask a question. On this Bill, our... we're dealing with Senate Amendment #2, correct?"

Poe: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Our analysis indicates that this would allow elected officials to purchase credit that reflects the salary they would have received had they received their stipend payment from the state, is that correct?"

Poe: "Yes. And what happened is these... this affects a lot of people that's in the last five years of their career and their average salary, and what would happen if they didn't receive that this year. I don't think anyone's complaining about that, but if they're going to retire in the near future, it would affect their retirement. This doesn't affect their retirement date. And the employee would have to pay the employer/employee costs plus the interest to make this work."

Franks: "A stipend is not salary, would you agree?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Poe: "I guess it depends on how many years you've been receiving it. If you've been receiving it the last 20 years and you didn't get it this year, I'd think you probably would go home and tell your wife, I got a cut in pay."

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate it. I'm going to speak to the Bill then. The problem that we have in State Government is the things... are so many entitlements and people receive things and they become entitled. This isn't a bonus for good behavior that you get once in awhile. What we've done is we've created a secondary form of compensation called stipend that there's no basis for it. And we were giving, I think, \$6 thousand a year stipends. And I just believe yesterday that was part of the deal we were trying to cut those stipends. Stipend is not part of the salary. clear that if you vote for this, what you're doing is giving a pension sweetener, not based on salary, but by being based on an unearned stipend that's given denotatively. So, it's a gift and now they're trying to get a pension on a gift. I'd ask you to think long and hard on this. I will be voting 'no' and I'd ask you to join me."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Tryon."
Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Tryon: "Just for the record, Representative Poe, the proposal that you have... since we've just gone through all of this pension reform and reformed the pension system. Is it going to create any additional liability for any of the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

pension systems because the participant's going to pay their share and the employer's share, that's correct?"

Poe: "That's correct. And all the IEA, AFSCME, SERS, IFT, Teamsters, they all support this Bill."

Tryon: "And it's also something that they are currently paying into the pension system for. So, even though Representative Franks had said that, you know, a stipend is kind of a bonus that we've turned into a salary. Today, last year... five years ago, if they got the stipend, it was treated as salary in the pension system, is that correct?"

Poe: "Yes."

Tryon: "All right. So, there is no liability to the pension system or the state or any other public employer. It's solely on them?"

Poe: "I think another thing I'd to add, that you got employees is that we're asking them to do this voluntarily and if they have an opportunity to buy these back... these days for their retirement, then it's a lot more incentive for them to go ahead and help us out."

Tryon: "Okay. No further questions. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, is the employee in question on this incur all the costs related to what the employer as well as any employee contribution would be?"

Poe: "Yes. And they even... if there's any interest involved, they have to pay the interest also."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Brady: "So, there would be nothing that would be costing the...

the entity, whether that be IMRF, whether that be..."

Poe: "Universities or whatever."

Brady: "...an agency in county government or wherever they work, they would not be affected or a county board, is that correct?"

Poe: "That's true."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4644. This is final action. 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 Senger, Biggins, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Biggins, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk... Biggins. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 81 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate #2 to House Bill 4644. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Davis, Monique Davis, on page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4647. Representative Davis on a Motion to Concur."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4647. What the Senate did was add an Amendment that removes all references to the Anti-Crime Advisory Council because that council no longer exists. It was eliminated by the Executive Order of Governor George Ryan. The second issue was adding requirements that all calls that were placed to the hotline

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

would be answered by the Chicago Police Department and recorded and investigated by the Chicago police. It added a provision that is required when there is a recording on a telephone and that is the eavesdropping statute takes place, so they have to advise the caller that their call would be recorded. And the final change was adding a Section that provides that no reimbursement from the state would occur and that the implementation would not require any state funds."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the House concur. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Representative, I... let me preface my question, I think this is a good Bill, I think it's a good idea. And I congratulate you and Senator Meeks on doing anything to try and stem what we know is going on in the city. I am, I think, obligated to ask you one question. It is a mandate and it exempts the state from paying anything. Now, from what I read, the City of Chicago is experiencing, like most governments, some serious budget problems. Has the city expressed any concern about the cost to you or to Senator Meeks?"

Davis, M.: "No, what they did express to me was they do have a line currently that exists for phone calls to report, you know, things that may occur. They already have a phone line for that."

142nd Legislative Day

- Black: "Okay. Well, I assume that somebody had reached out to Chicago because the Senate vote was unanimous. And, again, anything that I can do to help you with... with the violence that's going on, it's a good idea and I think it will get a unanimous vote in here, but I do appreciate your response. Thank you."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Representative Black."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Davis, I know you and I have talked about this Bill in... in committee and I had some concerns about the cost, but the cost of the code of silence in the streets of Chicago and elsewhere is too much of a price to pay. And if this helps save one life or prevents one fight, then I think this does its job. We have to work on breaking that code of silence because law enforcement can't do it by itself. We need those eyes and ears on the street to report these types of situations so that we can save lives and prevent violence. So, thank you, Representative, for bringing this Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4647. This is final action. 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 Biggins, McAuliffe, Saviano, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Biggins, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

to House Bill 4647. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Franks, on page 8 of the Calendar is House Bill 4658. You have a Motion, Sir?"

Franks: "Yes, I do. Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 This is a Bill that we previously passed in the House and Senator Harmon carried it in the Senate and he's made it a better Bill. What he's done has brought all, pretty much all the parties together. The Chamber of Commerce is now neutral, proponents now are NFIB, Illinois Insurance Association, the Illinois Life Insurance Council as well as AFL-CIO and other... and other unions. And what this Bill, as you may recall, is dealing with the credit histories. And this is very important because right now many employers are using credit histories and they're victimizing people who, of no fault of their own, have lost their employment and it makes it very difficult for them to get jobs again. Virginia Parks is a Professor at the University of Chicago and she's shown that there is no research showing that credit history is a good predictor of an employee's performance. If you look at credit history as well in the other light, I'm sure Bernie Madoff had wonderful credit history, was probably a stellar credit risk, but I'm sure we don't want him working for us. There's no... there's no rationale for the discrimination that's been used by employers to deny people jobs based on credit history. So, the Amendments tighten the language and it also shows that nothing in this Act shall prohibit employers from conducting thorough background

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

investigations. I think it's a stronger Bill that left that House and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates yes."

Black: "Representative, the Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 becomes the Bill, correct?"

Franks: "Well, there's also two. Yeah, #1 originally became the Bill but Amendment #2 retains the Bill..."

Black: "Adds to the Bill?"

Franks: "...adds to the Bill."

Black: "Okay. Let me ask you a question, I'm having trouble understanding in Senate Amendment #1. And I can understand what you're trying to do with credit history, but you... you mentioned one of the great financiers of our generation, Mr. Madoff. If Mr. Madoff ever gets out of prison and I doubt that he will and he applies for a job as a Wall Street investment banker, are you telling me that the Wall Street firm cannot access his remarkable credit history?"

Franks: "Well, you know, Mr. Millikin, as you may recall, went to jail for quite some time and I think they've named a business school after him since. So, I think they may be aware of that. But there's nothing in the Bill that would... that would prohibit an employer actually from conducting thorough background investigations, including Mr. Madoff's criminal history."

Black: "Okay."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Franks: "So, hopefully they would rely on that more."

Black: "And that... that's one of the things I'd like to focus on. I know there was some opposition, check that... there was some concern expressed by financial institutions that if they're hiring somebody to be a loan officer or somebody to work in their bank and this person has had a absolutely horrible credit history, defaults, bankruptcy, those kinds of things, that a bank, credit union, whatever, a financial institution feels that they should have access to that because it may have a direct bearing on the efficacy of that... that employee. Are those financial institutions still allowed to check on things of that nature?"

Franks: "Absolutely. And that... that's... that is a protection that we kept in the original Bill, has been kept on the concurrence."

Black: "Okay."

Franks: "And that's something that I think is critically important and I know you do as well."

Black: "Well, I was having trouble trying to figure out why so many 'no' votes were cast in the Senate when I think the Senate Amendment corrected many of the concerns that were expressed when the Bill was in the House?"

Franks: "I agree with you. And it's a better Bill now than what we had sent over."

Black: "Okay."

Franks: "I thought it was a good Bill then, but I think it's better, I think it's tighter now."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Black: "All right. I hope to live long enough to have a credit history, Representative. And I think your Bill will protect me if I do."

Franks: "And I'm sure your credit history will be better than that of the State of Illinois, Mr. Black."

Black: "It couldn't be any worse."

Franks: "That's right."

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

Osterman: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Osterman: "Representative, do you have any other Bills you're going to be calling today?"

Franks: "I may."

Osterman: "Some of your colleagues want to know if you have other Bills? This is a fine piece of legislation and I'm going to vote for it, but..."

Franks: "There's some others you can vote 'no' on."

Osterman: "...some of your colleagues... some of your colleagues want to know if there are other pieces of legislation you were going to bring forward that maybe aren't as stellar as this that we could talk about?"

Franks: "Oh, yeah. I got some real stinkers coming up."

Osterman: "Okay, great."

Franks: "You'll have a chance then."

Osterman: "Then I want to change..."

Speaker Mautino: "And the Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4658. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Winters, Representative Coulson, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 101 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4658. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On page 8 appears House Bill 4691, Representative Zalewski for a Motion."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4691 was sent over to the Senate. They reduced the fines on the Bill to make them a little less aggressive. But other than that, the substance of the Bill remains the same. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, I know you're a young father, I come from a different generation. We didn't have car seats and all of that, we didn't even have seat belts when I... when my children were very young. I guess we survived... well, I think they survived okay. They're pretty nice children and have fantastic grandchildren. You're moving to concur in Senate Amendment #1 that lowers the fine for what, failure to properly restrain or failure to have a car seat?"

Zalewski: "Rep... Representative, I'm sorry. I'll go... I'll take a step back. What the... what the Bill we sent over to the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Senate did was said that if you were cited for a violation of this Child Passenger Safety Seat Statute, we were going to give you the option to mitigate the fine and have the case dismissed if you chose to (a) purchase the car seat and attend a training course at a local State Police or firefighter station. Currently, the statute only allows for the purchase of the seat to allow the waiver of the fine. So, what we've done is we've said we've added this extra step in... in an effort to incentivize parents to not only buy the car seat, but actually go to the training because oftentimes parents are... they're purchasing the car seat, but they don't know how to quite properly install it, and that could lead to significant traffic... significant safety concerns for the child. So, we've added this extra step in a way of incentivizing parents taking the step. We've increased the fines. We sent over a set of fines... a fine schedule over to the Senate. There was some discomfort with that fine schedule. They'd asked us to look at that and they reduced some of the increased fines and sent it back to us."

- Black: "All right. So, in other words, you've added a way for...
 for parents to comply, but if they comply with the training
 program, it doesn't necessarily abrogate the fine,
 correct?"
- Zalewski: "What... if they are to purchase the car seat and complete the course and get this letter on letterhead, they can take it to the circuit clerk of the court the same way they can do an insurance violations, show that they

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

completed the course and then the clerk or the court is given permission to waive the fine and waive the case."

Black: "Okay."

Zalewski: "It's off their record."

Black: "All right. I think that's a reasonable alternative. And I think that in this economy and in my district where unemployment is approaching 16 percent, that is a very important avenue, I think, for... for these parents to be able to access because it is complicated. My daughter and son had to teach me how to put in a car seat; we'd never seen one... never had one. So, I think the Amendment makes the Bill much more reasonable and I appreciate your efforts. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4691?' All those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan, Representative Burns, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4691. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 543, Representative Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the chamber. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 543. And this is the one that would deal with

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

the continuing appropriation for the pensions as we instead are going to enable the Governor's Office to borrow money to meet that obligation in fiscal 2011."

Speaker Mautino: "On that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Eddy: "Representative, I think… you'll correct me, I'm sure, if
I'm wrong… that this discontinues the continuing
appropriation for the pension payment, is that accurate?"

Currie: "What it says is that the payments will be... the automatic payments will be suspended until the Governor certifies that there is adequate money available to continue the appropriation."

Eddy: "So, in effect, if you vote for this concurrence, you're voting to suspend the public policy that requires that a continuing appropriation be made to the pension systems. You are authorizing a nonpayment to the pension systems?"

Currie: "Because we don't have the \$3.8 billion available to make those payments and it... we are giving the Governor the authority to continue them when we have adequate funds available to meet this requirement. In addition, Representative, we adopted legislation yesterday that enables us to borrow for the pension payment."

Eddy: "So, that begs the question, if we're borrowing specifically to make that payment, why is it necessary to pass legislation to suspend the continuing appropriation that... that borrowing is intended to... to make?"

Currie: "Speaker, could I take this..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "...I'd like to take this Motion out of the record."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record.

Representative Sullivan. On page 4 of the Calendar under

Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 49,

Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 49, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #3."

Currie: "Actually, I think we should ask Representative Reitz to describe the Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Leader Currie. Rep... Amendment #3 will change the bonding authority for coal projects, will allow us to expand that and give grant authority to the Office of Coal Development and Marketing to help with the clean coal projects. There are three that are included in the budget. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 49. On that question, the Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Bost: "Yes, Representative, I just want to make sure. This is money that was actually located in another location that hasn't been used over the years, is that correct?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Reitz: "That's correct. It was directed..."

Bost: "And... and bas..."

Reitz: "...at Baldwin, yes."

Bost: "...and basically what we're doing it is, we're moving it into projects that definitely will provide jobs for Illinois citizens, correct?"

Reitz: "That's correct."

Bost: "And I stand in strong support of the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Poe."

Poe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Poe: "Yeah. Representative, this will also help the clean coal and help the future of coal in general?"

Reitz: "Yes, it will. It will expand the... the use of that degenerating plants and synthetic gas plants that use Illinois coal."

Poe: "Yeah. I also sign in strong support. This is something that we in Springfield who generate our own power and it's something that we need to continue to do that. And we're a coal fired plant and we appreciate your work on this."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's moved adoption of Amendment #3. And on that question, Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Mulligan: "Representative, are you piecemealing budget line items by adding things like this?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Reitz: "No. This is not... this is not part of the budget. This...
this Bill expands the use of these... of these dollars for
coal marketing and coal development."

Mulligan: "Well, you're taking it from another fund, so that it appears that you'd be making an appropriation..."

Reitz: "No."

Mulligan: "...or a different issue for the coming year?"

Reitz: "No, that's not true. This money was authorized years ago, was directed at a certain project in Randolph County. And what we're doing is allowing us to use this... and that project is not going forward. So, it's allowing us to use that. These are just... these moneys have already been authorized to use. So, the appropriation will be in a separate Bill, if that's your point."

Mulligan: "Well, the point is that the appropriation Bills are kind of ridiculous this year. And so, if the appropriation is second, this is either a feel-good, I want to say that I did this for my home community or it's a real Bill, I want this for my home community or it's I'm going to take money from something else that may be important to you for my home community type of Bill. And under a normal circumstance you would certainly want to do something like this because it would help the economy of the state overall help this other part of the state, too, but unfortunately, we have found out that these are not normal They're not normal circumstances in a circumstances. budget year and they're not normal circumstances on the House Floor. That's why I'm asking what the goal is of this. Do you have an answer?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Reitz: "Was that a question? Well, I was trying to figure out the question. But I would say this, these moneys were directed..."
- Mulligan: "The question is, what are you... what is your intent with the Bill? To help out your home community and... without the help of the actual money coming forward, that the money would be appropriated later or is the goal here just to put out a feel-good Bill or do you think the money's actually going to be there?"
- Reitz: "The... the money is in a following appropriation Bill. It does not go to my community. We are actually taking the money from my community and going to Representative Bost, Phelps, Poe, Brauer, to their areas to try and create jobs in Illinois."
- Mulligan: "Well, you're mentioning all good fine Republicans on this side who probably would be sponsoring this Bill if they thought they could get it through, too."

Reitz: "Okay."

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. I think that that's why we're here. We're trying to help our areas or areas that are important to us for economic development. And it makes perfect sense that we attempt to, especially in Illinois, support coal development because it creates jobs. And I applaud the effort because hopefully what we'll be able to do is put people to work in parts of our state on projects that include using coal in a manner that's environmentally acceptable. So, I think we need to all support this

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

because this is going to help with the biggest problem we have in this state, and that's employment. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. No one else seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, 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. Place this Bill on Third Reading and read it a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 49, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you. In the discussions on the Amendment, the Amendment is the Bill and the intent here is to take dollars that were appropriated that aren't being used and spread them to other clean coal projects throughout the state to help put people to work and provide safe, reliable clean power for people in Illinois. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's moved passage of Senate Bill 49. 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 Pritchard, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 49 is declared passed. Under Senate Bills-Third

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Reading on page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3012. Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3012, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3012 has five components to it that modify election law. The first is, it establishes a pilot program on university campuses for early and grace period voting. Secondly, it shifts the dates of the election calendar to allow two additional weeks for the certification of candidates and preparations of ballots. When we adopted early voting, we essentially took three weeks out of the election calendar in which we have to file petitions, file challenges and have election authorities have time to resolve those challenges, get the ballots prepared, test the equipment and run the election. We just... when we added ... we deducted three weeks from that for early voting that became very problematic for the election authorities, so this will add two weeks. It moves the number of time frames around so that they have two weeks... an additional two weeks to make sure that all those things are done. Thirdly, it expands the jurisdiction of municipal electoral boards to include districts partially within their boundaries. Fourth, it modifies the service and filing requirements for electoral board decisions and judicial review petitions. And next, it changes the nomination period for a candidate filling a vacancy after a Primary to account for the filing of petitions. lastly, allows absentee ballot applications to be copied

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- and requires election authorities to accept and process any such application. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "Lady's moved passage of Senate Bill 3012. And on that question, the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Mr. Speaker, I'll have substantive questions of my own, but I have a parliamentary inquiry."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry, Sir."
- Rose: "How many votes does this take? Because the University of Illinois-Chicago campus is involved as well as several Chicago campuses, which would be under the Chicago Election Authority. And I would thereby think that this would violate Home Rule?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Rose, I will discuss that with the parliamentarian and get back to you with that answer. In the meantime, would you like to continue questioning?"
- Rose: "Thank you. I would ask if you put this on unlimited debate because there's a number of... a number of questions here. We have a number of my colleagues raising their hands. So, can we do that, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Place... this shall be placed on Extended Debate. Is that what you're requesting, Sir?"
- Rose: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Mautino: "It will. And under that, we'll be granting five minutes and I'll go ahead and use the timer as there are a number of people."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Nekritz... Would the Lady yield, first of all?"
- Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Rose: "Representative Nekritz, a couple quick questions for you. First of all, this will cost Coles County \$60 thousand to implement. That's an unfunded mandate, correct? There's no reimbursement mechanism here. It would be on the local county taxpayers?"
- Nekritz: "There is no reimbursement mechanism in here, you are correct, but you know..."
- Rose: "So, who should we eliminate in the county clerk's office to pay for this? What positions? I would ask the same question about Champaign County where the equipment alone will range somewhere in the \$80 thousand range to purchase the equipment. And I guess my question to you, Representative, Champaign County just got going through a very painful series of budget cuts, oddly because the State of Illinois hasn't paid them. Who do you suggest we cut at Champaign County to pay for this? Which positions?"
- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, every county has the ability to determine where their early voting sites will be. And... and part of the issue with this is that there... there have been lawsuits out there about where those early voting sites can be located..."

Rose: "But... but there... but this is..."

Nekritz: "...in order... and in order to prevent discrimination.

So..."

Rose: "But Representative, this is an..."

Nekritz: "...we're wanting to make sure that on a very pilot basis that we're not discriminating."

Rose: "...this is an unfunded mandate. Well, first of all, it does discriminate and we'll get to that in a minute. But

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

this is an unfunded mandate on our local counties that have not been paid, both Coles and Champaign have gone through budget cutting recently, largely because the State of Illinois hasn't paid them what's due. I'm asking you, what positions do you suggest are cut to pay for this?"

Nekritz: "And... and Representative, I would, again, respond that the early voting sites are required to be, under existing law, they're required to be placed at various locations around the county. If the clerk wants to put one at... we're simply indicating that one of these has to be at an institution..."

Rose: "Are you requiring that..."

Nekritz: "...and then it's..."

Rose: "Well, right now the early voting sites..."

Nekritz: "...up to the clerk to determine where the rest..."

Rose: "...are in the county..."

Nekritz: "...of those will be."

Rose: "Right now, in... So, let's transition in the second argument because this is completely discriminatory on its face under the..."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Rose, if I could... I'd ask the Members of the House to please give your attention to those in the process of debate, bring the noise down, some of the staff members move to the back. Continue, Sir."

Rose: "Thank you. This is discriminatory and violates the Equal Protection Clause because as you just noted under current early voting, if you early vote at the county clerk's office, every citizen has that opportunity. Students, senior citizens, everyone in the… in between has

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

the option to go there and early vote. You are now... you are now prioritizing and saying one set of citizens is different than others. So, why don't you do this in other locations, Representative?"

Nekritz: "Representative, there's nothing in this legislation that would prevent anyone else, any other voter from going to that early voting site. And it's, you know, I don't know in Champaign County, but I know that in Cook County there was an underlying study done to determine where these locations should be. We've had a situation in Lake County where there was obviously discrimination going on with regard to the location of early voting sites. So, we had to change the law to prevent that from happening. So, this is another effort in that direction."

Rose: "Representative..."

Nekritz: "And it is just a pilot program so that we can evaluate it."

Rose: "Representative Nekritz, you just noted in Cook County you... are you aware the Chicago Board of Elections, in an April 22 Daily Illini newspaper article, the Chicago Board of Elections expressed concerns about this due to cost, my first point and fairness my second point. April 22, Daily Illini, Chicago Board of Elections."

Nekritz: "Unfortunately, Representative, I don't get the Daily Illini."

Rose: "Well, they expressed a concern about cost and fairness 'cause it violates equal protection. I don't know how you set one set of citizens against another set of citizens.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

How do you do that and not violate the Equal Protection Clause?"

Nekritz: "Representative, and anyone is welcome at that... at the early voting site that's being proposed here."

Rose: "Under current law, everyone is treated the same, everyone, because they can go to the early voting site. You are now designating and saying that one set of citizens is different. By the way, you know in Champaign County most of the polling places are in dormitories? So, it's pretty darn easy to actually just get on the... on the, you know, go down the hall and vote since the poll's in your dormitory. But notwithstanding that point, Representative Nekritz, you're an attorney. Explain to me how this doesn't violate equal protection? You can't treat one set of citizens differently than another set of citizens."

Nekritz: "And Representative, I'm actually puzzled by your argument because we're not treating them differently. They're... and anyone is welcome to go to that voting site and vote. So, I don't know how they're being treated differently..."

Rose: "Because..."

Nekritz: "...and how we're denying them access?"

Rose: "...here's exactly why, Representative, because from Oakland, Illinois to Charleston, Illinois is about a 23-minute trip. They don't get an early voting site in Oakland, Illinois, but they do in Charleston. And you're telling them they have to drive now... they have to drive to Charleston to early vote; whereas, the student gets to walk

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

down the street. They get to drive 20 minutes versus just walking across the street. How's that..."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reboletti.

Rose: "Forty minutes. You..."

Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman is yielding you his time. Gentleman yields five minutes."

Rose: "Thank you. So, again, Representative, you're actually instituting an artificial barrier to that for citizens in outlying areas. Particularly, I might note most of your downstate counties where the universities are, are very rural areas, and it takes some time to drive. So, you're saying that in Charleston, for example, the students can make a five-minute walk to the union, but the citizen in Oakland, the senior citizen in Oakland living at the newly opened residential living facility, has to get in their car... what if they don't have a car? And they have to drive now to Charleston to avail themselves of your equal opportunity? How's that fair to the senior citizen?"

Nekritz: "And... and Representative, I guess, I'm, you know, I'm confused because I'm assuming that the... that they will still have the early voting site at the clerk's office, which is available to them now, would continue to be available to them."

Rose: "It's available to everybody now. That's my point."

Nekritz: "It's available to everybody now."

Rose: "That's fair."

Nekritz: "And so, I'm assuming that not everyone can walk to the county clerk's site right now, so they have to get in

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

the car to drive if they want to avail themselves of early voting."

Rose: "Right."

Nekritz: "This doesn't change any of that."

Rose: "But that's fair because every citizen is treated the same way. You're not giving some people a couple weeks of early voting right across the street, while there's other people have to get in the car and drive. That's not fair."

Nekritz: "So, we... so, those ... "

Rose: "And that violates equal protection."

Nekritz: "And Representative, your argument about the car doesn't work because if... everyone has to drive to the clerk's office, then if you don't have a car, that's not fair either. That's a... you're discriminating against people without cars. So, there are some... there are, you know..."

Rose: "Right. 'Cause in rural Illinois..."

Nekritz: "...where early voting is not the perfect option."

Rose: "...you're giving..."

Nekritz: "It's another option for people to vote."

Rose: "Representative, I would simply go back to your own Chicago Board of Elections who on April 22 agreed with me on both points."

Nekritz: "Well, I..."

Rose: "Cost and fairness. 'Cause it's... it violates equal protection."

Nekritz: "And I'm..."

Rose: "...and frankly, I still have a real problem, and Elaine, I know this wasn't originally your Bill, so this isn't aimed

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

at you, but I have a real problem with the Senator from Champaign County who his county, my county, just got done wasting a bunch of money... cutting a bunch of money because the state hasn't paid them, who now has to turn around and cut even more to pay for this. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Elections concurred in my comments on this point. I would think that it would be wise for this Body to vote 'no'."

- Speaker Mautino: "And Mr. Rose, you have made a parliamentary inquiry. We are prepared to address that now. And joining with us, the House Parliamentarian, David Ellis."
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Rose, on behalf of the Speaker in response to your inquiry, I believe you made a Home Rule request? And there is no preemption of Home Rule in the Bill, Sir."
- Rose: "Mr. Ellis, is that... why is that? Cause this... the University of Illinois-Chicago is in Chicago, which would be the Chicago Election Authority."
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative, if the General Assembly... if a statute wants to preempt Home Rule, it has to do so explicitly. It has to be in the Bill. The Supreme Court has ruled on that consistently. There's no, as far as I can tell, I saw no preemption of Home Rule in the Bill. It's a long Bill, maybe I missed it."
- Rose: "So, you're saying the City of Chicago can opt out of this, but the county of Champaign couldn't?"
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "You asked for a vote requirement determination. And if there is no preemption of Home Rule, it's a 60-vote requirement."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Rose: "Oh, that's... exactly. Just like this place, they're out, we're in."
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative, in addition, I don't believe that the University of Illinois-Chicago is a Home Rule entity."
- Rose: "It wasn't the University of Chicago, it's the Chicago Election Authority. That's who… that's who has to put up the thing at the location."
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Okay. Well, it's... it's a 60-vote requirement because there's no... there's no explicit preemption of Home Rule, Sir."
- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from... Mr. Rose."
- Rose: "Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a verification, if it gets the appropriate 60 votes."
- Speaker Mautino: "It has been acknowledged and you'll be granted a verification. Representative Zalewski for five minutes."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, I have a question about another aspect of the Bill. Representative, there are... will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Continue."
- Zalewski: "Thank... thank you. Representative, in the Bill we changed the filing... the fulfilling of vacancies from 60 to 75 days, correct? If there's a vacancy on the ballot, it's... the... the committee is given 75 days to meet, correct?"
- Nekritz: "Yes, if the vacancy occurs after the Primary, correct."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Zalewski: "And it... in the Bill... in the statute itself, are we changing all aspects of the Code including the General Assembly and the Election Code 'cause that was the original..."

Nekritz: "It's only for the General Assembly, Representative."

Zalewski: "Oh, it's only for the General Assembly?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Zalewski: "So, that portion of the Code is now changed to reflect that 75 day number?"

Nekritz: "Correct. I'm sorry, Representative, what was the question?"

Zalewski: "I think, I can... I can figure out what's going on.

There was some confusion by the State Board of Elections as
to the reason... the precipitance for the change was?"

Nekritz: "I understand, I'm sorry. The reason is that this...
the method of filling the vacancy where petitions now have
to be obtained and filed that only applies to the General
Assembly, so that's why this change only applies to the
General Assembly."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just curious, what prompted this legislation?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, a number of these proposals have been floating around in different Bills throughout the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- year and... and they were just consolidated into one at this juncture."
- Dunkin: "So, this is not an original idea, huh?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I don't know which one you're referring to, but no, a number of them have been included in prior legislation."
- Dunkin: "So, I guess, I'm trying to figure out is... is there a problem... a new problem that we're experiencing at the university level or within that community?"
- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, there are a number of other states where there is voting going on at university campuses. And in fact, there is one instance where there was a lawsuit filed because a traditionally African-American campus was consistently being denied the opportunity to have an early voting site. So, we thought it would be appropriate to try this on a very pilot project basis and see whether it would have a positive impact on student voting."
- Dunkin: "So, what college campuses are speaking of that are predominately African American in the State of Illinois?"
- Nekritz: "It was... No, this was not in Illinois. This was Prairie View A&M, I believe, in Texas."
- Dunkin: "I'm familiar with Prairie View."
- Nekritz: "I'm not sure... I'm not sure where Prairie View A&M is."
- Dunkin: "So, what happened exactly at Prairie View? I went to a black college."
- Nekritz: "They... the... they were being consistently told that they could not have an early voting site on their campus.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

And I don't know all the details of the case, but... and so they sued and were successful in getting an early voting site on the campus so that they... that the students had access to voting."

Dunkin: "So, okay. Now, obviously, you know, African Americans in this country and voting opportunities are a huge, huge part of our history, certainly in the elections a number of nationwide, state and local and county elected officials. Are we having this concern or this problem here in Illinois?"

Nekritz: "Well Representative..."

Dunkin: "Or are we just responding to..."

Nekritz: "We're hopeful that my... I don't know that there's been a specific allegations of that, but we are, again, trying this for one election cycle at the... all the four-year institu... public four-year institutions to see whether it could be helpful. And there's a... there's a requirement for an evaluation in the Bill itself so that we can evaluate it and come back. But the Bill sunsets in March of 2011. This portion of the Bill sunsets in March of 2011 so that we'd have an opportunity to take a look at it again."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, doing the Barack Obama election would that...
that was a major phenom in America and college campuses all
over America really had a level of enthusiasm one way or
the other to come out and support or support his opponent.
Was there a problem in Illinois, at least in the '08
election when we had unprecedented numbers of new, young
people, in particular, especially on college campuses,
playing an active role in participating in the election

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- process? Because I think that's a great determinate to assess because that was such a heightened moment in this country's history."
- Nekritz: "Again, Representative, I'm not aware of any specific allegations."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So, do you have a sense of the cost... that it would cost on all of these various campuses here?"
- Nekritz: "Well, it... I don't believe that there should be additional costs. All of these locations are... all of the election authorities are required to have early voting sites. And... and this would just be another... and this would be one of those sites."
- Dunkin: "So, how does this differ from the current early voting sites that we have? Or at least, for example, in Cook County, I mean... I guess what I'm looking for, are there any inhibitors at any level in the State of Illinois around our college campuses, especially in light of the '08 election?"
- Nekritz: "There's nothing to prohibit it or inhibit it in law, but it is at the discretion of the county clerk. And... and we did, as I said in my opening remarks, we did have a problem in Lake County where a predominately minority community was consistently being... even though they were one of the largest communities in that county... they were consistently being denied the opportunity to have an early voting site in that community. And so we came in and changed the law to require that. And this is another step in that direction to make sure that... that we're giving everyone adequate access to early voting."

Dunkin: "So, in Lake County where... you represent Lake County?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Nekritz: "I do not."

Dunkin: "Well, I haven't heard from... So, in Lake County, you're saying that there was discrimination with minorities not voting or blacks not voting, Representative?"

Nekritz: "Well, the... one of the large communities in Lake

County that is predominately African American was one of
the largest municipalities that consistently was not given
access to an early voting site..."

Speaker Mautino: "Lady will be allowed to answer the question and then we have 13 Members seeking recognition, so we'll move on, each Member granted five minutes."

Nekritz: "The county clerk was using its discretion to not provide an early voting site in that location. So, we changed the law to set a standard for the... for munic... the size of municipalities that had to have access to an early voting site."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis for five minutes."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Reis: "Representative, I don't know that anyone's asked you this question, but... I don't know if anyone's asked the question today or in committee, but why do we need this Bill?"

Nekritz: "Which portion of it, Sir?"

Reis: "Why do we need your Bill?"

Nekritz: "Well, there are a number of provisions in the Bill.

So, with... when it comes, as I indicated in my opening remarks, when it comes to the... to changing the... the various time frames within the election cycle, when we adopted

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

early voting we just gave the election authorities three week... three less weeks within which to have the petition challenges resolved, make sure that the ballots were set, test the equipment and move forward with... with a fair... free and fair election. So..."

Reis: "I guess specifically the..."

Nekritz: "...the election authorities were looking for..."

Reis: "...university stuff?"

Nekritz: "...two addi... try to squeeze two additional weeks, so that they would have more time to make sure that... that the names on the ballot were in fact the accurate names. That's just one."

Reis: "I guess more specifically, the university aspect of it that seems to be the most contentious part of it."

Nekritz: "Okay. Well, that was why I asked my initial question as to which portion of it you would like to discuss."

Reis: "Why do we need the changes in the university voting?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think there have been instances around the country where, as I referred to, there was one particular instance where there was actual discrimination going on. A number of college campuses in other areas of the country are... are afforded access to... to early voting sites. And so, we want to try this, again, on a very... one... for one election, but around the state to see whether it's something that we would be interested in and we can evaluate it."

Reis: "Do you think this will help Democrat or Republican votes?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Nekritz: "I... I believe it will help young voters,

 Representative."
- Reis: "We're always grateful for you helping out our side of the aisle. So, this is only good for one election, too?"
- Nekritz: "Correct. But it's... but there are a number of campuses involved, so I think it will give us a fairly representative sampling around the state."
- Reis: "We have concerns in what is... what things are put in place to keep people from voting at campus and voting at home?"
- Nekritz: "I'm... I'm sorry. I didn't understand the question, Sir?"
- Reis: "What would keep a student from voting through this new process at their university, but also either voting in person at home or absentee at home or early voting at home?"
- Nekritz: "You mean, so that they don't vote twice?"

Reis: "Exactly."

- Nekritz: "Well, we... we have mechanisms in place to prevent anyone from registering in two locations. And so those would... those would still apply."
- Reis: "But every... the laws you have passed over the last few years have tightened everything down to where you can register, go vote in such a narrow window of time before the election... are these computers linked together? I mean, you're talking about days where this could happen. You could almost do it on a Friday and go home and vote over the weekend, the weekend before election and no one would know what was going on in Carbondale versus Deerfield."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, that is why we... we are... have instituted the statewide database to make sure that that doesn't... that those kinds of things don't happen. But that could happen for anyone right now with early voting. That's not a problem of... on the college campus, that's anyone, if someone was just so inclined to commit voter fraud and commit a felony."
- Reis: "You're assuming that all counties are computerized. I have counties that aren't even... their election processes aren't even computerized. So, how could they be linked together?"
- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I believe the... that they're... at some point in the very near future they're going be required to be computerized and be part of that statewide database."
- Reis: "Okay. But not before this would take effect? And it's only for one election anyway."
- Nekritz: "And Representative, the incidence of voter fraud of that type is really, really low. And I just don't, you know, there's no indication that there's widespread felonies being convicted so that people can vote twice."
- Reis: "To the Bill. So, we have a Bill coming from the Majority side of the aisle that's going to help all voters. It's only for one election, a very important election for the Majority side of the aisle, really doesn't have any provisions put in place to prevent people from voting twice. I think that Amer... or the people of Illinois can see what's going on here. This is one more chance to try to beef up the numbers for Democrat votes. It's a cost to

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

counties, a cost mandate that they can't afford. My county closed their jail, they cut their sheriff's staff in half, some of them are paying with IOUs. And here we are putting another unfunded mandate on and for what reason?"

- Speaker Mautino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir. Further discussion? Representative Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Reboletti."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman yields his time to Representative Reboletti, five minutes."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."
- Reboletti: "Representative, are you aware of what election commissions like the DuPage County Election Commission is trying to do to save money?"
- Nekritz: "I have to admit, Representative, I have... haven't followed the specifics of the DuPage Electoral Board."
- Reboletti: "Well, I know that for the last number of election cycles they've been forced to eliminate additional polling sites so that people every year can't find their polling place because they've had to consolidate it. Why wouldn't we want to make sure that we had more local polling places so that all residents could be within five blocks or two miles of a polling place, instead of focusing on the college vote?"
- Nekritz: "Representative, this is not about poll... polling places, this is about early voting. And there... we haven't changed the requirements for the number of early voting places that would have forced DuPage to do what they did.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

This, again, this is an effort to make sure that we are, on a very limited basis, studying to see what might happen and then we can come back and reevaluate it."

Reboletti: "But this is for early voting sites at college campuses?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Reboletti: "Okay. So, we don't have an unlimited number of early voting sites in DuPage County, but what we'll be able to do is expand the amount of early voting places statewide only to college campuses. Why aren't we doing that and saying, we're going to mandate every township building to have early voting? Because then that may take care of Representative Rose's concerns for the people in the City of Oakland. Why wouldn't that be a better solution to help us statewide?"

Nekritz: "Representative, they can do that if they, if they so choose right now. And in fact, you know, I think in suburban Cook County that's a lot... there's a lot of that going on. But again, this is a very limited program, one... one election only and we can evaluate it. We can take a look at it again and see whether it worked."

Reboletti: "Well, to the Bill. We can mandate, I guess, whatever we want to. That's what we were put here to do is to pass laws that are supposed to help, I guess, access to the ballot. And what we're doing here is catering to one particular section of our population. We're not expanding it to seniors, we're not expanding it to the disabled, we're expanding it to college students only for one cycle. And then maybe we'll come back in another cycle, and the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Presidential election, depending on how this next cycle comes up. We're not mandating it to expand it to help people out in rural Illinois or to make it more effective for suburban areas to get the vote out from their residents. So, I'd urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Fritchey: "Representative, let's try to get down to what this is really about. Right now, out of these college campuses that are issued, do any of them have early voting on campus?"

Nekritz: "No. Not one."

Fritchey: "Doesn't it strike you as somewhat odd or coincidental that none of these have early voting locations on campus?"

Nekritz: "Well, I think that is the reason for the legislation.

You're right is that... is to... it is to see whether that

could work... could be a better outcome if we did have the

early voting sites there."

Fritchey: "Common sense would dictate that we would want to have more people involved in the process, whether you're Democrat, Republican, Green, Independent, what have you. The idea that democracy works best when the most people are involved, correct?"

Nekritz: "Right. And certainly getting people when they're young and getting them engaged is much better predictor of their lifelong involvement."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Fritchey: "And that's what I was going to say. I think we can look in any of our districts around the state and we see that the voting block that tends to be the most anemic tends to be the younger voters. Isn't that correct?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Fritchey: "And if we could develop good civic participation and public involvement at the early age it's likely to stay with them throughout their later years, right?"

Nekritz: "I wholeheartedly agree."

Fritchey: "Common sense would also seem to dictate that we'd want to have early voting available where we have population density, such as college campuses, right?"

Nekritz: "I think, you know, and that's one of the things we would certainly be reviewing as part of this pilot program."

Fritchey: "And the only way to review that is actually to try it?"

Nekritz: "We'd love to give it a shot."

Fritchey: "And when we're talking about college campuses, we're not just talking about students. We're talking about faculty, we're talking about staff, we're talking about employees, we're talking about the people that not only tend to make up these campuses, but oftentimes tend to be the core group of the very cities that they're in. Isn't that correct?"

Nekritz: "Yes. And certainly... as I indicated earlier, anyone would be welcome to vote at that site. It isn't just limited to those affiliated with the university."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Fritchey: "And as you eloquently and repeatedly pointed out, we're not looking for additional sites. We're simply trying to say, look, if you are in a community and there's a college campus there let's take one of these sites and put the site where the people are."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Fritchey: "To... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know I'd like to see us try if we can to take politics out of this. This isn't about politics, this is about common sense. And I would think that if most of these campuses tended to skew politically toward the political philosophy of those people that are opposing this Bill, those people would magically become proponents of this Bill. There's not a cost to this There's not a subversive reason to this Bill. It's an idea of putting the early voting where the people are. The reason we have early voting, we adopted it in this state, was to try to increase participation because it's the right thing to do for democracy, not for Democrats, for democracy. Getting people involved, getting specifically younger people involved, but getting these campuses in these communities involved in the process for elections at every level from the most local election to the President of the United States and every election in between. simply reallocates the existing early voting sites to make sure that one of them is placed squarely where the people are and giving them the opportunity to vote and giving them an opportunity to increase the numbers. Time may tell that it doesn't work. I'd be surprised if that's the case. I think all of us would recognize that common sense says that

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

if you put early voting sites where there's more people, more people will take advantage of them. But we'll never know that by conjuncture, we'll never know what by debate. We'll know that by trying it, by trying to advance democracy, by trying to make sure that our efforts reflect the reality of where people live, where they go to school, where they participate in their community and where they vote. This isn't a complicated piece of legislation, but it is a good piece of legislation. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Champaign,
Representative Jakobsson."

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

Jakobsson: "Representative, I know that we're talking about having a polling place on campuses and yesterday when this Bill came to committee my county clerk was there and he was talking about having to close other polling places if he had to open one on campus. Now, the one that he would have to open on campus would that have to be open on election day or is it only for early voting?"

Nekritz: "It... it's only for early and grace period voting."

Jakobsson: "Right. So, I'm a little confused when we hear other people here also talk about having to close other polling places because equipment gets moved around the county anyway? So, do you think that this would interfere with election day?"

Nekritz: "Not at all, Representative. And I think your point about the equipment being... being available and then being

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- moved around the county anyway for purposes of the actual election day itself is an excellent one."
- Jakobsson: "And I have another question, if you don't mind.

 There's been discussion about one class, you know, that
 this would just serve one class of people, in particular,
 students. But if this were on campus and the... the software
 is supposed to be for countywide, is that correct?"
- Nekritz: "I believe it would be... it would need to be so that...
 so that anyone from that county... 'cause that is... that would
 be a site for that county to go to, anyone in that county
 to go to."
- Jakobsson: "Right. And there are a number of people on campuses, I believe, across the state who are not only students. We have faculty, we have staff, we have other people who work on the campuses. So, would they be allowed to vote in these... in this campus?"
- Nekritz: "Absolutely, Representative. And having been to your home community I know that the university is right in the middle of town. So, anyone from town could go as well."
- Jakobsson: "Okay. And then I know that there's been discussion that or I've seen in the statute actually where there's an election commission and a population of over 100 thousand they have to set up another one anyway, so that should be easy. Now, that doesn't apply to Champaign County because we have a county clerk."
- Nekritz: "Representative, I'm having a little trouble hearing you."
- Jakobsson: "Okay. I was talking about the part in the statutes that says where there's a election commission or a board of

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

commissioners, if I've understood it correctly, that... and a population of 100 thousand or more that there needs to be a second early voting facility anyway. So, this wouldn't... this would only apply, I think, where are county clerks."

Nekritz: "So, Representative, it's my understanding that it...
that population needs to be at least 250 thousand in order
to require a second voting site and... for the clerk."

Jakobsson: "Yeah, for the clerk."

Nekritz: "Right. Right."

Jakobsson: "But for where there are commissioners then other people across the state are worried about this, it's 100 thousand. So, it's... there are other places where it would be required anyway. They can just choose."

Nekritz: "Representative, that provision, that particular provision only applies in the City of Chicago. I'm not sure quite why."

Jakobsson: "Okay. All right. Well, thank you for answering..."

Nekritz: "Because those are for… because those have Board of Election Commissioners and then so, Aurora and the City of Chicago are the only ones that separate… and Peoria are the only ones with separate elect… Board of Elections versus the clerk that… that operates the elections. So, those are… those are a little bit different."

Jakobsson: "All right. Well, I just wanted to mention that because we're... some discussion about the University of Illinois in Chicago. So, thank you."

Nekritz: "Okay. Great. Thank you... thank you, Representative."

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

Representative Durkin."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Durkin: "Representative, in committee yesterday Mark Shelden, the clerk of Champaign County, said it's going to cost \$60 thousand. I'm not sure if you... where he's going to get the money from. And I think that some of the other county clerks are in that same position. If they do not have the money to set up for this pilot program, what are the consequences on... upon them? And if they don't even... if they cannot set up the existing... this grace period, this pilot program grace period if they cannot afford it, they cannot comply, what are the sanctions or consequences against the county clerk?"

Nekritz: "Representative, I don't know what the sanctions are, but that would... because they would be not in compliance with the law that would be something for the state's attorney to deal with."

Durkin: "I'm curious because I think that there are going to be a situation where some of these county clerks just can't do it. They're either going to have to put people on unpaid furloughs to make up the difference and I'm not sure if they want to do it."

Nekritz: "Representative, the clerks are already required to have early voting sites. So, I'm a little unsure as to why this is... why this is such a big expense."

Durkin: "Well, you heard it yesterday. I mean, the clerk came in yesterday in committee..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Nekritz: "Well, I understand we heard it. I didn't get anything in writing to indicate why this was such a problem."
- Durkin: "Well, I think he made his case clear. He's going to have to get a computer program that's going to have to... have a new computer program, he's going to have to put additional staffing in for that location. I... you know, it wasn't rebutted I know that. Let me ask you another question. The... do we really think that one election is going to provide the sufficient data for the State Board of Elections to make some type of recommendations?"
- Nekritz: "You know, Representative, I think it will because it isn't just one election at one institution. It's one election at a cross section or at... frankly, at all the four-year institutions across the state. So, I think we can get enough data as to whether or not it's worked for students. There's a number of institutions there's 9, you know, at least 9 and some of those have several campuses. So, I think that there will be a good cross section for us to evaluate."
- Durkin: "Don't you think that there's a different type of voting trend or access which happens in a Primary versus a General? Don't you think that that would be a comprehensive way of addressing this situation? Would you be able to give sufficient information to the State Board of Elections to make whatever determinations? I mean, we're just talking about one General Election. I just have a hard time believing that we're going to be able to use

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

just one election as a basis for the State Board of Elections to make some type of findings."

Nekritz: "And Representative, if you'd like to extend the period of the... that this Bill covers, I would... I would welcome... offer that up to you."

Durkin: "In this chamber?" In this chamber?"

Nekritz: "I would offer you up to do that. But I think that, you know, that we can look at the… we can evaluate it and then if we, you know it's due by March of next year. We can look at it and say if that wasn't… was insufficient, we can go ahead with the… and look at the Primary for the next time."

"If I felt that if I submitted an Amendment, it went to Durkin: the Rules Committee I know I exactly what will happen to It'll happen to the sixty Bills that we saw yesterday that have been... that were... they have been bottled up that are going to change that would be for the benefit of Illinois. But I think that this Bill is... there's some good portions to it, but by placing the information or the language in requiring the county clerks and universities to participate in this pilot program is wrong. You're saying one election, not an election cycle, one election is supposed to be the basis for information. To me that that is unheard of. There's not one stat is... one person who's involved with statistics or does this type of research that will ever say that one election cycle or one incident is enough information for them to be able to provide a thorough analysis. So, I'm voting 'no'."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of this great Body.
 Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."
- Golar: "Representative Nekritz, I'm not going to be redundant, most of my colleagues on this side has expressed many of my thoughts. But Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a win, win situation. Many of our universities, and I just want to say this, too, Representative Nekritz, are we talking about access? Is this the real genesis of this, Representative?"
- Nekritz: "Absolutely, Representative. And that's the purpose for the pilot program is to make sure that we're providing access in the best way we can. And so we can study it and review the data."
- Golar: "Thank you. Because... actually before I came into this Body there were many, many times in speaking to university students talking about not knowing where they needed to go and vote. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge an 'aye' vote. The Representative has worked very hard on this, it is going to make a difference. We know that it is, of course, going to be a cost involved. But let's support this Bill. And for us on this side, I would say that this is a win-win situation for Democrats."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can't really believe I heard what I just heard. Win-win for Democrats.

 There you go. That's the way to win friends and influence

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

people and encourage bipartisanship, by golly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I had filed some note requests on this Bill yesterday, the Chair ruled they weren't filed in a timely fashion, I disagreed. I asked that the Chair be overturned, gee, much to my surprise I lost that request. Let me just try and talk to you, not about a win-win or what's good for what Party, let me talk about some things I think we should all try to understand as best we can. Can I have some order? I'm not going to talk over that."

Speaker Mautino: "Please give the Gentleman your attention."

Black: "I have two community colleges in my legislative district, the students at one in Champaign can take mass transit be on a situation at the University of Illinois campus in a matter of minutes. The community college students in Danville would have to... and there is no mass transit in the... in the true sense of the word between intercities, Danville and Champaign, so they would have to drive 70 miles round-trip to avail themselves of this. And how in the world can anybody say when you're talking about some of the best and brightest young people of the State of Illinois who are on our college campuses that they don't know where to vote. They don't know where to go to vote. And these are the leaders of tomorrow? I've never had a... I've never had a college student come in my office in tears and say, I don't know where to vote. Come on, for crying out loud. And look what this Bill does, this is one of the amazing things about this Bill. Now, I've been in politics a long time. I've been around people who would love this.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Allows any person to reproduce, distribute or return an absentee ballot application to an election authority. then mandates the election authority must accept process the absentee ballot application. We've... Illinois's had a very rich history of voter fraud. I remember the 1960 Presidential Election very well between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy. And the election turned on Illinois. And what did we hear? Well, the precincts in Chicago haven't been heard from yet. And now, you're going to let anybody reproduce an absentee ballot. What this Bill does is to allow a college student not only to vote on a college... or register, but to cast an absentee ballot at the same time. So, you register and you vote. Now, there's no central database. So, that college student who may live in Danville or who may live in Elk Grove Village or who may live in Chicago, there's no way you're going catch up with them. So, I'm going to vote absentee in the home where I live and I'm going to vote on the college campus. good deal. It's a great deal. Come on. Let me appeal to you on one common factor that we should have learned by This is an unfunded mandate on county governments. Maybe your county has money. Mine has literally decimated the Vermilion County Health Department, laid off 35 people. They have decided that the animal control shelter must be closed one additional day a week. Boy, did I hear about that. When you fool with dogs and cats people get upset. The state is behind in reimbursement for your state's attorney salary, for your public defender's salary, for your probation officers and for those of you that have a

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

juvenile detention center, they're three months behind in reimbursement for that. Some counties are going to have to start laying off probation officers, maybe layoff the public defender and/or close the juvenile detention center. Oh, this is only \$60 thousand to the county of Champaign. They've all agreed to take furlough days; they're laying people off. If I can't get through to you any other way, maybe this is a good idea but this is a terrible time to do it. You are mandating a cost to the county and exempting the state from having to pay it. Now, unfunded mandates in this recession is not a good idea, I don't care what it's about. So, if I can..."

Speaker Mautino: "Ask the Gentleman to bring his remarks to a close."

Black: "I'll do so. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can't say bring it back in a year and I'd support it, I won't be here. All I can tell you is that almost every one of your counties is in as desperate of fiscal condition as the State of Illinois. This is not the time and I don't know what's magical about the 2010 election cycle anyway, generally the Presidential Election vears are important than the Gubernatorial Election year. Oh, that's right, there's a Senate race, I forgot. But the bottom line is this, bring it back when the recession is over, when everybody has money. But how many times have some of you gotten up on this floor and said, unfunded mandates must stop. That's what this is. The counties don't have the money. It's not about Republicans; it's not about Democrats. Don't tell local units of government they have

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

to do something when we're not even paying them for other items that the..."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just to let you Bost: know, as the statement was made it's a Democrat win-win situation, well, I want to let you know that the county clerk of Jackson County who is a Democrat and a friend of mine, he and I just recently had had a conversation just a few moments ago. And this was put in as a pilot program in Jackson County and for 28 days they had someone on campus trying to do just exactly this. They actually had to pull people off staff to try to be able to fund it and cover it. Now, this is his words. During that entire process, 18 people voted, 18 people. At a time whenever our county is suffering like many other counties, like Representative Black explained that... that each county during these tough financial times. Now, if it is a win-win for the Democrat, then tell me which particular Democrat in his office should be laid off and how good would that feel? Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not a Republican/Democrat issue. This is an issue of whether you want to have common sense on the process. I have a county clerk that has explained to me in great detail, who has been at this job for quite some time, explain to me how he opposes this because of the way they tried it and how they saw that it did cost them money and did not actually provide a benefit to any voter. The other problem is, is a lapsed period, that there is no time to actually take the machines and figure out when somebody has

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

registered or not registered and get the... get the information back and forth from, this is just 6 miles away, from Murphysboro to Carbondale. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that... that has... is loaded with all kinds of problems. You know, everyone on this floor wants to see the opportunity for someone to have the opportunity to vote, make sure that everybody that votes that can vote. Make sure that everybody votes and votes in a correct way, but when the Democrat county clerk of my county comes to me and says, this is bad. He didn't start that job last week, he didn't start that job last year. I think he's been there about 17, 18 years now. He's ran these elections, he understands the importance of making sure everybody can vote. He also understands the importance of making sure a college campus has that opportunity where those people are registered. Folks, this Bill... once again, listen to the people on the front line that try to manage and control this process, in a positive way, not to support one side or the other, but trying to support it so that everybody can have the opportunity to vote. I believe that we could actually go down the path where certain people would not get the opportunity to vote because of cost, expense and not only that, then the amount of employment that we might lose in the county as well as the problems that exist in the county clerk's office already to try to do the other jobs that we have mandated them to do. I do stand in opposition to the Bill. I respect the Sponsor of this Bill, but I think this is not the Bill to be supporting. I would encourage you to vote 'no'."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Myers."

Myers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have great respect for the Sponsor of this legislation, but I think in this particular case more research should have been done on this particular issue instead of just assuming that a pilot project would provide the information that she says she is looking for. Many other speakers have said pretty much all that needs to be said, but not everybody said it. So, I'm going to say from the McDonough County perspective with Western Illinois University there, they've also tried much what the Jackson County has provided or has tried to do at Southern Illinois University. We've had polling places on the campus of Western Illinois University and very few students vote. Once the polling place is removed from Western's campus it's just basically right across the street. Western's campus is also very much integrated into the city. Previous speakers have talked about faculty and staff at these universities can vote there in early voting. Faculty and staff vote in their own precincts in large numbers. We don't have any problem with that, whether it's early voting or whether it's regular voting on election day, they turn out and we are thankful for that. Some of you may know that I've been teaching a class in the spring semester for several years at Western Illinois University called, Inside State Government. And granted, there's only about 17 or 18 students in that class compared to the 9 or 10 thousand that's on Western's campus, but I'm always amazed when I start that class at the beginning of the semester how little these students know about

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Quite frankly, how little they care about Government. State Government. Now, that all changes by the end of the semester when they realize it's their government and they should be concerned. But when I start out by asking how many of them voted in the last election, how many of them are registered to vote, those kinds of questions, there's a great number of them that are not registered to vote. those that are, they are registered to vote at their own home, their own residence of their family and so they have no desire to vote in a local election there. When the polling places were put on campus at Western Illinois University, it was much the same response as we saw in Jackson County and Southern Illinois University. turnout is extremely low. The turnout is low not because they don't have access to the polling place, but because these students don't care. They don't care because they're involved in all of their academic activities and studies. And quite frankly, they don't pay attention to the news that's going on. And that was very evident when I asked one of the class how many students knew about Tony Rezko, how many of them were following the Governor Blagojevich situation, very few of those kids knew. I... I think in this particular case if you want to find out why students aren't voting you should go to the campuses first before you think about putting a polling place there. Find out why the turnout is so low at the other polling places even it's just right across the street. I think that this, while I said I have great respect for the Sponsor, I think this is a misguided piece of legislation that really should have

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

been addressed in a different way instead of some pilot project that only applies for a very short period of time. I think that... I wish that everybody in this Body would really consider the common sense of this piece of legislation and vote 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,
Mr. Osterman."

Osterman: "To the Bill. You know I've heard this debate and it reminded me of every time we've tried to deal with our election law in the time I've been down here. You know, what are we afraid of? We're afraid of college kids having an easier opportunity to vote. And you know, some of the previous comments talked about a lack of interest or a lack of participation among young people. You know, I happen to think that all of our citizens of our state given the crisis that we're in, the crisis that we've seen in the last 5 years and 6 years and some of the people that we've elected to office, that there is a higher degree of participation and engagement now more than ever. College students are looking at things that we're dealing with here in the Legislature, cuts to education. They're looking at their future and a lack of jobs. And I guarantee that they are much more engaged and will be in November and in future elections than they have been in the past, not just in Presidential Elections. If the issue is voter fraud, then we should collectively, in the bipartisan way, increase the penalties. Every day down here we vote on increase in penalties in everything. If we want to do it for voter fraud, let's do it for voter fraud. I don't think anybody

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

here wants to see any voter fraud happen, but we want to engage people and have them be... have a chance to vote. Some of these same arguments about cost and hardship on clerks and election authorities are the same arguments that have been brought forth to this Body every time we've done things like early voting. So, when early voting happened as a pilot of sorts, it was a slow turnout, but I think all of you now that have early voting that is totally changed how our elections have run. And it is... helped people get involved in the process and vote early. And I have not heard one complaint from any of my constituents that said, you know, this is a burden or this is a problem. I think they're helpful and they're thankful that they had that opportunity and they have not engaged in fraud. this as a way to go vote and participate. I think that all of us... and the other issue came up about partisanship and quite honestly, I don't think this is a partisanship issue And in fact, there are universities that are at all. covered under this legislation that have a lot of suburban students who are born and raised Republican and they're living in Chicago or other Democratic areas and they're voting Republican. I think it's a wash. I think all of us want more participation. I think this is a pilot project and it's a solid piece of legislation. And I think all of us should embrace this and vote 'aye' and see how it works."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In our area, which also happens to be the Lady's area, we register our high school kids if they turn 18 at the local high schools. Not only that, in Cook County we received our voter verification cards last week. So, that those cards are out there telling you to remove your kids or leave them on there. Many people won't because they're not sure where they're going to college yet or what's going to happen. So, I think they will be left on the vote... rolls registered at our homes and then they will go to school and they can register there again. In the last election, early voting is a great convenience for a lot of people, but it's also a great tool to gather people together, herd them into vote, take them by bus, do whatever. In our area, one election was obviously lost because of early voters who voted straight Party ticket in a normally Republican area. think that's very interesting. Do I think that anything this year is not political in the year where we need an election to win the map? Oh, cynical me, I guess, no. I do think, quite frankly, that if it's a win-win for Democrats or supposed be a lose-lose for Republicans. I notice a lot of the stuff down here is a lose-lose for Republicans this year, but none of us are going home. We're still standing up, we're still representing the people, and let me get that straight, the people and I still think in my district no matter how the turnout of this vote goes, I will ask the parents and I will ask the students to still get out there and do their absentee ballots and do what they need to do. But do I think this would be better

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

served in another election year? Absolutely. I do not think this is a good Bill for this time. I don't think there's money for it. I think in our area, particularly, where they've already verified who's voting from your household in the past week, this is a really bad vote. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Lake,
Representative Cole."

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

Cole: "Representative Nekritz, I just... having had three college students that just finished school, I guess I have... with the last 5 or 6 years of the voting laws the one in particular that was most important, I believe, to the college students was absentee ballot and no excuse absentee In other words, you can get an absentee ballot sent to you, to your home for whatever reason you've chosen to do that, not just for college students, for everybody. We started doing it for college students and snowbirds and then we applied it to everyone. Why... what ... why is it so important when the absentee ballot is so accessible to those college students that all of a sudden now early voting becomes so much better? I... I'm trying to ... the college student's residence is still where their home is, it's their census count is still where their home They're a resident of the city still where their home is, not their university. So, I'm trying to figure out is this about voting in the local elections where the campus is? Is it that the students want to vote for the mayor or the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

trustees of Carbondale or... or DeKalb? Is... is that really the impetus of the... of the Bill because I'm... my college students simply wanted to vote in the Primary and General Election just like they always have when they were home."

Nekritz: "Representative, the... remember that this is a pilot program. And so, it only applies to the... right now, to the upcoming November 2010 election. And I don't believe that any of, at least in my area, I don't believe that any of those municipal township races will be on the ballot. So, it does apply to only the General Election and again, it's an effort to see if this will boost turnout, if it can help, you know, college students turn out in greater numbers. And then we'll evaluate it. If it works, we can come back to the General Assembly. The Bill dies of its own... by its own terms and so, we would have to do something affirmative to extend the program. So, I... it's..."

Cole: "So, there was... was there a reason behind not doing it in the Primary only doing it in the General?"

Nekritz: "Well, I... I'm getting a little bit of mixed signals because if we did it for the Primary it would last for another year and a half and I'm sure there would be ever more upset over the cost of it, you know, the alleged cost of it then. So, I... this was... it's a very limited scope in terms of the time. Again, it's a pretty broad brush in terms of the number of institutions that are affected and we can come back and take a look."

Cole: "But there's a larger cost... there's a huge... there's a larger voter turnout in a November election in the General

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

than there is in the Primary. So, the cost is greater in the General Election, I would assume?"

Nekritz: "I don't know why that... I don't know why having one site opened would be more expensive to... it's not done on a per voter cost basis. When, you open the site it's available to everyone. We don't, you know, I don't... I think the number of people voting it does not impact the cost."

Cole: "Well, I figure with the number of election judges... well,
I was hoping. But once again, why is this... why do we have
to do this after we spent so much time trying to make sure
that that absentee ballot could be delivered directly to
the mailing address of the student?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I would hate to..."

Cole: "What makes this better?"

Nekritz: "...think that once we decide on a... given laws that provide access and availability for voting that we would just wash our hands and say, well, we did it so we're done, and we're never going try anything else that would ever expand the access to voting, and be done. So, I would think that we would want to try something on a pilot basis, see whether it improves turnout."

Cole: "Another question, Representative. I don't know if you'd... do you support voting online?"

Nekritz: "You know, we've had some..."

Cole: "For the very same reasons?"

Nekritz: "I... Representative, we... I think... I don't know enough about it to speak to it right now."

Cole: "Okay. Thank you very much."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

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

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been listening to the debate and I decided to put my light on after hearing it. And I noticed when everybody said they respected the Sponsor they came out and spoke against that. respect the Sponsor and I'm actually going to speak in favor of it. 'Cause I was listening to the debate and I kept thinking to myself, what price democracy? Last year, we impeached a Governor and it... it wasn't cheap. It took a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of money. This year, the first question on our ballot will be whether we should institute a recall provision in the State of Illinois? Should that ever be implemented the cost could be millions of dollars. But we did that and we passed that knowing that it could cost us some money down the road because it was important for our democracy. Now, we've seen the low voter turnouts, especially in Primary times, and numbers continue to fall even in the Generals. I can tell you in my county, in the last Primary there was about 17 percent voter turnout. We should be doing everything we can to get more people involved and more people voting. It's the best thing we can do for our democracy. This is a pilot program. If it doesn't work we can scrap it, but I think it's critically important to get more people who... who need to vote and this will make it more accessible. Now, I've under... I've heard the arguments on their side and it really comes down is to they don't want people voting in university areas 'cause they tend to think they're going to

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

vote more Democratic. I mean, that's really what the arguments were. That's not a good enough reason to vote 'no' here. We don't know how people are going to vote. You know, you don't know how they're going to when they go into a voting booth. I can tell you in my county, in the last Primary 76 percent of the people pulled Republican ballots, but I can tell you also 52 percent voted for Barack Obama in the last election. So, let's not worry about the politics of it; let's just make it more accessible. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Mautino: "Our final questions from Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Point of clarification."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Brauer: "The win-win for Democrats was that W-I-N or W-H-E-N?"

Speaker Mautino: "I'll take that under advisement and we'll get back to you. Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't belabor the point, this is about, I mean, there's a lot of good provisions in this Bill with regard to the Election Code. The debate, obviously, focused on one. It is about access and the timing of that access for... for young voters who we're trying to sweep into the process. The cost... these... each of these counties is required to have an early voting site, this doesn't change any of that. If they want to move it to the university, they can do that. So, I don't think it... it has to impose any additional cost burden on the counties. And I think that with all the... with the entire

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

package of this Bill put together that it's a good package
and I'd urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 3012; and there has been a request of verification, that's been acknowledged. All Members please vote your own switches and the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Representative Dunkin, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There has been a request for verification 64 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Representative Rose has asked for a verification. Mr. Rose, do you persist? This Bill is... Mr. Clerk, read the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Boland; Bradley; Burke;
Burns; Carberry; Chapa LaVia; Collins; Crespo; Currie;
Davis, M.; Davis, W.; Dunkin; Farnham; Feigenholtz; Flider;
Flowers; Ford; Franks; Fritchey; Froehlich; Golar; Gordon,
C.; Gordon, J.; Hannig, B.; Harris; Hernandez; Hoffman;
Holbrook; Howard; Jackson; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Joyce;
Lang; Lilly; Lyons; Mautino; May; McAsey; McCarthy;
McGuire; Mell; Mendoza; Miller; Nekritz; Osterman; Phelps;
Reitz; Riley; Rita; Sente; Smith; Soto; Thapedi; Turner;
Verschoore; Walker; Yarbrough; Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Rose, questions of the affirmative."

Rose: "Representative Dunkin?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Dunkin? Mr. Clerk, remove him from the Roll."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Rose: "Representative May?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative May is in the aisle right here in front, Democratic aisle."

Rose: "It's funny, Mr. Speaker, I, for the longest time I didn't have you sitting in your seat and then I realized it's 'cause you're in the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Well, if you're questioning me, I'm right here."

Rose: "Yeah."

Speaker Mautino: "Hi, Chapin. Mr. Rose..."

Rose: "Representative..."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie asks leave to be... granted. And Representative Howard, granted."

Rose: "Representative Franks, where did he go?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Franks is in the annex, rear of the chamber."

Rose: "Thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "And on that question, 63 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 3012 is declared passed. Committee Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May, 26, 2010: direct floor consideration for Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3537, and recommends be adopted Floor... Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 for House Bill 2332. Also, recommends be adopted Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1215."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the House to give a wel... a round welcome of applause to a former Member, former Member that served here from 1973 to 1983, former Sam McGrew. He was the chair of the Higher Ed Committee and also served on the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee. Sam McGrew, let's welcome him back to the General Assembly."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome back, Sam. Senate Bill 3537 appears on page 4 of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3537, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read a second time.

 And Floor..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McCarthy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy on Floor Amendment #2."
- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 makes it clear that the COLA for both the judges and the General Assembly is not compounded so that it lines up with the other pension systems that we changed. And also that the Social Security Covered Wage Base, which would be the maximum pensionable salary, will have one half of the CPI or three percent, whatever is lesser. So, I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House adopt Floor Amendment #2. On that question, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "He yields."

Fortner: "Representative, when we debated the pension reform Bill earlier this Session, one of the questions that I asked had to do with whether or not we were using the CPI or one half the CPI. And at that time you indicated that the reason for the difference was that for the JRS and GARS that because... and I'll apologize if it was Speaker Madigan instead of you 'cause I know you answered some of the questions and Speaker Madigan..."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Fortner: "...answered some of the questions. But the answer that I got was that because the percentage was reduced from 80 percent to 60 percent for those two that the increment was to be the CPI and because the other funds did not have the base percentage reduced that they had the lower increment after retirement as a way to kind of balance out those two different things. Where one, we've reduced the starting point so they get a higher increment. The other ones with the higher starting point had the lower increment. That was the answer at the time, but now it seems that they're all going to have the lower increment. And I just wonder, why the change? 'Cause I... it seemed like that was a very rational and clear distinction that you had earlier this year."

McCarthy: "I thank you for that. But I think after further review it was looked at that that was overly generous as far as the salary would move up. The... there was no three percent limit or half. It was just basically whatever the CPI could be. And after we had COGFA look at that, they

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

came back and said that that 106,800 number at the end of 20 years, which would be an appropriate career for either a judge or a General Assembly Member that it would be well over \$200 thousand, would be that maximum salary. we're trying to level the playing field so that the average pensioner in our state is not dwarfed by these people that have these gigantic pensions and that's why we put that in We didn't think that that CPI would be limiting there. enough. You adequately or accurately certainly expressed my opinion at the time when we were debating Senate Bill 1946, but after looking at it and listening to some of the other people that are affected by the much parameters of half the CPI Urban or three percent, whatever lesser, I have chosen to move forward with this Amendment at this time, so that we keep everybody on a also level playing field. And I think when negotiating these things for our municipalities down the line to deal with Articles 3 and 4 which include the fire and police, we'll have a much more rational argument if we don't have one group that has one ... one set of rules and the other... other groups have a different set. So, I feel that ... I mean, I don't argue what you said. You accurately portrayed my answer, but after further review I've decided I think this is a better route to go."

Fortner: "I appreciate the answer, and one other question. Again, not applicable this year, but those of us who can recall the period from the late 1970s, early 1980s in a period where we saw some double-digit inflation, has there been any thought about what might happen to those retirees

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

should this country again experience that type of economic environment and what we might have to do?"

McCarthy: "Well, then we would have the..."

Fortner: "Hoping that we don't get there, but..."

McCarthy: "...then we'd have the..."

Fortner: "...we understand that once in a while it happens."

McCarthy: "Yeah. If... if the CPI did go up that high, we would be now under this Amendment, we would..."

Fortner: "You'd be locked at three percent."

McCarthy: "...we would have the three percent curtailment of that. So, the systems would be protected somewhat."

Fortner: "So, the systems would be protected. And if it turned out things were just way out of line, that was to be something we'd have to deal with for the retirees should it find that they've fallen just so far below that some of the ones at the lower end of our pension scale might... 'cause again, not worried about the... for this case, the top end ones..."

McCarthy: "Correct."

Fortner: "...but some of the ones towards the lower end might find themselves falling at a point where they could not make ends meet."

McCarthy: "Yeah. And some of the inflationary pressures are not as much on people that when they get in that age group as opposed to people in their earning years when their families are growing and things of that nature. So, there would be some mitigation. But you're right, I mean, it would be... it would make it more difficult for them. But you

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

know, we do want to protect the system so that, you know, the solvency of the system continues into the future."

Fortner: "Okay. Thank you very much."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mike."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it, in the opinion of the Chair. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. And read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3537, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've had an adequate discussion there, but I certainly would be willing to answer any questions that the Body would have. And I thank you for your indulgence and would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 3537. On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

Black: "Representative, I apologize, you may have already answered this in the Amendment, but I was back in the green room having lunch. Didn't spill anything either. Well, actually I did, but not on me. The question I have, it

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

appears, from what I could hear back in the green room, all... all you're attempting to do is to treat General Assembly Retirement System, us, and the judicial retirees in a similar if not almost identical fashion as the pension reform Bill that passed earlier. So..."

McCarthy: "Correct. Identical when it comes to Social Security Covered Wage Base, which is going to be the maximum pensionable salary into the future and also for the COLA for both the annuitant and then for the survivor's annuity after that. They'll have the same thing as SERS, SURS, all those different county ones that... every pension program that was included in Senate Bill 1946. They would be identical to everyone except for the Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6, which I believe are the downstate fire, downstate police, Chicago fire and Chicago police."

Black: "Okay. I..."

McCarthy: "Which we'll deal with later."

Black: "...I... long overdue. Congratulations."

McCarthy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 3537. 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 Connelly, Davis, May, Sullivan, Burns, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3537 is declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar under Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1215. Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #2."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the... of the Senate Amendment 2 was approved in the Executive Committee this morning. This whole Bill is a trailer Bill to the appropriations for fiscal 2011 that we passed last evening. There were various mistakes and some changes that were required to be made. And this is the Amendment that will do that. Most of this is cleanup, most of it is just changes in language that was either left undone by our colleagues in the Senate or were mistakes that we are now correcting. I'd be happy to answer your questions. We're... on Amendment 2 we're talking about appropriating some of the pay-as-you-go capital, restoring money having to do with grants in the State Board of Education that was inadvertently left out, funding both elections for the State Board of Elections, appropriations for the Court of Claims Award, putting some federal money that is now available into the Illinois Arts Council, permitting the Attorney General to access more money from her whistleblower fund, providing for increased moneys for the Executive Inspectors General, and the... finding funds for the State Police Merit Board. We're also appropriating money from the hospital assessment for the human services lockbox. I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Eddy: "Representative Currie, there's a pretty long list on our analysis of either additional grants through the Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources, DCEO. You mentioned specifically that there was a change made to the appropriation in the education budget? It looks like it's \$131 million or just a little more than \$131 million?"
- Currie: "And... and this was left out in the Bill as it came to us from the Senate. So, this is not new money it's old money. It's what we always do, but it wasn't in the Bill they sent us. So, we're putting it into the trailer Bill."
- Eddy: "It... does it become part of the block grant amount that the Governor will have the responsibility now to admit to the grant programs and..."
- Currie: "I believe the answer is yes. This was money, maintenance of effort money that we were required under the… our legislation, federal legislation, of last year to identify. And all we're doing is putting it back in where it belongs."
- Eddy: "So, for the specific programs that require the state to fund a certain amount for vocational education or title programs or whatever it is, this money allows for us to maintain the effort necessary to have the federal funding?"

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "This really doesn't and I just... for clarification, this doesn't do anything with the mandated categorical money..."

Currie: "It does not."

Eddy: "...that was shorted?"

Currie: "No."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Franks. McHenry."

Franks: "Yeah, McLean's probably not going to..."

Speaker Mautino: "You're actually right."

Franks: "...for a change... for a change."

Speaker Mautino: "Glad I could help."

Franks: "Thank you. Thank you. Representative, I'm not sure I understand the purpose of what we're doing here. This is a trailer Bill from the..."

Currie: "On the budget."

Franks: "...on the budget."

Currie: "On the budget. We... remember we concurred in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 859 yesterday. But there were some mistakes, which often happens in drafting, that the Senate didn't catch when they adopted the Amendments to 859. And so, this is a trailer Bill fixing errors that we have since discovered, they have since discovered, the Governor's Office has since discovered."

Franks: "Okay. So... but it would provide for additional fundings? For instance, I see the Illinois Sports Facility Authority..."

Currie: "Actually, that's in the next Amendment."

Franks: "Oh, I'm sorry. I'm looking at Amendment #3."

Currie: "You are."

Speaker Mautino: "We're on Amendment #2."

Franks: "Okay. I guess, one question I'd have. We're assuming when we passed the budget last night, the Bill the 859, that we were assuming for instance that the pension

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

obligation notes were going to be going through. What would happen with the... with that assumption should the Senate fail to pass the pension obligation notes?"

Currie: "Then we'd have to go to Plan B, Representative. And I suspect Plan B since we failed to raise revenue, since we failed to make \$4 billion in cuts, I suspect Plan B would say let's just take a hike and walk away from our responsibilities. I hope it doesn't come to that. We should all hope it doesn't come to that."

Franks: "Is there a Bill that would... 'cause I know, I thought we were going to have a Bill dealing with deferral, but I haven't seen that Bill because it wasn't in the emergency..."

Currie: "There is a House Bill with a Senate Amendment that would... that would do that. But that... that we essentially would have to do anyhow because there is a continuing appropriation and unless we take action, we could be doubly funding the pension system."

Franks: "That was another concern I had..."

Currie: "Yeah."

Franks: "I just was trying to figure out how all this worked."

Currie: "Yeah."

Franks: "So, I'll... we'll talk about this on Third Reading. So, thank you for answering those questions."

Currie: "Yeah. Well, that's not in this Bill."

Franks: "No, I know."

Currie: "Yeah."

Franks: "But I'm... I'll have other questions on this. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussions on Amendment #2?

Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Brady: "Leader, in committee this morning, I'd asked you about, in particular, the State Board of Education funding part of it and I believe you touched upon that a little bit with Representative Eddy."

Currie: "Right."

Brady: "And then I also asked you, in particular, about the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity and some of the grants that were listed in our analysis. Were you able to find out... these are grants that were left out of something?"

Currie: "Right."

Brady: "Is... is that what I understood you to say?"

Currie: "And... and that's exactly what it was. In this measure there are some reappropriations and some changed language with respect to Member projects from earlier legislation and the one that you talked about this morning is precisely one of those. So, it is not new money and in other... some place else we'll see the \$100 thousand deleted because that will no longer apply to the original project, it will apply to this one."

Brady: "So, the... the \$100 thousand grant to the Youth Connection Charter for construction of a hydroponics rooftop greenhouse is a old project that is now having the appropriation to it?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Currie: "Yeah. Apparently, there was a change on the part of the Sponsor, maybe the definition wasn't accurate. So, we're really just putting the language that expresses the real intent of the appropriation, which we've done for all four caucuses."

Brady: "And also I asked, would we be seeing other Amendments to this Bill?"

Currie: "There is one more Amendment and it is pretty technical. We'll get to that after we finish with this."

Brady: "And... and that's coming right here to the floor, right?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Brady: "The technical Amendment?"

Currie: "Yes, that's on the floor."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you."

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

Durkin: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Brady to...
based on his tremendous blistering cross examination, I'd
like for him to continue with that train of thought."

Speaker Mautino: "No."

Brady: "Thank you to my..."

Speaker Mautino: "Just kidding. Yes, go ahead."

Brady: "...thank you to my great legal scholar colleague Representative Durkin, but I will not need that time. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "And with that, the... seeing no one else seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2? All in favor say 'yes'; opposed

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

'no'. The 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.
Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, again. This is pretty technical stuff and it primarily deals with mistakes that were in the Bill originally. Many of these fixes are those that the Governor's Office caught. Although the language in the Bill has been out there for two or three months, sometimes people don't look at it carefully until it's time for final passage. So, I'd be happy to answer any of your questions. As I say, it's pretty much technical clarifications."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1215, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We discussed this Bill on Second Reading. This is exactly as I said. It's a trailer Bill to the appropriations we adopted yesterday evening. And it is primarily technical changes and fixes, omissions in the Bill that we adopted

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

yesterday as that Bill came to us from the Senate. I'd appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of Senate Bill 1215.

On that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Technical is an interesting term. Thank you, Mr. Technical is an very interesting term for this Bill. It pretty much looks like a pork Bill to me. And do we have it as a trailer Bill so that if you voted the way we wanted your pork goes in here only we don't identify it? Because it looks to me if you go through this Bill, the Bill actually lists right down through there different projects all over without any particular classification except maybe you can tell from the town or where it's from. And it's a trailer Bill to a budget Bill that we voted against now, I don't know why you'd vote for it now. frankly, I think this is a really interesting way to do minor pork projects or major in some instances where there's 6 million or 5 million, but quite frankly, it's a list of individual projects if you look through it. And since Amendment #3 was so technical, I was just trying to pull that up, it doesn't appear to me that it's that that it can't technical be explained. And Representative Currie has taken it upon herself to introduce all the budget Bills, although she does not serve appropriation committees and certainly on any Representative Mautino, I expected you to be out there doing the appropriation Bills this year, but this is such an interesting way of doing things that I would certainly

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

urge a 'no' vote on this. Because basically what you're doing is you're voting to add pork into a budget that really doesn't have line items. But, you're just giving away little perks to people that make it a little more interesting for you to vote for the things that are happening here right now."

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

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Black: "Thank you. Majority Leader Currie, in Floor Amendment #3, if I'm reading this correctly, provides an additional... is it almost \$7 million GRF to the Executive Ethics Commission? Is that amount of money correct?"

Currie: "If you remember we adopted a Bill, I believe it was significantly increased Senate Bill 51 that responsibilities the authorities of the Executive Ethics Commission and the Procurement Policy Board. The Executive Ethics Commission is going to have to hire a significant number of chief procurement officers. And since we were committed when we adopted Senate Bill 51 to the idea that we are going to cleanup the way we do business in our executive agencies, the only way we can make sure that we want them to do is implemented is to pay for it. that's what this Amendment does. It says, we will pay the cost of the reforms we have embraced."

Black: "Okay. I just... I didn't realize it would be that much money. Let me ask you another question, if I can add

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- quickly, this appears to be adding \$135 million to various items in GRF. Am I... do I have the right amount?"
- Currie: "Yeah, except that remember some of this... some of this was left out of education, for example, \$131 million in GRF funds for the State Board of Education, but that is not new money. That was supposed to have been in the budget we adopted, it's a repeat from last year. So, it may look as if we're spending a whole bunch more, but that's only because there were errors in drafting in the Bill the Senate sent us that we voted for yesterday."
- Black: "And that money in the education line items is required to maintain our federal match, is it not, in some cases."
- Currie: "Right. They... It was actually maintenance of effort that was required under the American Recovery and whatever Act, ARRA. There's no ARRA, but here's no reason for us not to have that money available to the state board."
- Black: "Okay. All right. And one last question, on the… I think it was the IEPA grants there is some money set aside for assistance to local governments for sewer systems. I'm going to assume that that money will be used for those local communities who have taken a great leap of faith. I have one of those in my district, the Village of Homer, has taken a great leap of faith and borrowed money to come into compliance with the sanitary sewage system. They were supposed to have received a substantial grant to help them do this, they did not because they ran out of money, but they've been told if you continue maintenance of effort the grant will be forthcoming. So, I hope that's what this is for."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Currie: "That's exactly what this is for. This is the pay-asyou-go capital and it does include a lot of help for local governments in dealing with their..."

Black: "Okay. Fine."

Currie: "...their sewer systems."

Black: "Thank... thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

Rose: "Representative, I know there's a lot of different things in here that are somewhat nebulous in origin. Exactly why are we spending \$100 thousand on the conservation of fur bearing mammals?"

Currie: "On the which?"

Rose: "On the conservation of fur bearing mammals."

Currie: "That... that's a fund in the state's Department of Natural Resources for exactly that program."

Rose: "We need to spend \$110 thousand on fur... conservation of fur bearing mammals?"

Currie: "Yeah. We have something called the State Fur Bearing Fund, Fur Bearing Fund in the Department of Natural Resources."

Rose: "Representative..."

Currie: "I supposed we could instead take the money away and give it to my schools?"

Rose: "...this is exactly what's wrong. We can't pay our schools, but we got \$110 thousand for the conversation of fur bearing mammals. Really?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Currie: "Yeah. You know, Representative, you could have offered an Amendment to sweep the fund instead. And as I say, give it to my schools."

Rose: "I'll... Mr. Speaker, can I offer a verbal Amendment right now? Is that allowable?"

Speaker Mautino: "No."

Rose: "Let's take it to Second and I'll offer a written Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "No, we are on Third Reading."

Rose: "Enough said."

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

Eddy: "Thank you. I have no questions about any fur bearing fund. I do just want to follow up quickly 'cause I have a question about e-mails I've received related to vocational education and the Perkins Fund and the maintenance of effort there. This doesn't specifically deal with that, does it?"

Currie: "I don't believe it does."

Eddy: "Okay. So, for those concerns to be met, the State Board of Education would have to use... or the Governor's Office... the block grant amount to make sure."

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Eddy: "Okay. So, I..."

Currie: "You're correct."

Eddy: "I know there's a lot of people that are concerned about that and we know now that a lot listen on the Internet and we need to not confuse those issues. For vocational

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

funding we still need to make sure that that maintenance of effort 'cause this is specific to ARRA funds."

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one else seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the record. 68 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1215 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be... on this last Bill, I'd like to be recorded as a 'no'. I inadvertently hit my green switch."

Speaker Mautino: "The record will so reflect. Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Holbrook: "We're joined today by the Signal Hill schools from Belleville, Illinois. They're right behind me here in the gallery. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

Representative Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Cavaletto: "Thank you. I'd like to welcome the mayor of Centralia, Illinois here today, Becky Ault. Becky, welcome to the Capitol."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome, Mayor. On page... no one else seeking recognition, on page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3710. Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3710, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie on Floor Amendment #2."
- "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Currie: Amendment 2 combines two initiatives that were supported by the Governor and by many Members of this House. would provide that in the new capital markets program, right now a \$10 million tax credit. That money is used up helping businesses across the state and this would propose to double the amount available from 10 million to 20 million. In addition, most of the states that surround Illinois have made significant investments development of innovative businesses of new ideas, biotechnology, other kinds of technology. Illinois is losing out to our sister states and the second part of this Amendment would provide \$10 million in tax credits to those who would bring these new innovations, new ideas Illinois making it possible for us to be a hub innovation and experimentation. So, I would appreciate your support for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. On that question, Representative Reis, the Gentleman from Jasper."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

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

Speaker Mautino: "She will."

Reis: "Representative Currie, was this same language included in Senate Bill 2093, which was the STAR bond legislation?"

Currie: "That was... this was combined in that... with that proposal as well. But I think it's a good idea to have this as a separate proposition as it were an insurance policy in case the Senate refuses to act on that Bill or in case the Governor were to use his Veto."

Reis: "Sounds great to me. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking further recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2?'

All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. Several notes have been requested on the Bill, as amended and have not been filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Leave this Bill on Second Reading. On page 13 of the Calendar appears House Joint Resolution 121.

Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that we had passed and sent over to the Senate. This would all... it's a constitutional requirement when we have a Constitutional Amendment to have a description of what the Amendment would do. And this is the recall Amendment. And we passed this a few weeks ago and I think that we made a couple of scriveners' errors, which was found by the Senate. I think they changed a few words from a to v, those type of things. I don't have... and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves the House adopt Amendment #1.

No one seeking, recognition all in favor say... This is a

Concurrence Motion. It's a concurrence with Senate

Amendment #1. And on that question, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Black: "Representative, Amendment #1 just... what, clarified some language?"

Franks: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

Black: "What... what did Senate Amendment #1 do? Or the Amendment do, I'm sorry?"

Franks: "I think there are two grammatical changes that needed to be made."

Black: "Okay."

Franks: "They've changed the word 'the' to the word 'a', I think, in two separate instances."

Black: "Well, I wondered if that was going to happen.

Unfortunately, the Amendment doesn't add what I think you and I would like to see and that would be more people subject to recall."

Franks: "Correct. And well, that's a totally different..."

Black: "Yes, that's totally different, I understand."

Franks: "This is what we have. You know, I think this is the first Constitutional Amendment that's going to be on the ballot in I don't know how many years. Maybe you can tell us, Mr. Black, with your institutional knowledge?"

Black: "Ninety-two, I think, was the last one."

Franks: "So, it'd be 18 years? Yeah, it'd be 18 years. So, I think we were out of practice."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Black: "Well, you know, a half of loaf is better than none and a first step is better than no step at all. And I assume some day Illinois might join the ranks of other states in having recall for any number of public officials. And who knows, we might even have an easier referenda question and citizen initiative, but all things in due time. Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Riley: "Representative Franks, can you sort of explain to me the provision..."

Franks: "What we need to..."

Riley: "...what..."

Franks: "Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you had the question. I apologize."

Riley: "Okay. You got to... you got to give me a chance to ask the question. The provision about the electors initiating the impeachment process. Can... can you sort of explain that?"

Franks: "Could you give me a moment. I don't have the file, 'cause that's..."

Riley: "Okay."

Franks: "...that... that's a different Bill, quite frankly. The Bill we'd already passed was the Bill to allow for this to be on the ballot, the question of recall. What we're doing now is describing the pros and cons, which is required

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

whenever you have a Constitutional Amendment, that's what this House Joint Resolution is doing. Is using the agreed languages by the caucuses to describe this particular Constitutional Amendment. So, I know you're asking me right now the particulars of the underlying Bill? I don't have that file with me."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 121. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representatives Davis, Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 100 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 121. This, having received a Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted Amendment #2 for Senate Bill 3215."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a consistent trend. Could you have my switch checked? On 121 I needed to be recorded as an 'aye'; I was inadvertently voted 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "I think Representative Franks had the same problem with his switch earlier."

Bost: "It's amazing how this happens. You know, electronics begin to fail at the end of the year."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect your intentions, Sir."

Bost: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr... Representative Osterman."

Osterman: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Osterman: "Well, first, if Representative Bost switch keeps malfunctioning, I may call one of our gun bills today, but I will... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to have all of us give a warm welcome to teachers and students from Lake Shore schools in Chicago that are down here today."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives. On page 6 of the Calendar is Senate Bill 3710. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3710 was held on the Order of Second Reading pending the filing of notes. Note requests that are still pending are a fiscal note as amended by House Amendment 1, a state mandates note as amended by House Amendment #1, a balanced budget note as amended by House Amendment #1, a correctional note as amended by House Amendment #1, a Home Rule note as amended by House Amendment #1, a housing note as amended by House Amendment #1, a judicial note as amended by House Amendment #1, a land conveyance note as amended by House Amendment #1, a pension note as amended by House Amendment #1 and a state debt note as amended by House Amendment #1 and a state

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie for purpose of a Motion."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the notes are not applicable. This measure has nothing to do with land conveyances. The cost of this measure is contained precisely in the language, \$10 million in new market tax credits, \$10 million in angel investments. So, I move that the notes are not applicable to passage of Senate Bill 3710."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the House declare...

 that the notes be declared inapplicable. And on that
 question, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "I object to that. And I further ask pursuant to House Rule that each of these notes be taken separately as a separate Motion."
- Speaker Mautino: "That request will be granted. Representative Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Well, I was rising in support and I do rise in support of the Sponsor's Motion to make those notes inapplicable. It's incredibly important that we address this issue of the angel tax credits and new market tax credits for businesses and not have it be caught up by notes that are completely inapplicable to anything that's related to the context of this Bill. I would certainly ask the chamber to pay attention to what we're doing here. We've had one opportunity this year or maybe a handful at most to do something that benefits businesses in the State of Illinois. This is one of those times. There is no opposition that I know of to this legislation and to hold it up with notes that make absolutely no sense to the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

relevance of this Bill is unconscionable. I would ask for the Lady's Motion to be supported."

Speaker Mautino: "We will be taking these one note at a time.

Mr. Clerk, what is the first note?"

Clerk Bolin: "State Fiscal Note Act."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the State Fiscal Note Act is inapplicable. And on that, Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Just to say that the Bill itself establishes the cost, \$10 million for one of the tax credits, \$10 million for the other. There is no value in having a separate note filed that says precisely what the Bill says. I'd urge your support for my Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "First of all, these have already been passed. We have expectations they're going to pass out of the Senate as soon as possibly tomorrow. Secondly, there's no way that the fiscal note is inapplicable. When this passed previously in this General Assembly there was a fiscal note requested and a fiscal note filed with a fiscal impact by the Department of Revenue. So, there's no way that this note is inapplicable under any torturous view of the law."

Speaker Mautino: "This will receive a Roll Call... a record Roll Call. It requires more 'yeses' than 'noes'. On the Lady's Motion, all in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 91 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the note is declared inapplicable. Mr. Clerk, the next note."

Clerk Bolin: "The next note is a state mandates note."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Speaker Mautino: "State mandates note, Representative... Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Yeah. In fact, of course, this is entirely a state program. The Mandates Note Act note has nothing to do with this. I urge the same Roll Call."
- Speaker Mautino: "Question is, 'Shall the state mandates note be declared inapplicable?' 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 Dunkin. Representative Fritchey. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 88 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the state mandates note is inapplicable. Mr. Clerk, the next note."

Clerk Bolin: "The next note is the balanced budget note."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the balanced budget note be ruled inapplicable?' Representative Currie… all in favor vote 'yes'… Representative Stephens is seeking recognition."

Stephens: "Are we just talking about this Bill or is this the entire process of governance of Illinois these days?"

Speaker Mautino: "That would be this Bill."

Stephens: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,
take the record. 82 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 1 voting
'present', and the balanced budget note is ruled
inapplicable. Mr. Clerk, further notes?"

Clerk Bolin: "The next note is the correctional note."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie moves that the..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Currie: "No criminal law involved in this measure. I... I move that the correctional note is inapplicable."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bradley on the Motion."

Bradley: "We'll withdraw the rest of the notes."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw the remaining notes... note requests. Further Motions?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Motions pending."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3710, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We've discussed this intensively. A \$10 million tax credit program for the development of new markets and also a \$10 million tax credit for angel investments to make sure that we have high-paying, high-tech jobs in the State of Illinois. I'd appreciate your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of Senate Bill 3710. And on that Motion, Representative Mendoza."

Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Representative Currie for, you know, enduring this process with me. And just to remind the Members that this is one of the best investments that we can make in our business community. For a \$10 million... \$10 million investment that we allow through these tax credits, there'll be a \$40 million investment in... in our high-tech sector and it's one of the most important initiatives that we can do for that community. We are bleeding jobs away to neighboring states and this is our moment to be able to tell the businesses

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that we do appreciate them being here in Illinois and we want to continue to support them and foster growth instead of job loss. Thank you."

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

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Black: Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I know that this is not an easy vote for some of you. We don't need to belabor the point about the economic situation that the state is in, and for years I've heard about corporate welfare. Let me just tell you a little different story where I live on the Indiana border. In the last seven or eight years I have seen the State of Indiana at the last minute take away a large distribution center, and not take away, obviously, it wasn't under construction, but it appeared that it was going to locate in Vermilion County, we needed the 500 jobs. What county doesn't? At the last minute, Indiana swept in with all kinds of incentives and lower business rates, particularly workers' comp and unemployment insurance, which this Body is going to have to address sooner or later, hopefully sooner. Then we had opportunity to get a \$750 million Honda manufacturing plant, automobile manufacturing plant. I thought the Vermilion County site was superior and quite frankly, some of the people from Honda, North America, did as well. was not an incentive driven location as much as the distribution center, but again, business costs, although they didn't... Honda wasn't too concerned about workers' compensation because they said they trained their workers

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

in such a way that they didn't think that would be a major cost factor. But again, this was 2 thousand workers, \$18an-hour or better jobs, a \$750 million investment. again, because of various incentive programs that Indiana Illinois doesn't, that plant that located Greensburg, Indiana and is now producing Honda automobiles have several... a couple of thousand very employees. These are not easy things, but that's the way the world is today. You either compete or you lose jobs. And there's a number of reasons why you lose jobs, some of which are not certainly involved in this Bill, but any... any tax credit that says to somebody, if you set up a business in Illinois, we're going to do what we can to help you and not give away the store and I think that's what this Bill does. So, I've seen it happen in my district and I'm sure some of you have as well. That's the reason I support the Bill."

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

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find this to be a unique Bill that I would like to support also. It's very interesting to me after all these years that there are actually tax credits coming through that community and the Sponsor, who never likes tax credits, is sponsoring it. So, I'm really glad that the Democrats have decided to lead the business community out of the darkness into the light. And I will be supporting this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Senate Bill 3710, no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3710 is declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Fritchey: "I... I realize that at times different areas of the state have what may qualify as slow news days, sometimes I'll sit here and I'll start scrolling through the newspapers from around the state and you find various headlines. I just happen to come across one that caught my eye and it could be one of the more interesting headlines I've ever seen in this state or maybe any other. And for those of you that have missed it, it is in today's edition of the News Gazette and the title of the article is 'Black's beard goes away; wife, dog reported happy again'. The first time... Representative Bill Black's wife and dog are happier now that he has removed what even he admits was 'a scruffy-looking beard'. Representative, I'm sure that the people of central Illinois are happy to know that Sharon is happy, that Emmy Lou is happy and that peace has returned to the Black household."

Speaker Mautino: "And the Gentleman will be granted five minutes for a rebuttal. No, just kidding. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Well, I thank the Gentleman for his kind remarks and what is that old statement we've all heard before? Must be

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- a slow news day, is all I can say. We… we argued about the budget for hours and what's in the paper, but the fact that I shaved my beard. Whoopee do."
- Speaker Mautino: "On page 9 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 4711. Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 4711 went over to the Senate and it deals with mandates for school districts. When it went to the Senate there wasn't a formal method for school districts to show cost for mandate, that was added in the Senate. And it requires the school district to have a public hearing and to post the actual mandated cost prior to waiving the mandate. And I'd be happy to answer any questions and encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4711. No one seeking recognition. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4711. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zalewski, House Bill 4788."
- Zalewski: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in the Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4788. It removes the language which allows a trustee to be a... an annuitant to be on the board. It simply now allows the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

city treasurer to appoint a designee to serve in her stead on the board. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #2. On that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Franks: "Thank you. How does the Amendment change the Bill that we had passed before?"

Zalewski: "Representative, the Bill originally had a provision in it which I believe allowed an annuitant once they retired to serve on the board, if I'm not mistaken. That provision has been removed."

Franks: "So, how would it be now with the new Amendment... the Senate Amendment?"

Zalewski: "All the thing the Bill allows is for the city treasurer of the City of Chicago to designate a substitute, a proxy, to appear in her stead when the board of the funds meet."

Franks: "I'm not sure I understand what we're trying to do here. Because before..."

Zalewski: "So..."

Franks: "...go ahead."

Zalewski: "I'm sorry. Under the current law of this particular fund, the city treasurer has to attend all the… all of the board meetings. That is an aberration, an outlier, but typically with these boards mem… the elected officials like the city treasurer of Chicago can appoint a proxy. For whatever reason, with this specific board, they weren't

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

allowed to do so. So, this Bill simply makes this board in conformity with all the other pension boards in the City of Chicago."

Franks: "Thank you for explaining that. Now, I understand it."

Speaker Mautino: "And no one else seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4788. And having received the Constitutional Majority, this Bill is hereby declared passed. On page 9 of the Calendar is House Bill 4927, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill This is a Bill known as the video gaming trailer And before some of you who are antigaming immediately shut down, let me tell you there's no new gaming in this Bill. This is a Bill that is technical in nature for the most part. This is a Bill that makes some cleanup changes for the most part. And we all have an interest, all of us, whether we're for or against gaming to make sure the gaming laws we pass or any laws we pass work the way they're supposed to work. So, there's a series of changes in here and I'm not going to go through all of them, but let me go through a few, so you have the flavor of this. It allows for penny machines. It allows LLCs to be an acceptable business structure. It clarifies language

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that was flawed in the original video gaming Bill regarding truck stops. It prohibits terminal operators from having an undue economic concentration of video gaming terminals. gaming board powers to do the It requires... removes the requirement that investigations. a truck stop hold a liquor license to get a license. Under this Act, it'd be ridiculous for us to allow people to stop at truck stops and drink and gamble and then get on the road. So, we don't want the truck stops to be able to sell liquor to those who are using this... these machines. It has technical language to make sure that we don't have pop-up truck stops, that they're selling enough diesel fuel to actually qualify as a truck stop. The Bill allows the continued operation of amusement only, in other words, the legal video games that are out there today, until we go live with... with video gaming. It has a certain exemption for Edwards County. All of this has been not too much of an issue for people. The one issue in the Bill that has created some conversation is a definitional term in the Bill relative to the use of who the gaming board can prohibit. And so, as you know, the gaming board has broad and substantial powers under the law today to determine who can and cannot get a license to operate. Even with this Bill, the gaming board is given the power to prohibit a license to anyone found by the board to have a background with a criminal record, bad reputation or habits or prior activities who posed a threat to the public or who could pose a threat to video... the Video Gaming Act. all powers the gaming board has and will continue to have

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

whether or not we pass this video gaming trailer, but during the process of creating rules for the Video Gaming Law, the gaming board did something very curious. It set a date in time on December 16 and it said that if a... if an establishment was operating games illegally after that date they would not be allowed to get a license. Well, that all makes sense. We don't want illegally operating people to get a license. But then it went on to say, curiously, that if you're operating games illegally before December 16 we may keep you from getting a license. And it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, that there are thousands of liquor pouring establishments in Illinois who wish to apply for these licenses, but they have a right to know that the rules and regulations and laws and statutes that we're all operating under don't say 'may'. They have a right to know what is effective and what is not effective, what is in the law and what is not in the law, what will be investigated and what won't be investigated. And so, because the gaming board created this curious rule that creates vagueness, that creates the inability for those who want to access this law to know what's covered and what isn't covered, we attempted to define this issue in the Bill. And so, I know the chairman of the gaming board who's a friend of mine has spent a significant amount of time trying to convince you that there's something wrong with this Section of the Bill. The truth is, the gaming board's own rules left us with no alternative than to try to define what they were talking about because they refused to do it and as I say, there are broad, vast powers by the gaming board, with or without

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

this, to keep anyone out of video gaming they wish to keep out of video gaming. And so, this is a very important piece of legislation to make sure that this operation moves forward so that we have the dollars available to fund our capital Bill. And I would strongly encourage your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved concurrence of Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Burns."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Burns: "Representative, we worked together on a number of issues and I understand what you're trying to do with this legislation and it seems to make a lot of sense, but my understanding was that this was going to be part of a broader package to deal with other issues in the industry. Can you give us a sense, perhaps, of where we might be with some of those issues moving forward or..."

Lang: "Well, as you know, Representative, there's a Bill that where an Amendment got out on the floor today on Second Reading that would address the issue of... that was raised by some of the OTBs relative to how the Video Gaming Act affects them. It's a small issue, but it's a significant issue to them. I'm prepared to move that forward whenever it's up on the board. I support it; you support it. We'll try to pass it."

Burns: "Okay. Thank you so much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Mathias."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Mathias: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Mathias: "Representative, I know there's been a lot of different gaming bills out there and I just want to make clear, does this Bill in any way affect the racetracks?"

Lang: "No."

Mathias: "So, there is... the Bill that... that's been discussed to allow slots at the racetrack, is any of that language contained in this Bill?"

Lang: "It is not. It's a Bill I strongly support and I've worked very closely with Representative Burns who has been working on that. And we have an agreed, I believe, piece of legislation that isn't ready to move forward 'cause President Cullerton said he was not prepared to address that issue at this time."

Mathias: "But none of that language is in this Bill?"

Lang: "No, it is not, Sir."

Mathias: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 4927?' The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, I was talking to our Chief of Staff. Is this final action?"

Speaker Mautino: "This is final action."

Black: "Would you permit me to ask the Sponsor a quick question before you take the vote?"

Speaker Mautino: "Certainly."

Black: "Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Representative Lang, on the extension of operations, I know you've

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

explained this and I hope everybody listens and I think you... you made it very clear, but don't just tune out. You've allowed, and the Senate Sponsor have allowed the extension of operations for amusement only video gaming terminals. This is very important to downstate and I suppose even in your area, veterans' organizations who have used these machines for years. They're ubiquitous; they're all over. They use these machines to pay their taxes and pay their utility bill. As I understand what is in this Section, if an allegation was made that an American Legion post had engaged in grey gaming, i.e. payoffs they weren't supposed to do, they would be denied a video gaming license. This just simply says that, sure you can apply if you weren't convicted of illegal gaming. Correct?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. And thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. I have had dozens of calls from VFW, Disabled American Veterans, Legion posts who have been using these video gaming terminals for years and it is a critical part of their ability to survive. And for what they're gone through, if they find recreation in a video gaming machine, fine. If they decide that it might pay off to those who play, okay. Say I've voted for expanded gambling. At this point I just think with the Smoke Free Act and other things we've done to our veterans' clubs and organizations over the years, if this is what they feel they need to survive and continue to function and provide services to people in our communities, they've earned that right. They've earned that privilege. And I thank the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Gentleman for putting this provision in. I think it's very important, particularly to small downstate communities in trying to keep their veterans' organizations viable."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4927?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Flider. Mr. Osterman. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 81 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4927. And this, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 4928, Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. I Motion to... I Motion to Concur Senate Amendment #1. The Amendment becomes the Bill. It addresses concerns of the original Bill. It amends the Opening Meetings Act allowing elder abuse fatality teams to hold closed meetings under certain circumstances when abuse or neglect is suspected, alleged or substantiated. Originally the Bill did not require disclosure of the nature of the information nor the legal basis for keeping the information confidential, but now it does. So, basically, it's just tightening up the... the concerns that we had before. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Black: "Representative, very quickly, there were a number of 'no' votes on this the first time it went through. And I think that was because the Illinois Press Association had some deep-seeded concerns about further exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act and the Open Meetings Act. The Senate Amendment has addressed the Illinois Press Association's concerns and they no longer oppose the Bill, correctly... correct?"

Hernandez: "That's correct, yes."

Black: "Thank you very much, all I wanted to know."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4928. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mendoza, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4928. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4990, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4990.

Basically, this Bill was the Bill dealing with the 9-1-1 issues, the regional issue that we had there in mine and Brandon Phelps area... Representative Phelps' area. Also it had to do with some language from Representative Osmond's area. In the wisdom of the Senate, they decided that it

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

wasn't clear enough, that it was a pilot project. The language just clarifies that. And I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. On that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield? I just want to know what the Amendment does?"

Bost: "Basically, what the Amendment does, is it changes the language so that... they felt like it was... it could be misconstrued and not just be the pilot project. And what it does is it clarifies that it must be a pilot project in that region on the 9-1-1 issue."

Franks: "Okay. And this Bill had passed unanimously, previously?"

Bost: "Yes, it did."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4990?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4990. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, House Bill 5055."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to this Bill. The

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Amendments are technical. The Bill dealt with who can conduct a sheriff's sale. And there is a couple of suggestions made by Representative Franks which were added on in the Senate. I ask your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5055. No one seeking recognition. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no' and voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5055. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jackson, House Bill 5065."

Jackson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to move to concur with Amendments #3 and 1 of the Senate. Number 1 amends the Illinois Procurement Code, requires the distribution at Illinois' Procurement Bulletin to minority, female, and disadvantaged organizations to listed in directories of such entities maintained in the Department of Transportation, Department of Central Management Services and the Capital Development Board. Requires that notice of every contract that's offered must be provided to organizations, including small business as listed in those directories whose areas of certification are relative to the initiative of... for bids. Requires that each chief procurement officer rules for the content of the contract notification including encouragement to vendors to hire qualified Illinois' minorities and females, removes

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

provisions concerning publication of contract award notices in the procurement bulletins, requires that notices of the ward of each contract be issued to those organizations that respond to the solicitation including successful bidders immediately upon award of the contract. Provides that failure to give the no to show, told the time for filing for the bid contest. Senate Floor Amendment #3 makes the following changes to Senate Amendment #1, changes to the Illinois Procurement Code. Removes the requirement that the Procurement Bulletin be distributed to organizations listed in specified directories; requires that provided electronically to entities that subscribe online; removes the requirement that the bid invitation notice be provided to organizations listed in specified directories; require that those organizations be furnished written notification... or written instruction and information concerning registration on each procurement bulletin; provides that a failure to give notice of the contract award to toll the time for... for being for five... for five days."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 5065. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 5065. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Lyons, House Bill 5080."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I ask for concurrence with Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 5080. The underlying Bill dealt with... was an initiative of the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation that dealt with the whole problem of some unscrupulous locksmith act... operations going on different parts of the country. Well, the intention was to tighten up our rules and regulations governing the locksmith operation. And what... as sometimes happens, it goes over to the other chamber, when it went to the Senate they found some issues they needed to tighten up. So, with agreement with the ... with the locksmith group and the department, we found language that made it acceptable to both parties. And the third Amendment was just some technical language to clean it up. So, I ask for your support. And hope you can help me out with sending this to the Governor's desk."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have tremendous respect for the Sponsor, but anytime there's a locksmith Bill comes up it just reminds me of being a freshman here whenever I was told on this House Floor that the Illinois Locksmith Association are in total support of a Bill that would actually register the locksmiths. I go home and all my locksmiths are mad at me and I find out the only members of the Illinois Locksmith Association are located in Chicago except for one who is a lobbyist here in the City of Springfield. I will be voting 'no'. And nothing personal

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

against the Sponsor, but because anytime the Illinois Locksmith Association supports something it bothers me."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Amendments 1 and 3 from the Senate to House Bill 5080. This is final action. 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. 77 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 5080. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Eddy, House Bill 5132."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5132 is a Bill, as sent over to the Senate, that dealt with an issue related to reporting child abuse for students who had IEPs and were between the ages of 18, 20 and 21 in our schools. There was no mechanism to report that abuse. In the Senate, where it was found that private special education centers also lack that mechanism, so that was added and sent back over. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote on the concurrence."

Speaker Mautino: "And the Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. No one seeking recognition. This is final action. 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. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5132. This Bill, having

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed.

Representative Crespo, you're seeking recognition."

Crespo: "Yes, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

- Crespo: "Yeah, I'd like to ask the students and teachers from Einstein's school in Edward Park to please stand up and if you could please join me in giving a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

 Representative Smith, House Bill 4984."
- Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Senate Amendment that made some changes to this legislation, has to do with the certification of business and vocational schools. We had... and the underlying legislation thought that there was no opposition. In the Senate, the Board of Higher Ed came forward with some concerns. And so, the Senate Amendment addresses all the concerns that the Board of Higher Ed raised. The language is applicable for the next two years, has a two year sunset. And I believe it's the hope of the Board of Higher Ed to work out a more comprehensive system for certifying these schools during that time period. So, with that, the Senate Amendment removes any concerns that existed and I would move for concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 on this Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4984. And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, very quickly, is there a definition somewhere of a... what constitutes a vocational school? Does it have to be for-profit, for example?"

Smith: "I'm not sure in the underlying statute. I... there is a definition. I'm... I don't believe it has to be for-profit.

I can't think of anything not-for-profit currently, but..."

Black: "Yeah. I've had a couple of calls... a cosmetology school, for example, been in business in my area for, I don't know, 50 years. Does this apply to them? There is a truck driver training school, I believe that is for profit, wanting to know if it would pertain to him. And I quickly looked at the Senate Amendment and the underlying Bill and I don't know. I don't know what to tell them."

Smith: "Yeah. The... under the underlying Bill if they are accredited by a national organization then they could bypass the accreditation process or the credentialing process through the State Board of Education. That's really what this legislation does. Vocational business and vocational schools are regulated by the State Board of Education, not the Board of Higher Ed."

Black: "Right."

Smith: "A lot of people may not be aware of that. And for a lot of the, particularly the larger ones, they have to go through an accreditation process in their national organization and then do the same exact thing for ISBE.

ISBE is overburdened with this, understaffed and by removing those institutions who are already accredited, it'll free up some time for some of the smaller schools who

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

maybe aren't accredited through some national
organization."

Black: "All right. So, nobody's going to fall through the cracks?"

Smith: "No."

Black: "You and I aren't going to open up a storefront school, take tuition money to teach people how to operate the latest computer system and then we skip town with the money. I mean, that could still happen, but that's..."

Smith: "It still..."

Black: "...that's what you're after?"

Smith: "It could still happen, but there's... yeah, there's nothing in this..."

Black: "Okay."

Smith: "...legislation that changes regulating these schools."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The initial issue in the Bill was quite simple. There's already national accreditation and frankly, the state didn't have enough time or resources and was creating a huge logjam to rubber-stamp a national accreditation, isn't that correct?"

Smith: "Yes, Representative Leitch, that is correct."

Leitch: "Yeah. That was... it was a very simple thing. So, I'm curious now what was the origin or who would possibly... why would anyone be raising a concern in the Senate? What was that all about, do you know?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Smith: "The concerns came from the Board of Higher Ed, even though they had not voiced any concerns when it was here in the House. But they came forward at the eleventh hour with some concerns about what we were doing and they asked mainly that there be a sunset placed on this because they would like to take a comprehensive look at the whole process of accrediting vocational schools."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Representative. I find that pretty amazing because initially they told us they were in favor of the thing and then to subsequently come back and attempt to complicate your Bill for reasons unknown bewilders me, but good job and hope it passes."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4984. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Representative who wish? Biggins, Lang, Osterman, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4984. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. A point of personal privilege. I'd like to... I'd like the House to welcome Jason Dotson of Spring Valley who's joining with us today. His son, Nicholas, is assisting me on the podium and keeping my voting record straight. Jason, thank you for joining us. Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Point of personal privilege."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

- Reitz: "I'd like the House to join me in congratulating Representative Ramey. I know we all followed this last weekend when he made that putt on the 18th green, beat Phil Michelson, but the winner of the Masters this year, Representative Randy Ramey. Stand up, Ramey, stand up. Give them a wave."
- Speaker Mautino: "Welcome. Show off the green jacket. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Reboletti, House Bill 5150."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5150. It just made some grammatical changes to the Bill. This Bill had to do with the Department of Corrections having to get warrants for parole violators for Class III felonies and above."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5150. No one seeking recognition. This is final passage. 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 Leitch, Representative Lang, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5150. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5183, Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Amendment 2 to House Bill 5183. When this Bill left the House it was almost an agreed Bill. I'm pleased to tell you that it's totally agreed now. We have all proponents. If time permits, I'll... I'll mention those. This is an initiative of the Illinois Ambulance Association, three years of effort. Their Amendment clarifies come language. And I want everyone to know, on this Amendment, the Department of Public Health has established that there are some convicted felons that still have EMT license. want to be able to revoke those license, this language allows them to. It does some other things, too, and sets some criteria for critical care. So, this is agreed now. From the Department of Public Health, I want to state the legislative intent. This new language is not intended to change any existing administrative practice or procedure, rather it merely gives the department the ability to take action against persons convicted of Class X, I and II felonies. Be happy to entertain any questions. All the parties came together. We worked on this all spring and really the way legislation should work. And we had a lot of different parties, stakeholders. Superior Air Ground Ambulance companies... All these are in support: Illinois State Fire Marshal, State Ambulance Association, Health, Illinois Nurses Association, the Hospital Association, the Fire Chiefs, the Illinois EMS Advisory Board, the College of Emergency Physicians, Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts and the American This total Bill will set criteria for ground transportation of critical care, but the Amendment deals

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

with being able to revoke those license for convicted sex felons who with... right now, they can't revoke the license unless the act was committed while on duty. This says, if they're convicted. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Amendment #2 to House Bill 5183. And on that question, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative, the one concern or major concern that some of us had, had to do with volunteer EMTs. And... and I believe that the Amendment... the Senate... the Senate Floor Amendment #2 deals with that and exempts them from the fee for licensure, is that correct?"

Moffitt: "That is correct, Representative. An extremely important point, that for volunteer EMTs there will not be a fee. And that's very critical. You and I know that downstate it's sometimes difficult to get enough volunteers. And so this will allow them to have their EMT license at no charge if they're a volunteer."

Eddy: "As long as they're in a non-for-profit situation?"

Moffitt: "Right."

Eddy: "Okay."

Moffitt: "If they would become employed with that, then they would have to pay for a license."

Eddy: "Sure. I appreciate that change. It's something that I heard from in my eight rural counties whose volunteers were concerned about the fee. I appreciate you taking that out of there."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Moffitt: "Thank you pointing that out. Also, if we don't pass this legislation and create the revenue that's needed, it's easily could be that the department will no longer administer the test, which would basically double the cost to those that work as EMTs."

Eddy: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates he will."

Bellock: "Does this Bill affect... I had some problems with my local hospitals dealing with the critical care and the ambulances bypassing some of their hospitals. And there was a lot of discussion down here this spring on this. I'm not sure if this Bill affects that or not?"

Moffitt: "Representative, this... this would not have anything to deal with your question. This is simply setting... the whole Bill is setting standard for what critical care, what level of staffing, what kind of equipment you have to have if you're ground transportation. We have it for air, like Life Flight."

Bellock: "Right."

Moffitt: "We don't have the same for ground. In terms of procedure, like whether you bypass that hospital, that would be totally separate issue."

Bellock: "Okay. 'Cause I know that they were asking in that EMS for standards to be set because certain hospitals had said that all of the emergency vehicles should go to that

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

certain hospital. And this was a huge issue this spring and I want to make sure that this issue is not the same one?"

Moffitt: "Representative, I just... in response, this doesn't change anything in that procedure."

Bellock: "Okay."

Moffitt: "You will note that the hospital... when I listed the proponents, the Hospital Association..."

Bellock: "Well, it was the state EMS Advisory Council, I think, that was working on this issue with a lot of local hospitals in my area. And that's why, when I saw that state EMS Advisory Council, I wasn't sure if this was addressing that issue?"

Moffitt: "It... it doesn't change anything in that respect."

Bellock: "All right. Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it should be clarified here. You know, whenever I was a child growing up every... and this may sound ridiculous to many of the younger Representatives, but when a ambulance would roll out, quite often your ambulance was nothing more than a modified hearse at the local funeral parlors and they'd compete to see who would get to pick somebody up. Now, those times have changed. And now we're to the point that ground transportation to the hospital must have certain criteria for the betterment of the care that they can receive after leaving either the scene of an accident or your home when an ambulance has been called. All this does is kind of set

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

some standards. It's a sensible way to move into the future in emergency service personnel. I stand in support of the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Leitch: "I noticed the fire departments are in support of this.

Do you know offhand if Andrew Rand and the ambulance companies that we have in our area are in support as well?"

"Representative, it's my understanding... I'm not aware opponents whatsoever. The Illinois Ambulance any Association is in support and I think he's... that they are a member of that. I would want to check that out for sure, but I have not received any opposition whatsoever. Ambulance Association, there was a task force that met and worked over a three-year period to establish this criteria. I want to emphasize. This doesn't make anyone get licensed as a critical care transport. It's just if they want to, this is what the standard would be. Without this care transporting say between hospital to hospital, the level of care could potentially decrease in terms of staffing. This says that if you need a critical... if you're in critical condition, need to be transported you would... you could... if a doctor or hospital calls for a critical care ambulance you're going to get that same level of care that you would if it was Life Flight. So, the Ambulance Association, the Hospital Association, they are all supporters of this."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, I appreciate it."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition. This is final action. 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 Burke, Representative Cultra. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 97 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5183. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fortner, House Bill 5191."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5191. House Bill 5191 is a Bill that will improve the reporting small business financial impact for matters before JCAR. Senate Amendment 2 simply clarifies some of the things, the timeline at the request of JCAR and DCEO to make sure it fits with their timeline and also who would be able to request those reports. I ask for everyone's support of the concurrence."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5191. This is final action. 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 Lang, Representative McAuliffe, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5191. This Bill, having received

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Pritchard, House Bill 5193."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, 5193 was amended in the Senate to combine two great things. What is better than putting kids and ducks together? This is a Bill that we had that dealt with the Illinois 4-H Foundation license plate. In the Senate, they wanted to add Ducks Unlimited license plate as well. So, we have a Bill that deals with two special license plates. I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Mautino: "This is final action. The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to 5193. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 98 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5193. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5230, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "This is a Bill that we passed out of here, I believe it was unanimously. It went to the Senate. There was a technical… couple of technical Amendments over there. It's an initiative of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce and deals with the specific issue at DCEO. Ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Amendment #1 and 2 of House Bill 5230. And on that question, Representative Bassi."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

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

Bradley: "Yes."

Bassi: "Would you please repeat that slowly, Representative, so that we can understand what you said?"

Bradley: "You did that to me yesterday in committee."

Bassi: "Yes, I did."

Bradley: "So..."

Bassi: "And you did it to us again today."

Bradley: "I... I was talking fast 'cause I've got ice on my knee from my surgery a couple of weeks ago. So, I apologize. And after... after I got my rear end kicked earlier today, it didn't feel any better. So... so, it's an initiative of the Chamber and has to do with the Corporate Accountability Act. It's a specific issue, I believe, with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. It came out of the House overwhelmingly; I believe it was unanimous. It passed out of the Senate. I believe, again, it was overwhelming support. And a couple of Amendments, which I understand to be of a technical nature and back here for concurrence."

Bassi: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5230. No one seeking recognition. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- 5230. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 5290, Representative Coladipietro."
- Coladipietro: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5290. The Amendments are clarifying language requested by the Department of Corrections and they do not change the underlying Bill. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "This is final action. No one seeking recognition. The Gentleman moves that the House concur in 1 and 2 of House Bill 5290. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5290. This Bill, having received the constitutionally required number of votes, is declared passed. House Bill 5306, the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very good Bill for community based providers for mental health and substance abuse. It... Amendment 2 assures that the providers will be paid within the subsequent fiscal year. Given the times we're in, this is an important Bill to those agencies. And I would ask for your concurrence in Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5306. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5306. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative McCarthy."

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate if you'd have the Journal please recognize that I wish to be a 'no' on House Bill 5193. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Record will reflect. Representative Chapa LaVia, House Bill 5340."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to concur... move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The... Senate Amendment #1 what it did is added language requiring student teachers to undergo criminal background checks prior to participating in any field of clinical experience within the school district. This branched out of a situation while this Bill was going over to the Senate having to do with a student teacher that allegedly was... was cited with possible misconduct with a young... young child. So, they decided that this should be added in. teacher... student teacher would be required to pay for the fingerprinting, but the process itself as far as the fingerprints, the background check, would follow through to their... their position whichever school district they go into. So, it'd be part of their records anyway and is required once they are teachers. And I'll take any questions."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5340. And on that question, Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, Representative, as amended, is there a background check that's required?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, for student teachers."

Eddy: "Okay. So, it's still required. And who... I think you said this, but who did you say pays for the cost of the background check?"

Chapa LaVia: "The student teacher would pay for the background check because that file then would go with them into whatever school district they go into after that once they become a certified teacher in the State of Illinois. So, it's part of their process as it is."

Eddy: "So, they would be allowed then to use that background check. When they become employed, it would follow them?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. And then the idea would be then that if something occurred while they were student teaching or in the interim before they were hired, there would be a reporting requirement of that anyway under other applicable laws. So, that's the reason it's a onetime and it gets to follow them?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Eddy: "Actually, this could save school districts money because eventually student teachers are paying for their own

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

background check instead of school districts paying for it when they become employed."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "You're welcome."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House do concur... does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5340. This is final action. 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. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5340. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Bellock, House Bill 5350."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2, which addresses the issues of dangerous conduct and involuntary commitment with mental illness. We've already..."

Speaker Mautino: "Excuse me, Representative..."

Bellock: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Mautino: "...was it 2 or 2 and 3, for the record?"

Bellock: "Oh, 2 and 3."

Speaker Mautino: "Thank you."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. We've already passed this identical Bill in a Senate Bill. This is the same as the one sponsored by Representative… Senator Righter. And what this does is address the issue of dangerous conduct and

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

involuntary commitment. It's supported by all the mental health groups in the state. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from DuPage moves the House concurs in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5350. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jackson, Representative Mell, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0... 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5350. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Thapedi, House Bill 5409."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur, actually, in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. We were here in the House about this several months ago. It flew out of here with no dissenters. It went over to the Senate where we made some changes, most of them were all technical in nature. There was an additional change that set the effective date to 1-1-2011. That was to allow the title insurance industry to be able to comply with the changes that were made here. This is an excellent Bill. It's a collaborative effort by the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation, also the title insurance industry, the lending industry and the realtors. And I urge its 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Amendments 1, 2 and 3 of 5409. This is final action. All

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May, Representative Sente, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 5409. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Bradley, House Bill 5458."

- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that was an initiative of the Illinois Attorney General's Office. There was an Amendment, which again, was agreed to on this side, but in the interest of moving this along it took place over in the Senate just to clarify that it did not imply to certain employees. And it gives the Attorney General's Office the right to go out and collect subrogation claims against tortfeasors in public employee disability act cases. I've tried to say that slow."
- Speaker Mautino: "And we appreciate that. And the Gentleman moves to con... the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 5458. And the Gentleman from Vermilion is seeking recognition."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative, I... I'm trying to... Oh, that was in the original Bill. Let me just ask you the question. This does not allow or does it allow, if you're receiving workers' comp benefits, then would you still

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- receive a disability payment over and above workers' compensation?"
- Bradley: "I... I don't believe that this really addresses that.

 What this does is it says that if the state is paying under an employee disability claim and there's some other party out there that's responsible for the injury or the condition that they can go out and recover from that other party, the same way you do in other subrogation claims. It's actually a way for the state to recoup money that we're having to pay out on behalf of employees as a result of disabilities."
- Black: "This was... was this the Bill... staff just reminded me that local governments would have liked to have been included in this, but we couldn't get that worked out?"
- Bradley: "I... I don't know the answer to that."
- Black: "Okay. So, if a member... I'm trying to get this straight. If a... an employee of the Department of Corrections is injured by an inmate and is thus off on disability, in the past could we not go after that inmate to recover some of those costs?"
- Bradley: "The Attorney General believes that this legislation is necessary for us to initiate claims against third parties."
- Black: "Okay. All right. Thank you. Good idea."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5458. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative DeLuca,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Representative Wait, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5458. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5483, Representative Kosel."

- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5483. Senate Amendment #2 clarifies that local governing bodies are able to create whatever rules they would like to create for open meeting comment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #2. This is final action. 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. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5483. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Washington. Out of the record. Representative Rita, House Bill 5513."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I concur with Amendment #1. This was a drafting error by LRB, it was real technical. Ask to passage."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5513. This is final passage. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gordon,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Representative Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5513. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Hoffman, House Bill 5515."

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate amended this Bill, which passed overwhelmingly, providing for a greater flexibility to school districts in the utilization of funds. This is a technical Amendment, Senate Amendment #1, which provides for a public hearing and notice prior to the transfer."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5515. This is final passage. 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 Chapa LaVia, Connelly, Crespo, Flowers, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5515. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Osmond, House Bill 5571."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 5571. It just makes it... the changes over in the Senate were to clarify what promotional items were going to be discontinued for two years. And it just clarifies it."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5571. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Verschoore, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5571. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Schmitz, House Bill 5794. Excuse me. Representative Cole is seeking recognition. Mr. Schmitz, we'll get right back to your Bill."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 5515, I inadvertently voted 'yes'. I'd like to be recorded as a 'no'. 5515."

Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions." Cole: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Schmitz, thank you for that indulgence. House Bill 5749."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. The Bill passed out of here unanimously. It went over to the Senate and they put an Amendment on it. I really don't know what it does. So, I'd like to defer it over to Representative Reboletti who carried it through committee for me."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. As counsel to Leader Schmitz, I'd just like to advise the Body that was this does is moves the... we had a situation in Kendall County where there

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

was an issue with a forgery. And what this Bill does is allow, in a deceptive practice, that you can aggregate three different occasions over \$150 in three months that it could be charged as a Class IV felony. So, with that I would entertain any questions."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5749. This is final passage. 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. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5749. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Saviano, House Bill 5745. Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I stand to concur on Amendments... Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5745. Senator Harmon, my Senate Sponsor, took and cleaned it up and addressed some of the concerns of some of the groups. And I would concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5745."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5745. This is final action. 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 Feigenholtz, Representative Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5745. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mulligan, House Bill 5823. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It requires the Illinois Department of Veteran Affairs to establish a grant program to make grant entities that provide mental health and preventive maintenance services through the use of mobile units and the mobile crisis unit will concentrate efforts on homeless veterans and those veterans that have limited access to health care. The Amendment limited it to, which my Senator introduced, would make sure that they only go to places where there isn't an already established form of aid."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5823. This is final action. 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 Berrios, Representative Gordon, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5823. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Currie, House Bill 5833."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5833.

As the measure left us, it provided for a lower threshold for electronic filing from businesses. In the Senate it

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

was discovered the language we adopted last year, that was meant to reform the distribution of tobacco products, accidentally created a loophole. Many retailers are so small they can't buy from a distributor. So, what this Amendment does is to say that secondary distributors shall be permitted and will be regulated as are the original distributors by the Department of Revenue, but this means that the small retailers will be able to continue buying their supplies from larger retailers rather than from the distributor directly. I know of no opposition and I would appreciate your support for the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5833. Leader Stephens is seeking recognition."

Stephens: "Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Mautino: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Stephens: "I recognize most of your staff up there, but there's one that I don't recognize."

Speaker Mautino: "I bet it would be Nicholas Dotson."

Stephens: "Outstanding. He's doing... he's doing the yeoman work up there. Way to go, Nicholas."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, yes he his."

Stephens: "Way to go, Nicholas. Let's hear it for Nicholas Dotson."

Speaker Mautino: "And the Lady has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5833. This is final passage. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cole,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Representative Flider, Hannig, Mell, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5833. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Cole."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please?"

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Cole: "This afternoon in the Illinois House behind me in the gallery are students from my high school district in Gray's Lake, Gray's Lake North High School. Please join me in welcoming them to Springfield."

Speaker Mautino: "Welcome to the House of Representatives.

House Bill 5836, Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5836. It removes language in the Bill to ensure that families have the ability to determine whether or not it is appropriate that the individual child bring their inhaler to school. In the original Bill, it left that decision up to the health care professional, but the health care professional can only provide medical diagnosis, the prescription and necessary instructions on the inhaler. Anything outside of that is to be determined by the family."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5836. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Have all voted who wish? Representative McCarthy, McGuire, Schmitz, Wait, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Wait. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5836. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Nekritz, House Bill 5888. Representative Nekritz, House Bill 5888.

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 5888. This was a Bill to set some standardized arbitration rules for contracts and this removes the requirement established in the underlying Bill that arbitrators must despite... decide to dispute according to strict rules of law. And it also provides that none of the new rules are applicable to the substance of an arbitration dispute which was set out in the Bill apply... wait..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House..."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "...concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5888. This is final action. 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 Washington, would you like to be recorded? To vote? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5888. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Pihos, House Bill 6034."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Amendment #1 and #2 of House Bill 6034, but Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. And this provides technical assistance on playgrounds. The Department of Public Health shall provide technical assistance materials based on guidelines or standards such as the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, U.S. Access Board final guidelines or the standards of the American Society for Testing and Materials. And they shall be available on the department's Web site by June 30 of 2011. This Bill has no opposition that I know of and has been worked on with our park districts and the Illinois Department of Public Health."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6034. This is final passage. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6034. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 6080, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1, which is essentially some cleanup. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6080. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'... Excuse me. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Black: "Very briefly, Representative, I... is this the access to the original birth certificate law?"

Feigenholtz: "No, it is not."

Black: "Well, what... what does this do?"

Feigenholtz: "Could you hold on one second?"

Black: "I'd be more than happy to."

Feigenholtz: "Okay. This is a... essentially a Bill that takes language out of the Code for DCFS placements and puts it in the Adoption Act. It's an initiation... it's an initiative from the Chicago Bar Association, Representative Black."

Black: "The Chicago Bar Association. Oh, the lawyers' group?

There for a minute I was confused. Doesn't… doesn't require that you release family information does it?"

Feigenholtz: "One more question?"

Black: "Does... it doesn't require that certain family information be released?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Mautino: "Lady has moved the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6080. This is final passage... final action. 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 Cultra, Representative Leitch, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6080. This Bill, having received

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative McAsey, House Bill 6094."

McAsey: "Thank you. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1.

What this is, is a gut and replace Amendment. It maintains the language that we sent to the Senate, a technical change to the definition of neighborhood vehicles. Also, deals with an issue very important to our farm communities allowing them to use non-highway vehicles. And what the Senate added is language to allow for local municipalities, local control as to the vehicles that can be driven on their roads. And I would move to concur."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6094. No one seeing recognition. This is final action. Representative Black."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, this... is this the cleanup on the all-terrain vehicle language?"

McAsey: "It is. This is, yeah, the cleanup from the Secretary of State, the Farm Bureau language so that they can use... farm community can use the vehicles."

Black: "I come from a largely rural district and I've been instructed by several farmers who have called me to thank you for your work on this Bill and hopefully it gets a unanimous vote. Thank you."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6094?' This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lang, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6094. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Harris, House Bill 6124."

- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6124, which is a technical correction making sure that this applies to time barred limitation on all actions and not just to the one public Act mentioned in the original Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6124. This is final action. 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 Black, Representative Wait, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6124. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: approved for floor consideration is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 19."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Zalewski, House Bill 6151."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6151. The Senate made a change in the Bill that would simply remove the minimum fine aspect of the Bill and allows the court to impose a fine at its discretion. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6151. This is final action. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz, Representative Winters? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 6151. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Burns, House Bill 6202."
- Burns: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 6202. What the Bill does is create a ramp-up for the generation of solar power in the State of Illinois as part of our renewable portfolio standard. This is an agreed Bill that was negotiated between the environmental community, the business community and energy suppliers. And I look forward to getting an 'aye' vote on the Motion."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved the House concur in Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 6202. On that, the Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis."

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

Burns: "Yes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Reis: "Representative Burns, is the task force still in there?

 Does the Amendments add to the Bill?"
- Burns: "No, the Senate took out the task force. So, this Bill strictly deals with the renewable portfolio standard for renewable energy generation in Illinois."
- Reis: "Okay. Did you carry that similar language as well in the House?"
- Burns: "I'm... I'm sorry. I'm not... I don't quite understand the..."
- Reis: "Didn't you carry a Bill just like that in the House and now this was attached over in the Senate?"
- Burns: "Right. This Bill is a task… was started off as a task force Bill over here, the Senate stripped out the language and put in Amendments 1 and 3. And I'm moving to concur in those Amendments."
- Reis: "I understand that, Representative, but unless I'm confusing it with another Bill you had, there was some opposition to that Bill and that's why that Bill never made it out of the House. Now, it got attached over in the Senate as an Amendment. And I'm just wanting to make sure that everybody knows what they're voting on with this concurrence."
- Burns: "I'm not sure if I'm following you exactly,
 Representative. I'm not aware of... all I know is that this
 has been an issue that's been important to the
 environmental community. They worked with the ARES folks,
 the Competitive Energy Association, with business to come
 up with a way to phase in our ramp-up to the use of solar

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- power, six percent of our renewable energy source by 2014. That's what the Bill does."
- Reis: "I understand that. But I thought there was some opposition to that language when you carried it over in the House and that's why it never made it out of the House?"
- Burns: "I... I never sponsored that Bill. I never sponsored a solar energy Bill this year. I think Representative May had a Bill that dealt with this issue, but this Bill is not the same as that Bill."
- Reis: "Okay. Is the ICC still opposed? That shows in our analysis."
- Burns: "Yes. That's... that's on my analysis. I've not had a conversation with the ICC. The staff has not told me why they are opposed to it. They didn't... they did not show in committee, they didn't testify against the Bill in the committee. So, I can't explain the ICC's position."
- Reis: "Okay. One last question. We show that ARES is concerned, that they're neutral. They still think that there'll be a small rate increase on business class consumers because of this requirement. Can you address that?"
- Burns: "Again... and thank you, Representative, for raising the issue. There are two things. One is that this Bill was negotiated with the business community. My understanding is that the IMA and a number of the other business groups are neutral on this Bill with regards to the cost. It was negotiated with... with ARES and the competitive energy industry. And this is in the Bill that they're all agreed to."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In all due respect to the Sponsor, I think we get ahead of the curve sometimes on this, wind energy, photo electric, solar. All of these things are going to play an ever increasing important role, there isn't any doubt about that, but when you start trying to jump-start technology and say, what you will buy so much of your energy from this source and so much of your energy from this source, it... it isn't yet ready to be a mainstream player in the marketplace. You know, no matter how much you dream or how much you want to think that all of our energy is going to come from solar or wind or hydrogen cells or whatever, that's not going to happen tomorrow morning, it's not going to happen a year from now. there... there is opposition to this Bill. There is opposition to businesses who know that for every percentage of power they must buy from an alternative energy source, until that really is up and running and the distribution system is there, they're going to pay a higher price. That's, I think one, of the key reasons why the Illinois Commerce Commission is opposed to this Bill. They don't think that this is ready to be regulated in a reasonable fashion. We're jumping too far ahead. Technology is working brilliantly and in a few years I don't think this will be any problem at all, but right now, to say what you're going to do before you have all of the ingredients

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

together, you will increase your costs. And I think anybody whether it's your home electricity costs or ... or your business electricity or utility costs, you don't need increase right now. Let's wait until we additional technology. What good is wind power if it's not generating enough power when you need it in the middle of summer? The little turbines run like the dickens in the fall and spring and sometimes in the summer they don't turn at all. So, we've got a way to go and it's going to take a few years to get there. And I think we all want to get there. But this Bill, as I read it, is relying too much on technology that is not yet in the marketplace, it will raise costs. And I think that's one of the reasons and I'll certainly stand corrected if the Commerce Commission tells me, but I think that's one of the reasons the Commerce Commission opposes this Bill. And I intend to vote 'no'."

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

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield? Representative Burns, I'm... maybe I'm mistaken, but when I read this and I read the analysis, opposition seems to be very little after the Amendments. I think this came out of the Senate unanimous."

Burns: "That's correct, Representative."

Eddy: "After the negotiations. And the Citizens Utility Board has removed any opposition from this?"

Burns: "That's correct."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Eddy: "So, I understand the ICC may still be opposed based on just the idea that perhaps there's going to be additional cost. Now, I... I think some of these standards are going to be ramped up anyway by 2015."

Burns: "That's correct. The... there's a 6 percent... there's a requirement that 6 percent of the 20 percent of renewable energy sources will come from solar power by 2015. We don't change that in this Bill. What we do is provide a ramp-up to that 6 percent target over a three-year period. And the important reason why we want to do that is that if we do that we incent the creation of more solar energy generation here in Illinois as opposed to having our... the electricity generators having to purchase that solar power from other states because we haven't done what we were supposed to do to make sure we have capacity here in the State of Illinois."

Eddy: "Well, and the part of the Bill that... and with all due respect, I don't often disagree with some of my downstate colleagues, but I think the part of this Bill that's appealing to me is the potential for jobs."

Burns: "Yes."

Eddy: "Because of the renewable energy Bill and some of the requirements will actually create... I've seen estimates of thousands of jobs as we ramp-up to this."

Burns: "The... the conservative estimate is 5 thousand net jobs after the ramp-up is completed. An optimistic estimate goes as high as 15 thousand jobs. That's why the AFL-CIO, the Operating Engineers and a number of other unions are in

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

support of this Bill because they know it's going to create jobs for people in Illinois."

Eddy: "And... and this is limited to solar energy, is that correct?"

Burns: "That's correct."

Eddy: "This isn't about wind energy, this is solar. And it...
it's going to ramp us up to a required federal amount and
set some benchmarks along the way."

Burns: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. I think what we're... what we're doing this direction, this really adds some benchmarks that I think will... that will help us get there. And I intend to vote 'aye'. I think this is something it's time is coming and it will provide jobs to Illinois. Thank you."

Burns: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Franks: "Representative, right now current law requires that in 2015, 75 percent of our alternate energy must be from wind, correct?"

Burns: "Yes."

Franks: "And then at least 6 percent must be from photovoltaic's in 2015 as well?"

Burns: "Yes."

Franks: "So, what you're doing here is requiring a quicker ramp-up than what was previously required?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Burns: "Exactly. Right now, we go from 0 to 6 percent. And this provides a step to that 6 percent, which will result in solar energy being generated here in the State of Illinois as opposed to purchasing it from other states which have gotten ahead of us on that curve."

Franks: "Let me ask you why... I'm reading the solar and photovoltaic's. And I know there's a couple of different kinds of solar panels that are on the market right now. One is the typical solar that's used and if you generate more than what you're using in your home, for instance, you could sell it back on the grid. But the photovoltaic that actually almost serves as a battery doesn't it? And it... and it holds the power which can then be used at a latter time as opposed to the typical solar panel which is used at the time it's created?"

Burns: "That sounds correct, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. My qu... here's my... and I was listening to the debate and I like... I like your Bill, but my question was, what happens if our technology in the next few years finds a more efficient way to store the energy besides solar... besides the photovoltaic? And let's assume there's a new technology that could be cheaper to use and generate more energy, would we still need to require the 6 percent or could we move it to a different more efficient technology?"

Burns: "Well, you... you raise a great question. There... there ... there are a series of conversations that are occurring between the environmental community and energy generators about all sorts of mix... the mix for how we generate energy in the State of Illinois. That's a big broad conversation

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that's going to take some time for us to work out. I know people are interested in having those conversations, some of them are already started. This Bill does not change the definitions that already existed when we created the rate freeze and the Illinois Power Agency a few years ago. So, we're dealing with those definitions that are already in current law. As technology changes, I'm sure that we'll come back and... and work at changing that and look at other sources of energy as well."

Franks: "And that's why I'm wondering that maybe this might be better for a Resolution more so than a Bill to try to get them to get to these goals instead of necessarily mandating the ramp-up simply because of the issues we just discussed."

Burns: "Well, you know, part of the… part of the reason why you want to do this in a Bill is that… that we want to send a strong signal to the marketplace that solar is going to be an important part of the mix in Illinois and that we're not going to wait until 2015 to get to the 6 percent. There's also an argument that by putting this ramp-up in you will incent the market to come up with additional improvements in technology as opposed to waiting for 6 years. So, that's why I think we want to have this as a Bill. We want to change the law to make sure that that happens."

Franks: "Have we seen it being used in other states? I would think of warm weather, sunny states like Arizona or New Mexico or possibly southern California. Have they been using this type of technology and other mandates in those jurisdictions?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Burns: "We... my understanding from the environmental community there are states like Ohio that have weather very similar to us that are moving farther ahead in terms of generating more energy through solar and photovoltaic than we are. And the challenge is is that our law doesn't say that the energy has to be generated here in Illinois. An ARES or an electric... or a generator can purchase that energy from another state. And so what we're doing is... as my former boss would say, we're fattening frogs to feed snakes. We're making... we're creating jobs in other states and we're not creating jobs here in Illinois. And I know as you... as I've heard you talk many times on this floor you're concerned about creating jobs for people in Illinois..."

Franks: "Right."

Burns: "...and making sure that we're on the cutting edge of technology. This is an important step in that direction."

Franks: "So, you're going to be required actually to be created here in the state?"

Burns: "We don't require it to be created here in the state, but we believe that by having these goals set out you will encourage solar production here in the State of Illinois in advance of 2015 and that we will begin to ramp-up because we've put these steps into the law. One of the great things about solar energy, as you pointed out, that a lot of this energy can be generated locally on the tops of businesses, malls, et cetera. And by having this out there we begin to move that process forward."

Franks: "Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard, for what reason do you rise?"

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Yes, he will."

Pritchard: "Representative, do you have any idea why ICC is opposing this Amendment?"

Burns: "According to staff, the commission is concerned about some of the… about the costs to electricity consumers. But as I mentioned earlier, this Bill was negotiating… negotiated, it was an agreed Bill between the environmental community and the business community."

Pritchard: "So..."

Burns: "And that's why the Bill passed out of the Senate unanimously."

Pritchard: "So, isn't there some rate protection in this Amendment?"

Burns: "Is there some great..."

Pritchard: "Protection to prevent some unreasonable increase in costs?"

Burns: "There is a rate cap already in the law and that does not changed under this Bill."

Pritchard: "Is there any evidence that there is enough electricity out there today provided by solar that this wouldn't be a burden on energy users in the state?"

Burns: "The evidence is that the ramp-up was negotiated by the...
by ARES, by the competitive energy suppliers. So, they
understand that they could provide, they could meet this
burden. This was not done to them, this was done in
conjunction with them, in cooperation with them."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Pritchard: "So, to the Bill. Some of the individuals that have been proposing this and supporting it indicate that there is a national surplus of solar created energy today. So, that this should not create a burden, a shortage which would raise prices unnecessarily by ramping it in. And I would support the Sponsor's Motion."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Iroquois, Representative Cultra, for what reason do you rise?"

Cultra: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, he will."

Cultra: "Exactly what is the Illinois Power Agency Renewable Energy Resource Fund?"

Burns: "The fund is established for the power agency to purchase renewable energy."

Cultra: "All right. Where... where does the money come from?"

Burns: "We'll work on getting you an answer to that question, Representative."

Cultra: "Okay. Let's... let's go back to jobs. Right now, the renewable energy that the electric companies have to procure is from Illinois, right?"

Burns: "I'm sorry, one more time Representative?"

Cultra: "Right now, the requirement is that they have to buy this electrical energy they'd have to buy it... solar has to come from Illinois, I mean, right? I mean, there's... has to be produced in Illinois?"

Burns: "Right. That's... that sunsets in 2012."

Cultra: "Right. Right. So, I mean, when you're talking about then creating jobs if... if this thing... the procurement for Illinois sunsets then that means it opens up and they could

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

be procured from anywhere in the country. So, it's not going to create the kind of jobs we think it is if they can procure it anywhere in the country. Would you agree with that?"

- Burns: "Well, the... the problem is if you purchase solar energy from other states you lose some of that energy on the grid. And so it's more efficient to produce the energy locally and particularly, the way the solar energy is generated. So, if we have the ramp-up, we're sending a signal to the market that we want to purchase more energy from solar sources sooner than 2015. And that will incent more solar energy creation in the state."
- Cultra: "Now, would you say that producing solar energy it costs a lot more than what it would to produce, say, electricity from coal or nuclear power or even wind energy?"
- Burns: "My understanding is that solar may be slightly more expensive now. There's advances in technology that are coming. With respect to coal and nuclear energy, I don't have those data in front of me."
- Cultra: "Okay. Also, right now the consumer would be protected by ramping up the electrical... or this energy from solar, but not the business community, is that correct?"
- Burns: "That is correct. The rate cap applies to individual consumers, not to businesses."
- Cultra: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Fortner: "I think one of the important things as we look as these percentages is to keep in mind that the renewable energy portfolio is not the entire portfolio. So, when we're talking about one half percent to one and a half percent to three percent to six percent, we don't… we're not talking about the total percentage, we're just talking about that fraction of the renewable power, isn't that correct?"

Burns: "That is correct, Representative."

Fortner: "And that's a relatively small fraction of our overall electric supply under the Illinois Power Authority Act that procures that power, isn't that also correct?"

Burns: "That is correct, Representative."

Fortner: "So, we're really talking about a very small fraction. And I think as the Sponsor has pointed out, what we're trying to do is to make it clearer how we're going to get to that point. We established, when we did this Act three years ago, that we're going to have solar power at 6 percent of the renewable fraction by 2015, but we really didn't lay out how to get to there. What this Bill does, very simply, it just lays out the path of how we get there, and makes it clear to those who would be purchasing the power, bidding on the power and using the power how we get there from this point today. Isn't that basically what the Bill does, Representative?"

Burns: "That's correct, Representative."

Fortner: "Well, I rise in strong support of this initiative. I think this is a commonsense way when we establish the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

standards that we did, we also have an obligation to say how do we get there? We don't want to hit the consumers and the suppliers with a sudden jump saying, well, we didn't really want to think about it and all of the sudden you come in and you've got to jump up to a larger fraction. This way we bring it up gradually, the market can adjust in a reasonable fashion to that eventual 2015 standard. I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burns to close."

Burns: "Thank you, Speaker. We're all trying to create jobs and economic opportunity here in the State of Illinois, we've talked a lot about that this Session. This is another Bill that will go a long way to creating jobs for hardworking people throughout the State of Illinois, reduce our reliance on other... other kinds of energy, move the state forward tech... in creating new kinds of energy through solar, and make sure we have balance in our renewable energy portfolio. And this was a negotiated Bill with the business community, with the environmental community. This was an agreed Bill that came over from the Senate and I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 6202?' All in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', 0 'presents', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

and 3 to House Bill 6202. Mr. Clerk, we have House Bill 6241, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 6241. Senate Amendment #1 came as a response from the Illinois Manufacturers Association who thought that the… restores a provision in the Property Tax Code that says, real property includes permanent fixtures on the property. The engrossed Bill simply said that real property includes fixtures. IMA was afraid that without that added language it would result in the taxation of all gas, oil and coal and other minerals to be taxed as real property regardless of the current appraisal of land. Senate Amendment #2, on concurrence, adds to the Bill, it changes the effective date to January 1, 2011. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Bradley, for what reason do you rise?"

Bradley: "To the Bill. I remember when Representative Black first brought this to the Revenue and Finance Committee and I have to tell you that I was very skeptical about it. Skeptical of the concept, skeptical of whether or not he could ever reach an agreement, skeptical of whether or not he could ever come up with some type of workable solution on this issue. He's exceeded all my expectations and so I stand in support of this Bill today and the work that he's done in trying to make a more fair system here in the State of Illinois. And you know, this is a tough issue and it's going to continue to be a tough issue for us, but I think Representative Black has attempted to address this in a

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

very reasonable and workable manner. And we may have to do things in the future, but Representative, I'm willing as long as I'm here to try to continue to work on this issue even if you aren't."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

"Would the Sponsor yield? Rep... Representative, just a Eddv: couple of quick questions. As you know, this is something... a few years ago I had a fax machine burn up in my office with opposition letters to a similar proposal. And I know for years we... we've tried to make this much more equitable, I think is... is the intent here, so that those individuals who have certain types of homes, really they're just not... they're not going to be motor homes or mobile homes. They're not... they're on foundations or they're permanent. And I appreciate that. I did have some questions regarding the... the date... the implementation date of January 1. someone purchases a home prior to January 1, but it is not yet assessed because of the cycle of assessment, would it be then assessed for the first time next year and then be assessed under this new law?"

Black: "It's my understanding that it would depending on how it's meets the definition in this Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if it meets the definition of something that's to be no longer taxed under the Mobile Home Privilege Tax then it's... let's say, it's purchased in the fall sometime, but it's too late for the assessment cycle. That would be... that would be subject to the new type of assessment?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

"That... that is my understanding. However, if it meets the definition of a manufactured home, which is what we used to call trailers in my day, then obviously that is not going to change and it will be subject to the privilege If it meets the new definition of modular home, which is one that my brother just built, had trucked in to his land and erected on his land in the six figure range, that no longer is going to be subject to the privilege tax because it is in fact real estate and that's what the bankers and the mortgage association people wanted that changed. I would further point out that no one who is currently assessed under the property tax, excuse me, under the privilege tax, will have their assessment changed. And any dwelling located in a mobile home park will continue to be assessed at the privilege tax rate, which is I believe twenty-five cents a square foot and then after a few years it falls to seven cents a square foot."

Eddy: "And I think the key is that it's currently assessed."

Black: "Yes."

Eddy: "Those are the grandfathered, so..."

Black: "They are completely grandfathered."

Eddy: "And just so individuals, and I've had a few in my district call me and... and if they purchase something this fall before the effective date of the Bill though, that doesn't mean they're going to be grandfathered because the first assessment may not have taken place. And if that assessment doesn't take place, then they're not going to be grandfathered in?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Black: "Well, I think the Bill will protect them because it also establishes the Manufactured Home Installation Act. And if that manufactured home is, in effect, what we used to call a mobile home, then obviously the assessment will be on the privilege tax. We're trying to distinguish between what the assessors were going crazy for years. What is... what is real estate versus personal property? And I think it's... I think everybody that we've talked with for the four years are now in agreement that we've come up with a prospective definition."
- Eddy: "I appreciate that. I think it's something that's long overdue. I... I strongly support it and I urge an 'aye' vote. I especially appreciate the amount of time that you've put in on it and the number of changes. And I intend to vote 'aye' and I urge everyone to support this."

Black: "Thank you."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz, for what reason do you rise? Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's probably... to the Bill. I think this has been a problem for quite a while, trying to decide what is real property. And I... having served on the county board for a long time, it is really hard with the current statute. And I think the... the biggest concern that we have is... is that the manufacturing of manufactured homes now are... have transcended our tax laws. And I commend the Sponsor in working to... or in updating our laws and I think this is a fair and equitable resolution. And I appreciate his hard work and plan on supporting the Bill. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6241?' All in favor should vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6241. Representative Beiser, we have House Bill 6349."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Beiser: to concur on Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill The first Amendment is to correct a drafting error. The second Amendment and the third Amendment deal with a couple of provisions dealing with private right of action and the fine. What Senate Amendment #2 does, it provides that a private right of action may only be brought 30 days or more after a complaint has been filed with the Department of Labor by any interested party or person agreed by the... by a violation of this Act. Or number 2, anytime after the filing of a complaint if the department notifies the party they're not going to pursue it then they can move forward. And it also reduces the fine from 1 thousand to \$500. It passed out of the Senate unanimously and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 6349?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 6349. Representative Mautino, we have House Bill 2369."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2369. And the Senate Amendment 3 became the Bill and it allows the Illinois Finance Authority to collect up those recovery zone bonds off the Build America Program. It will collect them up that are unused without... throughout the counties and the cities, regions. It will be able to redistribute them back to the local, for example, the Upper Illinois River Development Authority in my area, your local CDCs or they would be able to utilize them. I know of no opposition, this has been agreed to. And appreciate your vote on concurrence."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would the Sponsor yield? Representative, there was some considerable opposition to this Bill whenever it went over to the Senate, has the underlying Bill been removed and just the language that you have just addressed?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Sullivan: "So, the underlying Bill is... is gone and just what you just said is the only part that we are seeing today?"

Mautino: "Senate Amendment #3 becomes the Bill. So, it was..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Mautino: "...basically everything was replaced. And the controversial pieces are out. There's no opposition."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Turner: "No further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2369?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nays', 0 'presents'. And this Bill... and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2369. Representative Crespo, we have House Bill 6419."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 6419. They basically just clarify language in the underlying Bill as requested by the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and Exelon. It doesn't change the underlying Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 6419?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 6419. Representative Reitz, we have House Bill 6420."
- Reitz: "Thank you. I was waiting for you to… I'm ready. I move for adoption of… or to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. This deals with the Funeral Directors Bill and the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Senate made some changes that allows the IDFBR to adopt rules in governing embalming facilities. And also requires funeral directors and representatives to stay and personally witness the burial. This is for at-need funeral homes. And I'd be happy to… or at-need funeral needs. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean..."

Reitz: "On Third."

Speaker Turner: "...Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, just a couple points of clarification that we worked on this. I want to make sure that this is in response to the Cemetery Oversight Task Force directly. It's some of the recommendations from the committee that many of us served on, is that correct?"

Reitz: "That's correct."

Brady: "And this does not address a particular issue that the Funeral and Burial Pre-Need Task Force, of which I cochaired and was members with others in this Body, it doesn't address licensure issues that exist when it comes to pre-need in the funeral industry, is that correct?"

Reitz: "No, that's correct. It's simply at-need. Actually, in the Senate Amendment it says that it... it specifically says that it does not affect the ability of a person to sell pre-need burial services."

Brady: "So, leaving to the Pre-need Task Force potentially legislation hopefully that will address the challenges of

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

problems we have in the pre-need funeral industry when it comes to licensure?"

Reitz: "Those are left in your very capable hands."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6420?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 6420. Representative Burns, we have House Bill 6462."

Burns: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate in Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 6462. 6462, as we passed it out from the House of Representative unanimously earlier in the Session, deals with juvenile prostitution, sex trafficking gangs here in the State of Illinois and people who solicit juvenile prostitutes and parents of juvenile prostitutes. It's a comprehensive Bill and is supported by Cook County State's Attorney Anita Alvarez. The Senate Amendments do several things. One, they narrow some of the eavesdropping authority that was given to local state's attorneys. Some of the criminal penalties, while there is still an increase over current law, they were scaled back a little bit. I worked hard to try to push for a suggestion made by Representative Reboletti here on the House Floor to include that anyone who was involved in juvenile prostitution there would be non-probation able

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

offense. We had tough sledding in the Senate to get that in, but we did fight for that with the State's Attorneys Office and other proponents. But the Bill is still a very good Bill. It will give the State's Attorneys Office the tools that they need to fight sex trafficking gangs, to crack down on juvenile prostitution and to make sure that the victims of juvenile prostitution, the prostitutes themselves are directed into social services. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know you... you had talked about this Bill when it first went through here, but maybe to remind the Members a little bit about the major purpose of the Bill besides the... that we talked about the penalty enhancement phase?"

Burns: "The major thrust of the Bill was to crack down on juvenile prostitution and to give our state's attorneys and law enforcement officials the tools they need to crack down on sex trafficking gangs. Because of Illinois location in terms of transportation, tourism and the like, we have a thriving sex trafficking rings in the state and our law enforcement officials didn't have the tools in the toolbox to crack down on this. So, we gave them some of the same powers they have to deal with drug gangs. We increased criminal penalties for those who solicit juvenile

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

prostitutes and we increased... and we made sure that there was a way to get juvenile prostitutes to social services."

Reboletti: "I'm trying to find that on my computer, but there was an article today somewhere about arresting some juvenile pimps in the suburbs. And I think it was quite eye-opening to find out about the sex trade in Chicago because of the conventions. But I have to tell you that I am disappointed in the Senate's action. I think we all can agree here that if you're a juvenile pimp that prison it... it should be mandatory. I don't know what... how you can rehabilitate somebody who takes children and traffics them and puts them out there for sale. So, I'm not going to let that portion, at least at this time, stop my support for the Bill, but hopefully we can work on this again next year. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise?"

Miller: "Thank you... thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Miller: "Just real briefly, I think following up with the previous speaker's comments. I think that there was two juveniles in Dalton, Illinois, that were arrested for basically having a young lady serve as a prostitute. They were arrested for pimping. Would the… would it be mandatory where regardless of age this Bill would apply?"

Burns: "To... to the pimp?"

Miller: "That's correct."

142nd Legislative Day

- Burns: "One second, Representative, we're going to get that answer."
- Miller: "Would it be the judges or the discretion whether to charge them as a minor or an adult in a particular case? Because I guess just my concern or my... my question really is whether a juvenile who's... who's engaged in pimping of prostitutes or getting women to, in this particular situation, would that... would this apply to them?"
- Burns: "They would... if they were a juvenile engaged in the... as a pimp, the pimp was a juvenile they would be guilty of juvenile pimping and they would be subject to the adult... to the adult penalties. That's my understanding."
- Miller: "Okay. I'm sorry. Say that one more time 'cause you..."
- Burns: "If the juv... if the person, if the pimp was a juvenile, that juvenile pimp would be held accountable to... it... I'm being told that it depends on the age of the juvenile pimp... on... and the specific concrete situations of the case. Did you... did you get that, Representative?"
- Miller: "I think what I heard was that this law would be applicable regardless of... or can be, the offender can be charged based on... regardless of age, is that what I'm hearing?"
- Burns: "The offender, if they're a juvenile, the court would have the discretion to adjudicate them in juvenile court or charge them as an adult in adult court."
- Miller: "Okay. That's the clarity. Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 6462?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 6462. Representative Chapa LaVia, for what reason do you rise?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote on House Bill 6241. My seatmate over here voted me 'no', but I wanted to be recorded as a 'yes'. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will so reflect that your seatmate did the wrong thing. Representative Reitz, we have House Bill 19. Dan?"
- Reitz: "Thank you. I'd like to concur with Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 19. This provides some bonding authority for a high school in Cahokia, Representative Jackson and my district. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 19?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 19. Mr. Clerk."

142nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee announcements. The following committees will meet at 4:30 p.m.: the Appropriations and Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will meet in Room C-1, Elementary & Secondary Education Committee will meet in Room 114 and the Executive Committee will meet in Room 118."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, if I can have your attention. We're going to go to committees, you heard the announcement on the committees. We're going to go to committees at 4:30 and then we will return back to the floor at 5:00. You've heard the committee announcements and the House will stand at ease until the hour of 5:00."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Attention, Members. The House of Representatives will convene in five minutes. The House will convene in five minutes."
- Speaker Turner: "The House will come to order. And under the Order of Concurrences, on page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Mautino, we have House Bill 5217."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5217. What's contained in the two Amendments, the Bill is changed from the form that we sent it over in, in that the director of the Department of Insurance may have the ability to appoint two public representatives to the Board of Directors of the Life and Health Insurance Guarantee Association. This takes care of a quorum problem. And the second Amendment for the concurrence is a page and line Amendment which restores what the current law is regarding the Life and Guarantee Health Insurance Association. The original Bill we sent

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

over had granted an... one organization an increase in immunity and by discussions with the Trial Lawyer's Association, we just returned it to the current existing law. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5217?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5217. This Bill passed, having received a hundred... and the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5217. And this Bill passes... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, passes. Clerk, committee reports."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2101. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2270. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2010: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 226."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Ramey, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Ramey: "Looking over seeing many Democrats on the floor, it'd probably be a good time to do this. Today, my family and I are celebrating the 80th birthday of former Senate President James 'Pate' Philip. And we wanted to send out an invitation on June 13 at 12:30 they will be dedicating a bust of his likeness at the DuPage Sheriff's Office in front of the James 'Pate' Philip Forensic Science Center. So, June 13 at 12:30 everybody's invited and come celebrate his good work in DuPage County."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you for the announcement. Representative Feigenholtz, we have House Bill 5429."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur on Senate Amendments 2 and 3. These are just cleanup Amendments that clarify a 30-foot height limit on condominiums. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"

Osterman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

Osterman: "So, Representative, this helps some of those larger condominium buildings that would, under the previous Bill, not have been able to deal with the solar panels? This would give them that flexibility if they wanted to pursue that?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Feigenholtz: "Representative Osterman, this Bill is really more guided toward homeowners' associations and townhomes, it doesn't involve buildings over 30 feet."

Osterman: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions... I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates she will."

"Thank you. Representative, I live in a subdivision that has a homeowners' association. These are, for the most part, single-family dwellings. There are a duplexes and a few condominiums in this subdivision. we have many codicils... deed restrictions. We're allowed to have satellite TV receivers. We're not supposed to build inground swimming pools and anything that we do to dwelling is supposed to approved our be bv the architectural committee of the homeowners' association. isn't as strict as some are, but... and I would have to check, but my guess is a passive solar collector on a roof would be prohibited under the current homeowners' agreement. Now, what does this Bill say that a homeowners' association cannot have a restrictive covenant that says we don't want solar panels on the roof of a house or off to the side of a house in our subdivision?"

Feigenholtz: "Essentially, what it does, Representative Black, it's a... the beginning of requiring homeowners' associations to stipulate and to clarify in those declarations that you are referring to whether or not they allow the installation

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

of them. So, for home buyers who are looking to use alternative methods of energy, there's transparency and clarity from the outset. That's all."

Black: "Okay. So, for purposes of legislative intent, if a homeowners' association wants to say that your passive solar collector cannot be on the roof where it is visible to other residents or it cannot be in the front or side yard, will this still be allowed? I mean, is it a decision that a homeowners' association will be allowed to make?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Black: "So, it... it's just giving absolute notice to somebody's who's going to buy a house in this area that if you want to put in a collector... solar collector system you will not be able to do so in this subdivision, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. That's exactly what it does."

Black: "All right. So, it's completely prospective?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5429?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Biggins? The Clerk shall take the Roll. On this question, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Schmitz, the Gentleman from Kane."

142nd Legislative Day

- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Could the record reflect and remove Representative Sommers for the rest of the evening."
- Speaker Turner: "The Clerk will so… the Clerk will make… remove him from the Roll. Representative Eddie Washington on House Bill 5494."
- Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for concurrence on House Bill 5494, its Amendment. This Bill is a Bill that aids the ISP when they have to take an officer, an active officer to bring him to court. Sometimes, from time to time, the defendant or the person charged with the violation sometimes is not aware that it's a cost whenever an officer comes to court and puts a great burden on the State Police. This will give a \$75 fee for reasons that are not legitimate to not show up to return some of that cost back to them. And I ask for a favorable consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5494?' This is final action. All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5494. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Careen Gordon, House Bill 5677."
- Gordon, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is... I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2.

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

This is... changes the definition of good funds in real estate transactions. It is finally an agreed Bill at the suggestion of the realtors. And it was all taken care of in the Senate as was promised when it passed out of the House regarding what is good funds when it is over and under \$50 thousand in the transactions. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5677?' This is final action. All those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no'. And the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5677. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino on House Bill 5732."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5732. And the change the Senate made is that the Department of Transportation will develop an annual application process for existing or potential participants to request the initial appropriation for the amount exceeding the formula amount. And that's currently 65 percent of eligible operating expenses. It's going to have three pieces to it. It must... it requires a description of the new service area, a proposed service area in the new area and a budget for

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

providing existing and new service. This has to do with when an existing, for example, in my area it'd be paratransit, is going to pick up additional territory. In this case, Bureau County is going to pick up Putnam County. And they're ready to go. They've met all the requirements. This would allow them to receive the moneys to operate. And it's... originally, it happened automatically. Now there's going to be a process of application to the Department of Transportation. The downstate mass transit all agree with this, as does IDOT. There's no opposition. And I ask the House to concur."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5732?' This is final action. All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mulligan. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 to House Bill 5732. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fritchey on House Bill 5772."

Fritchey: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. I'm actually handling this matter for Representative Mendoza who is not available right now. This was the pet shop owner disclosure legislation that had passed out of this House before. There were modifications made to the Senate and let me simply say, on behalf of Representative Mendoza, there is no opposition to this Bill anymore. Those parties

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that had concerns when the Bill came out of here have had their concerns addressed. They are now either neutral or in favor of the Bill. Essentially, the changes that were made had to be... were done in a paring down of those notifications that had to be posted by the pet shop. And with those changes that were made, the pet store owners and all interested parties are now, as I said, neutral or supportive of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Jasper, Representative Reis, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Reis: "Representative, could this now be your last Bill?"

Fritchey: "You know what, it... it's somewhat fitting that 14 years ago my first Bill had to do with feline tranquilizers and my last Bill is now having to do with pet shops. So, somewhere in between the two there's a connection here, but unanticipatedly, yes, this is now it."

Reis: "What's even more ironic is I stand in support of your Bill today, after the changes in the Senate. This has been a long drawn out controversial process, but I do stand in support of the Lady's Bill and intend to vote for it. Thank you."

Fritchey: "I'll... I'll assume you're referring to Representative Mendoza with that comment."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. If it indeed is to

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

be Mr. Fritchey's last Bill, then the process will be lessened by his absence. And I just wanted to indicate that he's one of the individuals that you hate to see go because he's added a great deal to the process. And I think he'll be sorely missed, but he's moving on to bigger and better things. But I just want the record to reflect that his first Bill dealt with a cat tranquilizer and his last Bill dealt with information on cats and dogs. It gives me an indication that, as nice a man as he is, he hasn't had a great deal of growth in the type of legislation he sponsored."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Miller, for what reason do you rise?"

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure if this is the appropriate time, but... but I have to say the same thing that Bill Black just said. John Fritchey's been a tremendous Legislator here, if this is his last Bill. That it will be sad; he'll be sorely missed. You know, in this process that we go through, some folks shine within their own self, John is one of them. We can sit here and talk about numerous things not dealing with the Legislator, our lives, our families and stuff and when a certain piece of legislation comes up, it's almost like a Bill, that a ring would just go off and he will all of a sudden get in tune to it. So, anyway I want to commend him on his friendship, leadership and we all want to wish him well."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake, Representative May, for what reason do you rise?"

May: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

- May: "Yes, Representative, we've established this is your last Bill and that you do a lot of pet Bills. And as someone who has shared a secretary with you my entire term down here, I want to ask you, didn't you also have a Bill about protecting the rights of chickens laying eggs?"
- Fritchey: "I... I've tried to be equal protection when it comes to my animal protection."
- May: "Oh. Well, you know, I... I don't know if you know but during the time that you sponsored that Bill and some of your other animal Bills, no one could get through to my office. You know, the lines were just tied up all the time. But I'm glad that you are a leader in protecting animals in this state. I thank you for all the leadership that you have shown on your years here in Springfield."
- Fritchey: "Well, I appreciate that, Representative May. I just hope we… let's just… we can stick to this Bill for right now and handle that at the right time. I appreciate that and I apologize for going through our mutual fax cartridge many times, but I assure you I probably got more faxes regarding mercury legislation than you did on chicken legislation. That being said, Speaker, are there any other questions on the Bill?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Black has another one.

 Representative... the Gentleman from Vermilion, you spoke once?"
- Black: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I just got a call and if I could relay the message with the indulgence of the Chair? There are just a few of us, you and I and maybe Mr. Fritchey and

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

a few others that are old enough to remember this. It's the old Buster Brown shoe song. And I'd just like to say as it goes, 'Arf, Arf, that's my dog Tide, he lives in a shoe. I'm John Fritchey, look for me in there, too'."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Will, Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As long as we're talking about Representative Fritchey and pets. I'd like those of you that were here to remember his very first Bill that went on and on and on and on, which was about ketamine. And Bill Black, as a result, talked quite a bit about the fact, what does a man from Chicago know about ketamine and the drug ketamine, that was a veterinarian drug? So, it seems almost full circle that if this is your last Bill that it also relates to pets."

Speaker Turner: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5772?' This is final action. And all those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5772. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Second-Readings, we have Senate Bill 3215. Speaker Madigan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3215 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, please withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment and then the Bill would be a trailer Bill to the McPier Reform Bill, which was carried in Senate Bill 28. Senate Bill 28 named Jim Reilly as the trustee of the authority, but does not provide a method to remove the trustee or appoint a successor in the event of a vacancy. This Bill makes three changes to address those Number one, the Bill permits the General questions. Assembly to remove Mr. Reilly by a Joint Resolution approved by a majority of those elected to each chamber. Two, the Governor is given the authority to fill a vacancy in the position of trustee provided the vacancy is subject to Senate confirmation that must be filled within five Three, the Bill calendar days. provides for the appointment of an acting trustee in the event the trustee certifies that he or she is unable to perform his or her duties. And finally, to ensure that there is no confusion, the Bill adds language identifying Mr. Reilly as the person who formally served as CEO of the McPier Authority, CEO of the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau and chairman of the RTA Board. Next, Senate Bill 28 permits the authority to enter into a marketing agreement with the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau and requires the Bureau to make several necessary reforms. The Bill requires the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Bureau to amend its bylaws to provide for a 25-member board with no more than two members from the restaurant and attractions industry. This Amendment would change the composition of the board to allow no more than 2 members from the restaurant industry and no more than 2 members from the attractions industry. Next, Senate Bill 28 would establish a revolving door prohibition for the trustee, the members of the board and the employees of the authority. The intent of that prohibition was to prohibit the trustee, board members and employees from accepting employment from a person or an entity contracting with the authority for a period of one year if the person personally and substantially participated in the award of a contract to the person or entity offering employment. This Amendment would clarify that employees of the authority are permitted to accept employment from a private manager, contracted to run the authority, except those employees who personally or substantially participated in awarding the private manager contract. Lastly, Senate Bill 28 requires the authority to use a manner substantially similar to the Procurement Code when procuring the private management contract professional service contracts. The Bill requires that if ... this Amendment would require that the authority procure those contracts strictly in accordance with the Illinois Procurement Code, thereby removing the word 'substantial'.

I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Turner: "On this question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Yes. Speaker Madigan, is this your last Bill?"

Madigan: "Unfortunately, for certain people, no."

Black: "Not me, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "I know."

Black: "I would for the record, Mr. Speaker, trying to figure out our position and help us understand what tomorrow may be. Is it your intent that to… if you can tell us, that tomorrow you intend to move for an override on the Amendatory Veto of the McCormick Place Reform Bill?"

Madigan: "The answer is, yes."

Black: "And then this Bill addresses a portion of the concern the Governor had expressed?"

Madigan: "That's correct."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3215?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 3215, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan."

142nd Legislative Day

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment becomes the Bill. And I move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "On that question, Representative Davis, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."
- Davis, W.: "Just a couple of questions, very quickly, Mr. Speaker. As we are talking about, presumably, Mr. Reilly becoming the trustee and when you were reading some of the tenants of the Amendment, one of the things that it said you identified all of his former positions, CEO of the Authority, CEO of the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau, but he is still currently the chairman of the RTA Board, correct?"
- Madigan: "The answer is, yes."
- Davis, W.: "Does he plan to resign his RTA Board position or is there some requirement that he would have to resign that position in order to become trustee of McPier?"
- Madigan: "He plans to resign from the RTA. And I believe this matter has been discussed with the members of the RTA Board either formally or informally. And it is the judgment of the Board that he would be required to leave the RTA if he were to take this position."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 3215?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang on page 5 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 744. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 744 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. This relates to a simple issue. Under the current... under the current modeling that OTBs use for where they're going to have their operations, they no longer build freestanding facilities. It's in their best interest and the interest of many, job creation, et cetera, for them to locate inside of places like sports bars and restaurants where they have an arrangement where they pay rent. That's been good for the sports bar and the restaurant; it's been good for the OTB. It's brought business to both. The problem with that it relates to the Video Gaming Act. The Video Gaming Act we passed prohibits... would prohibit those sports bars and those restaurants from having the video gaming devices. Because of that, many of the restaurants and sports bars are now pushing the OTBs out. They're saying, well, you know, we can make more money from the devices than we can from having you here, so out you go. And so, this Bill would

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

allow for those sports bars and restaurants that house OTBs to have the devices, that all the other bars and liquor pouring establishments can have under the Video Gaming Act, so long as there's no revenue sharing between the two. It would not be good public policy to allow the OTBs to share in the video gaming revenue. And so the Bill... the Amendment is very clear that there could be no such sharing at all. So, that's what the Amendment does. It's there to help protect the agribusiness, the horse racing industry, but also allow these bars and other establishments to survive. It would be unfair for them to not be able to have these machines, these devices, if the guy down the block with the same kind of establishment can have it. So, this is about fundamental fairness, jobs, et cetera. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fritchey, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Fritchey: "Representative, just one question. When you talk about no cross ownership, is that between the entities or could an individual have an ownership interest in the bar and an ownership interest in the OTB?"

Lang: "The answer is, no. There could be no cross ownership of any type."

Fritchev: "Even at the individual level?"

Lang: "That's my understanding of the way the Bill is drafted, Sir. And for legislative intent, I would so state."

Fritchey: "Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment 3 to House... Senate Bill 744?' All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 744, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "The Amendment became the Bill. I move for passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 744?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, we have Senate Bill 2101. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2101 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Leader Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 deals with a fund transfer within the Illinois Department of Financial and

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Professional Regulations. And this will transfer \$4.2 million from the... from a locally held fund to help support six funds, primarily \$4.2 million would be transferred to the Savings and Residential Finance Fund, but also will assist with... with five other funds that are low and looking at to having financial difficulties between June 10 and August 10 of this year. This Bill... or the Amendment this morning we've had, was controversial. We've had meetings with the banks who had the \$5 million within the locally held fund. And we've had meetings throughout the day, the banks have gone neutral on the Bill. And what they had requested is to work with the department in beefing up the financial oversight in education funds. This money came from a national lawsuit and it was a proceeds of a settlement. There were \$20 million in the settlement, 15 million went to the General Revenue Fund in 2005, 5 million went to the Bank Education Fund. They've been using about \$30 thousand a year from this fund. And through our negotiations, in the course of this afternoon, the banks have gone neutral and will allow for this money to be transferred into primarily the Savings and Residential Finance Fund. And I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative, as we heard in Executive Committee a little bit ago, I just wanted to clarify the fact that the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

funds being swept... it's the fact also that the money that they accumulated in this fund for a variety of reasons was not being used as it was really intended with the number of bank examiners being out amongst the banks throughout the state doing their job, because of the reduction in numbers of those examiners, is that correct?"

Mautino: "That is correct."

Brady: "Okay."

Mautino: "And that's..."

Brady: "And so therefore, in your discussions and negotiations with the bankers, the Community Bankers and the department, there's been agreement that there will be enhancement of the examiners and the work throughout the state, the very important work."

Mautino: "Correct. And to expand on that, it's partially due to the Bill that we passed here through the Legislature that's creating the bank board. And so, the community banks and the Illinois Bankers Association is going to work with the department to make sure that they get the additional training dollars and commitment from this fund, that there is money within the fund to do that."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question... the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #3?'

All those in favor should say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

142nd Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2101, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you. I've explained the… the Amendment became the Bill. And so, I've explained that. I would simply ask for an 'aye' vote and be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."
- Mulligan: "Representative, where does the money for this foundation come from?"
- Mautino: "The money that was in the education fund came from a lawsuit settlement. It was a national lawsuit which involved Illinois, New York and the Federal Government."
- Mulligan: "So, is it a onetime... it's a onetime only amount of money? It's not an ongoing amount?"
- Mautino: "No, that's correct. It's a onetime amount of money that was deposited into this fund in 2005."
- Mulligan: "So, if you take the money it won't be used for what the lawsuit was originally for and it will go somewhere else and not come back?"
- Mautino: "The lawsuit... the money was at the discretion of the department from the proceeds of the funds. They put 15 million into General Revenue Fund, 5 million they placed in the education fund. And that's what our negotiations were about today with the Illinois Bankers and the Community Bankers. They've agreed to allow the money to go from

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

their education fund into the Savings and Residential Finance Fund, but there is no provision to put that money back."

Mulligan: "So, they've decided to just let it go and is that because they feel their feet are being held to the fire or this was a reasonable negotiation? The last time we swept a banking fund they came back and raised fees for bankers. And that came through JCAR and I was not particularly pleased with that. So..."

Mautino: "That's a very good question. The answer to that is through the course of the negotiations the banks and the department have made a commitment through the new board that we created to increase the amount of training and dollars available for the... for the financial bank examiners. And so, it was a cordial... no one likes to have their funds swept or changed, but by this agreement they think both sides are going to benefit. And the banks do understand the predicament the Department of Professional and Financial Regulation is in."

Mulligan: "So, they feel this was a reasonable negotiation and they're in agreement with it?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 2101?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 0

142nd Legislative Day

- 'presents'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Smith, on page 3 of the Calendar we have Senate Bill 226. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second. Mr. Clerk, place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 Amendments 2 and 3 were adopted on the floor. Floor

 Amendment #5, offered by Representative Smith, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Smith on Amendment #5."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is... first of all, this Smith: Amendment becomes the Bill. And it incorporates language that this Body has dealt with earlier this Session on principal preparation and work that Representative Eddy has done. Unfortunately, the Senate decided to take a slightly different path and so there have been extensive negotiations going on for several weeks and this is the result of that. This is significant reform legislation changing the way in which we prepare principals in the State of Illinois. Would create for the first time a separate principal's endorsement, would require all principal preparation programs to be approved by the Board Higher Education, would require those individuals seeking a principal endorsement to have a master's degree,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

four years of teaching experience and one year internship. who currently have individuals administrative endorsement on their certificate would be grandfathered in, those individuals who are currently serving as principals or assistant principals. addition, at the request of the Chicago Public Schools, there is a provision that would allow not-for-profit organizations to offer principal preparation programs as They would not be offering degrees, but only those preparation programs that would allow for the principal endorsement. Those not-for-profit entities would have to be approved by the Board of Higher Education. At this point, I know that the Illinois Principals Association and the Chicago Principals Association are neutral, but the State Board of Education as well as most of the education advocacy groups and the Illinois Education Association are all proponents. I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I'd move for the passage of Amendment #5."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Riley, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Riley: "Representative, I just have a question to clarify something for me. Now, the not-for-profits that you spoke of, would they be able to provide courses as an adjunct to principal preparation or are you talking about being able to offer an entire program which would lead to principal certification?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Smith: "They can offer a program, but that would have to be in partner with... in partnership with a institution of higher education. Many of them are currently doing that. They... they cannot offer the degree. They're simply there to partner with an institution of higher education in offering the principal endorsement on the... on the certificate."

Riley: "Understood. So, they're an adjunct to, but they're not..."

Smith: "That's right."

Riley: "...a replacement for?"

Smith: "That's right, exactly."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can these principals who go through the training or what have you of a nonprofit, can they be principals all over the State of Illinois?"

Smith: "Excuse me. Mr. Speaker, this is on Second. Could we just adopt the Amendment and then have the debate on... on Third?"

Speaker Turner: "With the indulgence of Representative Davis, we want to move this Amendment to Third Reading. So, there are no further questions on this Amendment. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 226 pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr..."

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. All Motions have been filed."

142nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 226, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, you have a question?"
- Davis, M.: "Yes, thank you, again, Mr. Speaker. Can the principals who go through the training with the nonprofits, can they be principals all over the State of Illinois?"
- Smith: "Yes. Yeah."
- Davis, M.: "They would be prepared?"
- Smith: "A principal endorsement would be good throughout the State of Illinois."
- Davis, M.: "So, besides the nonprofits giving an endorsement, who else in the state would give an endorsement for a principal?"
- Smith: "Any of the institutions of higher education that are currently... you know, Illinois State University, Northern, Concordia, I think does a lot of them as a private institution of higher education."
- Davis, M.: "Do we feel that our state universities and our private universities are doing an inadequate job in preparing principals?"
- Smith: "No, that's certainly not the intent, Representative Davis. But there has been a goal, actually a goal of this General Assembly, we created a School Leadership Task Force recognizing that we wanted to improve the rigor by which we train principals and school leaders, recognizing the fact that students will do better in those schools that have the best possible principals and the best possible teachers."

142nd Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "So, okay, Representative, are you saying that we're... our universities are not preparing them with the most rigor, that the private institutions or nonprofits..."
- Smith: "No."
- Davis, M.: "...can prepare them in a better fashion? Who are the private... who are the private institutions... I mean, they're not institutions, private agencies that are going to train principals for the State of Illinois? Who are they?"
- Smith: "Representative Davis, I'm not aware of what entities may be out there. To my knowledge, there's currently just one that is working with CPS and that is New Leaders For New Schools, I believe."
- Davis, M.: "Can the Chicago Urban League become a nonprofit that trains principals?"
- Smith: "Well, they would..."
- Davis, M: "Can Rainbow Push... Chicago Rainbow Push become an entity that trains principals?"
- Smith: "Yes. They would have to be certified by the Board of Higher Education, by the State Board of Education and by the Teacher Certification Board. So, they've got to go through quite a few hoops in able to... in order to be able to do this."
- Davis, M.: "And what is the length of time that the nonprofits will train principals? Is that one year, two years?"
- Smith: "That depends on their program. It depends on whether the candidate would be doing it full-time or part-time. Keep in mind this is not part of their degree. This is not part of their degree petition."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- Davis, M.: "How many courses will they have to take with the nonprofit?"
- Smith: "Well, we're not talking about courses in terms of getting a degree. They already have to have a master's degree or be working on a master's degree. So, it depends upon the program that that entity develops."
- Davis, M.: "So, they haven't developed it yet, but yet, we're going to approve that. Is that correct?"
- Smith: "We're allowing that to happen, but their program has to approved by the State Board of Education, the State Teacher Certification Board and the Board of Higher Ed. So, they're going to be a lot of our state educational leaders reviewing those programs and those requirements."
- Davis, M.: "Is that going to create a layer of bureaucracy that may not be necessary?"
- Smith: "There's already a certification process for those preparation programs. So, no."
- Davis, M.: "Do... do they have to go through that? If I went to a university in the State of Illinois and I prepared to be a principal, I took a master's program, then would I still have to approved by the three organizations or institutions that you mentioned?"

Smith: "No."

Davis, M.: "I would not?"

Smith: "Representative Davis, I said that the programs have to be approved by those groups, not the individuals. The programs for the not-for-profit entities would have to approved by those three groups, not the individuals."

142nd Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "There... there... you and I both know there's a lot of uncertainty in this Bill, there's a great deal of uncertainty."
- Smith: "Well, there are rules that will have to promulgated by the State Board of Education. And they will specify the rigor that will be required of all of the preparation programs for the universities, colleges as well as the notfor-profits."
- Davis, M.: "The non-for-profits that are selected, will they have to show that they have been successful in doing this or preparing principals in some other area?"
- Smith: "That may be part of what the boards require, what the rules will require, but that's not specified in the legislation."
- Davis, M.: "Do you know the reason why the State of Illinois needs nonprofit entities because I'm not sure what to call them, they're not schools. Do you know why the State of Illinois needs these nonprofits..."
- Smith: "Representative Davis, I think..."
- Davis, M.: "...to prepare... no, wait a minute... to prepare principals? We have a number of universities... we have state universities that we fund..."
- Smith: "I think the answer is..."
- Davis, M.: "...we give them millions of dollars..."
- Smith: "...this is a... an additional tool that is available. It is being done currently in Chicago and is being done with some success."
- Davis, M.: "Is it being done legally in Chicago? What success?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Smith: "Well, I am told and I believe I..."

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

You want to finish answering?"

Davis, M.: "To the Bill. The Race To The Top, I must be concerned with the little boys and girls in Chicago and they need a principal that's trained in a university whose curriculum we know. This curriculum is not even developed. I'm just not sure the State of Illinois, as you pass this Bill, you're not sure of what you're going to get. This nonprofit group will charge these individuals to go to their locations to get their principal certification. I support the Race To The Top, but I do not support Illinois diminishing the value of our state universities and letting nonprofit groups, who we can't name, do their job. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Eddy: "Representative Smith, just a couple of things I just want to make sure I clear up with this as far as what the legislation's effect on current principals would be. Now, the understanding is that for current principals they would be grandfathered in and continue to work as principals for the remainder of their career. And we're talking, especially for those who have been career principals or really those who have had a year or more experience which would at least be equal to the internship we're requiring here, those individuals would be grandfathered fully and

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

- they would actually receive this endorsement, is that correct?"
- Smith: "That is... that is correct, Representative Eddy. And I know you worked hard to make sure that was part of the original legislation we passed out of here."
- Eddy: " I think some important things happened as this developed and... and there was an attempt, at one point, to remove the requirement that a master's degree be part..."

Smith: "Right."

- Eddy: "...of this and there was also an attempt to kind of play with the number of years of experience. But as the legislation sets now you have to have a master's degree and four years experience. So, the truth of the matter is the rigor really hasn't been reduced. There was a point at which there was that concern."
- Smith: "I believe there was that concern with... with the developments in the Senate, yes. But that's not part of this legislation."
- Eddy: "I think where there is concern still has to do with the non-for-profits. And as I recall, the Board of Education and the Board of Higher Education their commitment is to make sure that through the rulemaking process that the rigor is still in this program and through rules that... that these non-for-profits are going to have to mirror the same quality that any program through a university might have?"
- Smith: "That is correct, yes. And that was stated in committee. Any nonprofit group would have to go through the approval process to have their program approved by the Board of Higher Ed. And they would have to demonstrate

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that... that they're meeting the same standards and the same rigor as the colleges and univ..."

Speaker Turner: "Give the Gentleman another minute, go ahead."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll... just very quickly to the Bill. This is always hard to change. And that's... this is change. This is a significant change in the way we prepare So, it is uncomfortable. our future leaders. taking a leap of faith here related to how the rules are going to fly out, but I think we're going to watch them very, very closely to make sure that that rigor is there. I think we have to do this. We have to make sure that the people we're preparing for leadership positions in our schools have an internship that's meaningful. There are concerns about this, but it certainly is improvement. And I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this legislation, so that we can improve the way that we prepare our future leaders."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin, for what reason do you rise?"

Dunkin: "Point of inquiry? To the will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates he will."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just curious. This Bill has effective date immediately, but it won't take place until 2014... 2015. Am I reading that correct?"

Smith: "The... yeah, there are..."

Dunkin: "2014?"

Smith: "The provisions of the Bill take effect immediately, but there are rules that have to be adopted. And so the… the existing certification process will not expire until 2014."

142nd Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "Okay. So, earlier this year the state board presented its plan for the year and this was not a part of that plan or that process. Is there a reason why they did not present this earlier in the year and why..."
- Smith: "Well, Representative Dunkin, I think Representative Eddy can probably speak to this better than I because he's been working on this for a number of years. But there... we created a task force a number of years ago to look at school leadership, and that group has been working diligently throughout that time. They have come to an agreement during this Session. I don't know that the state board knew that that would be possible, but they have done so and that's the legislation that we passed out of this Body a few weeks ago, almost unanimously. And then we're back with this change which basically adds the nonprofit provision."
- Dunkin: "So, what current non-for-profits today are presenting...
 are training principals?"
- Smith: "They're... as I said to Representative Davis, I think there's only one entity that I'm aware of. It's called New Leaders for New Schools, which is currently working with Chicago Public Schools."
- Dunkin: "So, no other state... no other schools throughout the state is going to be subject to this training, only Chicago Public Schools?"
- Smith: "No, it... it could happen anywhere, could happen anywhere. This... this applies..."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin, bring your remarks to a close. Continue Representative Smith."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm not an expert on education. I am... you know, there are a number of us here who are, who really take this issue to task in terms of all of the various nuances of this legislation. We're talking about legislation that will affect principals or the leaders of our schools, and yet the Illinois Principals Association is not a part of ... of sanction of this either way. They're neutral on the You know, I'm very interested because as articulated about three weeks or so ago, there are schools that are in dire need of leadership which I understand. There are also schools that are failing tremendously. And yet, now we're coming up with non-for-profits to come up with training or a determining factor of what principals are valid or not when we have state universities that currently certify teachers across the state. That's a very interesting scenario to understand whether you're a part of the educational debate or not. And I'm curious, you know, this legislation is effective immediately and yet 2014 is when it'll take place. I'm just very, very curious because a number of the... the experts and people that I respect in this chamber have a lot of questions with this. particularly, not having the Illinois Principals Association weigh in on this with one position or the other. I'm all for our kids doing well, but again, I still have a number of questions in my head as of the sense of urgency for this right now. And if it's directly tied to Race To The Top and/or what... what's the benefit of having

142nd Legislative Day

- universities to certify teachers in this state, if they are not at the apex..."
- Speaker Turner: "Sorry, Representative. Representative Davis, you spoke once in debate."
- Davis, M.: "My name was used in debate by Representative Smith."
- Speaker Turner: "You've got 30 seconds."
- Davis, M.: "I have 30 seconds. With those 30 seconds I would like to say that it is so important for the people of the State of Illinois that you know who is training your educators. If Chicago is using private industry working in our system, do they have to reside in Chicago? If you work for the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, you have to live in Chicago. There's a residency law. Now, if these other people are getting money or what have you to come into our system, do they have to reside in the City of Chicago? Representative, I'm speaking to you, Smith?"
- Smith: "I'm sorry, what was your question, Representative Davis?"
- Davis, M.: "Will these profit… what do you call them… nonprofit organizations, who are paid by the people who get training in their schools, will they have to reside in the City of Chicago if they're working in Chicago?"
- Smith: "You're talking about the individuals who would be..."
- Davis, M.: "Any of them. We have a rule in Chicago that if you work in our system you have to live in the residential area of Chicago. Now, if you're going to have these nonprofit organizations..."

142nd Legislative Day

- Smith: "No, Representative Davis, perhaps that would be part of the rules that would be developed, but..."
- Davis, M.: "...perhaps it will be part of the rules, but we don't know. There's just too much that we don't know. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Just seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 226?' All those in favor should vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bradley, we have House Bill 2270 on the Order of Concurrence on page 8 of the Calendar."
- Bradley: "Okay. So, this is the Bill that the Representative Leader from Vermilion corrected me on earlier today. We now have the Motion to Concur on Amendments #1 and 2. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill, but Amendment #1 is necessary procedurally in order to concur on this. So, this is the Bill that's a special education, hold harmless for extraordinary circumstances. There are hundreds of schools which are negatively impacted. This is a formula that has not worked, it's not working. And if we don't do this and at least give the Governor the option to do this, then we ensure that those schools that are on that list will be negatively impacted regardless of what else happens with the budget. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2270?' This is final action. And all those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2270. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Soto on House Bill 5060 under the Order of Concurrences."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur House Bill 5060. There's a technical Amendment. House Bill 5060 provides a physical evidence, electronic evidence, computer files evidence, audio and tape recording. And I urge support of this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5060?' All those in favor... this is final action. All those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. There are 110 voting 'aye', 0 'noes', 0 'presents'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5060. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kosel on House Bill 22... 2332."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for concurrence on..."

Speaker Turner: "They're Amendments 1 and 2."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on Amendments 1 and 2 to this Bill. And I'd like to thank all of you on the House Floor for the great conversations we have had about this Bill. Again, this is the assessors Bill. This is the Bill that will eliminate a eight-month lame duck period for assessors. This is a great good government Bill that speaks to the great credentials that the assessors across the state possess. Assessors that have to be pre-educated before even running for the office and their ability to do things in this century instead of the last century. I would ask for your support on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan, for what reason do you rise?"

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had a very long discussion on this Bill. I want to bring up two points. First, an assessor's term is for four years. And should this become law we're talking about the affect... the negative affect that they believe that this Bill would do would be 25 percent of their term. If they win again, it's one out of 8 years or one out of 12 years, if they get elected. This is not a burdensome Bill for assessors. other point that I wanted to bring up, many of you are receiving e-mails from the Lake County Assessors Association. This is an association I was formally the president of. They were asked to chime in on how to solve the problem. And so, for these assessors to now all of a sudden be upset that we potentially might change the date

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that they start, they were asked what should we do to stop this potential corruption, this abuse of power at the very least and they never said anything. So, I just wanted to bring those two points up. And I certainly would hope that we can have a favorable vote. Thanks."

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2332?' This is final action. All those in favor should signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black. The Clerk shall take the record. This Bill, having received 56 'aye', 51 'nay', 3 'present', the Motion fails. The Lady's Motion fails. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the rest of the evening we'd like to have Representative Black be excused on the Roll, please."
- Speaker Turner: "The Clerk will so reflect it. Mr. Clerk, read House Resolution 1245."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Resolution 1245, offered by Representative Miller.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to honor our friend and colleague, Illinois State Representative John Fritchey, for his many years of dedicated public service; and
 - WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey was born at Barksdale Air Force Base in Bossier City, Louisiana; he then moved to Chicago with his mother, where he attended grammar school

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

and high school; he went on to earn his bachelor's degree in economics from the University of Michigan in 1986 before returning home to Chicago, where he earned his law degree from Northwestern University Law School in 1989; after law school, he became an Illinois Assistant Attorney General, representing the State in both State and federal courts; and

- Fritchey Representative had WHEREAS, has а long and distinguished career with the Illinois of House Representatives since January of 1996; he has developed a reputation as a thoughtful and substantive legislator who always puts the wants and needs of his constituents first; he has served as Chairman of the Civil Judiciary Committee and Vice-Chairman of the Business & Occupational Licenses Committee: he has also served on the Financial Institutions, Insurance, and Mass Transit Committees, as well as the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has been a leader and sponsor of numerous pieces of ethics legislation; he was the chief sponsor and the main impetus of the pay-to-play ban that prohibits significant campaign contributions by companies bidding for large State contracts; he also sponsored and helped pass legislation that changed Illinois' procurement laws, insulating decisions from political influence, and expanded the Freedom of Information Act to create more transparency in government operations; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has sponsored legislation to improve the health and quality of life of the citizens of this State; he helped expand family health care programs to

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

provide coverage for working families without access to medical care and expanded prescription drug coverage to seniors with low incomes through the State's Circuit Breaker program; and

- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has served as a proud champion of legislation that strengthens environmental preservation laws, expands protected wilderness areas, and increases investment in renewable energy; he was recently honored by the Illinois Environment Council for his 100% voting record on environmental issues that impact Illinois communities and resources; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has helped bring about substantive change in local matters; he co-sponsored and helped pass legislation that doubles the number of charter schools from 60 to 120; he was instrumental in passing legislation that reduced the Cook County veto override threshold down from a 4/5 majority to a more democratic 3/5 majority; he also drafted and passed legislation requiring companies who receive TIF funds to return taxpayers money if they choose to close or relocate their business; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has consistently proven himself to be a stalwart defender of the rights of families homeowners, and taxpayers throughout the State; he has helped provide seniors and families with access to affordable and adequate health care, expanded educational opportunities, and helped bring about property tax and TIF reforms; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey is well known by his peers as the "new face of Chicago Democrats"; as a result of his

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

effective leadership and centrist views, he was named by the national Democratic Leadership Council as one of the "100 Rising Stars to Watch" in the country in 2000 and 2003; he has also been the recipient of countless awards for his service to his community and the people of this State; and

- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey has taught as an adjunct lecturer in political science at Northwestern University; he is also involved with numerous civic organizations, local community groups, and chambers of commerce; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey is the founder of the John Fritchey Youth Foundation, an organization designed to create educational and recreational opportunities for local children through the sponsorship of academic and sports programs; and
- WHEREAS, Representative Fritchey will be remembered fondly by the members of this body and the citizens of the State of Illinois for his forthright and compassionate efforts to improve the lives and livelihoods of every citizen and his tireless fight against the injustices of our society; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we honor Illinois State Representative John Fritchey for his many years of dedicated service to the citizens of this State, thank him for his wonderful work in the Illinois House of Representatives, and wish him the best in his future endeavors; and be it further

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Illinois State Representative John Fritchey as a symbol of our great esteem and respect."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman, for what reason do you rise?"

Osterman: "I want to say a few things about my good friend, You know, John exemplifies what a hardworking John. Legislator should be. And he is someone who has dedicated himself to this job for all of his years down here. He's someone who has asked tough questions on bills when no one was willing to ask it, but other people thought of it. He's been one to try to broker compromise when it's been He's really worked hard, worked hard in his district, stood up for northsiders of the City of Chicago on issues like property taxes when others have not been as responsive and that's always sometimes not a pleasant fight. If John gave you his word, he stuck by it. He's a thoughtful, hardworking Legislator. And he's also someone though who had a great sense of humor and had a lot of humility. Sitting behind him I would see him grill someone on the floor and then turn around and kind of laugh and say, you know, I don't know why I did that, but I did it. He also was... he also was able ... he also was able to, like a few other Members in this... this Body, promote those things that he fought for and sometimes those ideas might be a little quirky. You know, no one could convert a story in the newspaper to a press release to legislation to an email blast quicker than John. It got to a point where I could be driving to Springfield and I'd hear a lead in on

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

NPR about a Bill and I know that that was John's Bill. But in all honesty, John is someone who has helped other Legislators. All of us that have had issues that have needed John's help; new Members, John has been there to help guide them along. And he's a loyal friend, he's dedicated himself to the people of this state on issues like ethics reform and he is someone who has given of himself. You know, this job can seem glamorous to people on the outside, but it takes a toll. And... but John has been there and worked hard for the people that have represented him. He is going to bring all of his skills and talents to an area that is much needed, which is Cook County government and we're going to give him a flack jacket and wish him well. But John, my wife, Peggy, and I, you know, wish you all the best in health and happiness. God bless."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons, for what reason do you rise?"

Lyons: "John, 14 years ago I sat where Kevin McCarthy sat, you sat next to me. We were seatmates our freshman year down here together. We also were here in the '96 Veto Session at the end when Republicans were still in charge and we were here watching the whole game being played in front of us for the first time as a couple of freshman. We were also here in that month of March in '97 when the Democrats took back the House and the Speaker let everything and anything through committees and on the floor. For those of you who don't know what it's like to be down on this floor for three weeks straight in the month of March and having

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Bill after Bill after Bill, going till 10, 11, 12:00 at night... and Mr. Mapes, by the way, asked then if we could have pizzas on the House of the floor back in the good old days. If you had to be here late at night... if you had to be here late at night, at least the Speaker and even Speaker Daniels at the time would pop for some pizza back then. But that having been said, John, you... you're one of the brighter bulbs on the tree and you always have been. And everybody on both sides of the aisle recognizes that. Everybody brings a talent down here, everybody has something to offer, everybody has something to give to this House Floor and to the State of Illinois and you brought a You've been blessed with a great intellect and a great ability to capture ideas and succinctly present them, whether it be on the attack or on something you feel passionate about. And John, you're getting to do this the way we all want to. You're getting to leave here on your own terms when you decide, and that's a wonderful thing to be able to say. So, I wish you nothing but the best. I am of your constituents, you're now one my county commissioner-elect. And good luck with the county board, my friend. I'm pretty familiar with what goes on over there. And I think you're going to be bored to tears compared to the action that you see down here. But the county will be a better place with you there and we'll be ... we'll miss you dearly. So, good luck, my friend."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook... the Lady from Cook,

Representative Feigenholtz, for what reason do you rise?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to reflect a little bit about John. I remember when John was first running for State Representative, I don't even remember what year it was, and getting a phone call from an... a very excited young man who had just became a father, long time ago, and has done an absolutely incredible job. We share a Senator; we've watched him become the Senate President. And I've watched you work with members of our community with a great deal of overlap on real life issues, things that really made a difference to them. The seven percent issue and the fact that a lot of the people in our community had to move out because they couldn't afford to stay in their homes anymore. You championed that and wrestled it to the carpet to make it happen and I am grateful as are people in the 6th Senate District for that. Aside from the fact that you are also a champion of our four-legged friends and your dog, Marley, I know that you have done an incredible job when it comes to things that affect the day to day lives of people in Illinois. And I know that you've worked hard to raise the profile and the integrity of what we do down here under such adverse, adverse situations and bring pride back. I agree with Representative Osterman that if I get one more e-mail about the National Guard, I just don't know what I'm going to do. Next thing we're going to see is the National Guard back home in Wrigley Field, right, John? Anyway, I, too, wish you well. I think the county board will be richer because of all the changes you as an addition. And have... I wish you the best of luck and I will see you back in the neighborhood. Stay close."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy, for what reason do you rise?"

Eddy: "Thank you very much. Very quickly, I know the hour is drawing late, but I wanted to add my congratulations to Representative Fritchey on his departure and... and thank him. I think over the years that I've been here we've kind of developed a real good friendship and a respect for each others positions and that... that s... that means a lot to me, number one. And the thing about John that I'll not forget is how honest he is and how passionate he is about the things he believes in. You don't have to agree with him and he doesn't mind and I think that's okay. It's also not personal; he's passionate. He keeps it on the right level and... and his word is always golden. You maybe don't agree with it, you know where it is. And I think and we worked very hard on one issue together and as an appropriate symbol of that I just would ask for a moment of silence."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you... you think back to the first month that you came to this chamber, it's pretty overwhelming. I came from the county board, I was chairman, I thought I was a pretty good debater. And I got here and the first day, Lou Lang got up and debated and Bill Black teed it up and then Fritchey got up. I'll never forget, I can't remember what the issue was, but it was loud, it was passionate, it was animated. And I realized then that these guys are really good at it. And that was... that was the year 2005. And it seemed that there was just

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

a lot of interesting debates then and that first month I... I watched John Fritchey and one day I saw him come over after a debate and he came over and he gave me the handshake of the Theta Chi Fraternity. And we had something in common about, we were fraternity brothers, didn't know different times, different colleges, but... but we had... that brought us, I think, together. And from that time, we got to work very closely. And then one day during one of the debates we had in the summer of '07, where Governor Blagojevich had kept us down here, I think John got up and... and laid out a passionate speech about the Governor keeping us down here. And he wasn't too happy about it and he said some things that I'll never forget, but I had to go over and tell John for the first time that Governor Blagojevich was also a Theta Chi and you can't say those kinds of things about fraternity brothers. And the look on his face was kind of priceless, are you kidding me, you know. so... so, we actually had a good time reminiscing about our days in the fraternity. But more importantly, John, I want to tell you that, as being a former county board chairman, I think you're going to be well suited. You're going to like what you're in for, you're going to like engagement level there. You're going to like the fact you can get things done in less than a year and... and get them actually started and in place and get them going. you're going to be very good at it. And I want to thank the relationship that we've had. professionalism, our ability to get along even when we disagreed. And that's... that's what I think you brought to

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

the table, the willingness to work even when you disagreed and walk away and come back and work on something else. And that's a trait that you have that serves you well. And I wish you luck in your endeavors in the future. And I'll still be following you on Twitter, I'm sure. So, good luck."

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

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minority counterpart on the Judiciary Committee, it's been a fun couple of years working with John. And since I've come here I've been on that committee with him and one of the things that I respect about Representative Fritchey, we're in committee, he asks the tough questions and he makes the Bills better. As Representative Black was also a part often says, the process is what's important and if you let the process work, things get better at every step. John Fritchey even if he liked the Bill or the Bill's Sponsor would still ask, have you thought about this. What if you did this differently? And I also appreciated that tact and 9 times out of 10 it really did make the Bill better. I.. as Representative Eddy said, one of the great things about John is if he tells you he'll do it, he'll do it. If he tells you he won't, he won't. In this business that's all you can ask. There have been a number of times where, maybe followed the I'm so far right, he's so far left we've come back around where John and I have stood as the two lone 'no' votes on Bills which probably meant it was the best Bill ever before us. But John, I just wish

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

you the absolute best. And it's been a privilege to be on your committee all these years. So, good luck."

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

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like my colleague and seatmate right here, Harry Osterman, I rise to speak about John Fritchey's humility also. And you know, John has been such a good friend to me, a person who has... you know, has a district right across the street from me, who from the day I walked in as a new person has sort of, you know, helped and guided me, not through just the labyrinth of the issues down here, but also about the labyrinth of the issues we face back home representing, you know, many of the same communities. It's been just a tremendous help to me. You know, he's helped me learn the ropes, he's helped me learn the procedures, some of the tricks of the trade. I look forward to having him as one of my county commissioners so that when we say, please, you know, take that complaint to your county commissioner, you know, we'll know we'll get great service and we'll use that line a lot in our office, John. So, thank you very much for everything."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have had the pleasure of serving on the Judiciary Committee the... my entire tenure here and John has been the chair that entire time and I have to say, and John and I talked about this a little bit, it's a very, very difficult committee. The issues on there range from constitutional issues to family law issues and the... the vision of that foie gras ban in

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

that awful movie we had to watch of how foie gras is allegedly made is forever emblazoned in my mind. And John has been a tremendous chairman for that and someone that I've emulated... tried to emulate as I... as I became a chair myself. And he takes on those complex issues, it's evident that he's worked with Sponsors and done a great job in... as Representative Rose said, in making the Bills better. So, it's been really a pleasure working with you on that committee. That's how I really got to know you. Those will be big shoes to fill. And I wish you good luck with the county board. I'm looking forward to having another ally on the county board. Someone I can call and actually reach and get something done because I... I represent 30 thousand constituents in unincorporated Cook County. So, I have lots of issues. Thanks."

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

Reboletti: "John, I just wanted to congratulate you on... on your career down here and what you've done for the people of the state. I think, a couple of things that I remember. The first time I got a chance to meet you, as I had a Bill in Civil Law and wanted to make sure I had talked to you first and you treated me like I'd been here forever. And you had talked about my predecessor and your relationship with him and how you hope you had a relationship like that with me. And one of the other debates I remember is you and I debated the minimum wage for... for kids. And I knew that when I made a point, you would nod your head and if you made a point, I would nod mine, but at the end of the day,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

no matter how passionate the debate was, you... you and I became friends and you still talk to one another as if you were in a courtroom. You do your job, you debate the issue and you move forward and for that I will... I greatly appreciate that. I consider you a friend, John, and wish you all the best in Cook County. You have a lot of work to do there, but you have the energy to do so and Godspeed to you."

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

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John, I just want to very briefly just tell you what an honor and a privilege it's been to serve with you, certainly not that we were always... looked at things the same, but I always respected your opinion. If I were to just describe the person I see to begin with it's a man of integrity and... and I mean that as a distinct tribute to you, straight shooter. If I had a Bill coming before your committee, I'd try to talk to you ahead of time. If you had ideas you would... one I had this year, you offered some suggestions and we took it to committee and in there we ... I said I would make some changes and bring it back and I did and you supported it and spoke for it. I appreciated that, you would give direction and be helpful. For all the problems that we have in Illinois politics and Illinois government, I just want to say we would... we'd have a better state if the ethical model was that of John Fritchey; it would be a huge improvement. I do want to thank you for your service. And without a doubt, this institution is a better place because of your

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

service. You know, I came from county government... county board and then county treasurer and then here, I thought that was an advancement. You come here and then you're going for your advancement back to county board, just kind of the... kind of the reverse. But I know that not only is this institution a better place because of the model, the example you set, but so will the county board be. So, John, thank you for your service, Godspeed, it's been a pleasure."

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

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, I have to say something to my good friend, John Fritchey. First and foremost, I want to add all the Members of the General Assembly to this Resolution. I first met John actually through Sara Feigenholtz, who I met when I decided to run for office for the first time, and she told me to get in contact about this young and very energetic young man and just to call him on a whim and get me some ideas about campaigning and why I'm running for office and so on and so forth and that was John. And actually he gave me some good advice and some things that I definitely needed to pull off a victory. And when I got here, we just clicked. We talked, we clicked and of course as many of you know we're probably best of friends down here. And sometimes in this Body this happens. But along the way I've gotten to know John in a lot of different ways as our families have interacted, not just from his work ethics here, which many of our Members have articulated so far, in some of the

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

issues that he's cared about, of course, the seven percent which me and him have adamantly disagreed over the years about that issue. But he was one of the biggest and most best Sponsors of the Payday Loan Reform Act, which was a very difficult industry. Of course, we all know that Representative Lang had just passed legislation to deal with it, but it's been a longtime coming and John was one of the cornerstones of trying to move that forward. was also one of the first Members I know that wrote a letter to Speaker Madigan asking for Blagojevich's impeachment and start to have the impeachment hearings. asked me, would I be a part of that letter, former State Representative Jim Brosnahan and Representative Holbrook back there, to be a part of it. And also, course, I thought most importantly it's not just his ability to pick this stuff up because we would be sitting here talking about all kinds of issues from rap music to family issues to whatever and then something would hit the ... hit the screen, hit our screens, and John would tune into it for a minute and not only just talk about transparency of the legislation itself, but hey, did you think about this and this is going on, and this and this and this and this, and really try to get into the legislation, in the depth of the legislation. I would just sit here in a marvel at him because we would just be talking about rap music or something and all of the sudden a light would go on and boom, but that passion is something I really appreciate and respect from him. As a Legislator myself, John, as Representative Tryon had mentioned, talked

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

about Twitter. John is one of the few Legislators that have used technology to its fullest. And too, when we first started having Web sites, John was on the forefront of that and tweaked his Web site over and over again. say, Dave, you need to get your Web site up and going. And then of course, the social networking and blogging, John was on top of it right away. And what that does for us is provide us as a better Legislator, not just to communicate with each other but more importantly our constituents. John has been on the forefront of that all the time and you can see him always twittering and maybe too much, John and facebooking and all the other stuff that he does. And of course, of course, as media, we use it. He likes... he likes the cameras. He hasn't met a camera he hasn't liked and an interview he hasn't been wanting to do and in fact, so much about anything. You could talk about bacteria endocarditis and he'd want to talk about it. But the fact of the matter is the media presence and getting involved makes us all sort of a better Legislator, makes me a better Legislator. For John and I's relationship, I believe, has been unique in this chamber. You don't often see somebody with hair versus somebody who's losing his hair hang out all the time like this, but we have and we've developed a friendship. And more importantly, it goes beyond this chamber. it's interesting what Representative Lyons said. He said that he's leaving on his own terms. You know, that's a thing that we all have to remember. We're here to do a job, we're here to serve the people and at some point we may have to leave and we should want to leave on its own

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

term... our own terms. John has done that. John is an excellent Legislator and he moves on with his career, of course, we all wish him well. As a friend, as a colleague, as somebody I look up to, I wish you well, John."

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

McAuliffe: "Thank you. John, it's been an honor and privilege serving with you. We both started about the same time in 1996 with Joe Lyons. And I remember your first election you were driving around putting up your own yard signs. So, you started out fresh and... and new. But I think we never really had any fights or discussions here on the floor, but I was thinking back to I think it was June of 1997, when most of the world was watching Michael Jordon beat the Utah Jazz when he had the flu and yourself and myself were doing a fund-raiser to help Walter Burnett. The only problem was we had to go into the ring together and fight three rounds. And I don't think... you didn't knock me out, I don't know if anyone was declared a winner, but I've been in the round with you once and I don't think I want to get back in there. But good luck to you in your new job with the Cook County Commissioner. And I know you'll make a... a big difference in them. I'm glad to call you a friend and look forward to seeing you back in Chicago. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Sente."

Sente: "John, I've only been here 8 months, but I've come to know you as a friend and a mentor and an impressive public servant. I'm only sorry that I don't have more time with you here. I do wish you all the best in your next endeavor

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

and I know you'll bring your best to that. So... and wherever you go that you'll... you'll bring that spirit and passion to... to what you do. So, best of luck."

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

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to express my congratulations for, again, you walking out here on your own two feet, same way you came in. And many people don't know that I met you back in the '80s when we were much younger. And we actually ran in '95, '95 you won, I lost and here we are. John, you're one of the most... you're one of the sharpest knives here in this Body. I mean, you're a quick study on issues that are extremely diverse in nature and yet you're able to pick out some of the nuances to add value to the Bill, whether you agree with it or not. I mean, you get up there and go on your good soliloguy and you vote against a lot of these bills that you add value to. But you're certainly someone here that a guy like myself still looks up to. I know we don't give people their flowers as often as they should, but that's certainly the case with me. You're someone that really helps set the tone for quick study, taking this job very seriously. I'm very proud of you and I wish you all the best of success. And hopefully, we'll be able to share some legislation at the county level by way of the state. Congratulations, again."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Joyce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. John, I really want to thank you for your friendship the last 8 years I've been here. As David alluded to, any time we had a Bill that would be up on the board that none of us really knew what was going on, we'd say, hey, John, what the hell does this thing do? And you would figure it out in enough time to let us know how to vote. But I will tell you, you've taught me a lot of lessons and three real important lessons. One is, I think it was the second week I was here you said, Kev, you see that person right there? That's the photographer for the Tribune. And all you have to do is go and buy him lunch once a week and you'll find yourself in those B rolls more often than others in this chamber. Then you told me how important it was to have fast fingers. As we watched you, you know, and a lot of times you'd start out 'yes' and all of the sudden you see the targets going off the Bill and right at the last minute before he says take the record, John shows up a red. And everybody else in the row is a green. But... and I think... what was that vote? Oh, yeah. The final thing I think was really shows a lot about you, John, personally as the pay-to-play legislation. And if anyone... everyone in this chamber's watched John present his own Bill and getting ready for a close or responding or listening to someone ask him a question, especially when it's near and dear to his heart he gets pumped up. And he's, you know, I mean, I almost look like he's a kid I coach out there, you know, on the football field. he's... he's pacing and he's doing his thing and he's, you know, getting real excited. And then all of a sudden you

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

look over and Jack Franks is speaking on John's pay-to-play legislation that he's been working on for 5 years. finally John comes over and he goes, to me and Bros, McCarthy and Miller, he says, no way I'm going to be out grandstanded on my own issue. And you know, you didn't let us down, John. But that's the great thing, John, I think that's the most important lesson that you have left anyone that's gotten to know you here is, take this job very seriously, but you don't take yourself too seriously. you've had the ability to work your butt off for your constituents and for the people of the state and yet, you have the ability to laugh at yourself. And that is a great, great quality that'll continue to serve you well. And I, like many others here, appreciate the friendship you've shown to me and wish you the best of luck."

Speaker Turner: "That was the final speaker and you were not supposed to editorialize from the Chair, but I'm just going to say ditto to all of the previous speakers. And as Secretary of State Jesse White would say, 'you're the man'. So, Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions. John... John Fritchey, the man. The Gentleman from Cook, John Fritchey."

Fritchey: "Speaker, as tempting as it might be, you got another thing coming if you think you're going to keep me from my last time at the microphone. There's wagering over here on whether or not I would tear up during my... my comments. Let me just say a couple things, if I could. I was 31 years old when I first ran. Those of you that don't know, my mom was an immigrant she came here from Morocco. My dad, which some of you know him and what you don't know is from Olney,

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Illinois, went right from high school to the Air Force. was actually born on an Air Force Base in Louisiana, raised by my mom. And you know, she sacrificed a lot to give me a lot of opportunities. You know, on paper, you know, I don't have the pedigree maybe that would have dictated that I would have the opportunity to do this job. considered it an honor truly from the first time. And I can remember the first day I walked in this building as a Legislator. And you know, I like to tell people that I was sworn in on a Tuesday and thought I would change the world by Friday and I kind of came in with that attitude. remember just being struck with this sense of awe kind of feeling, you know, I think when the little kid sits on Santa's lap for the first time and, you know, I've never lost that. You know, I walked in the building today knowing that, you know, it was going to be the last day I came into the building as a Legislator, but I still had that same feeling from when I first walked in that it's just been an absolute privilege and honor, not the title so much, but the job and the responsibility, the people that I've gotten to serve with. And you know, it's been... it's been a long time, you see a lot during those years. You know, we've seen the lows in this Body, I've seen us lose some good people. You know, I remember when, you know, we lost Terry Deering, when we lost Tim Osmond, you know, and there's nothing worse than seeing the bunting on these chairs and those of you that haven't seen it, I hope you never do. At the same time, you see some real high points. You see people have milestones in their lives, there's

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

birthdays, weddings. You know I've been here a long time, when Kevin got here he barely had enough kids for a threeon-three team, you know, now he can field his own baseball team. But you realize that, you know, what we do here is part of something bigger. Sure, we're all elected to represent our constituents and we... we do that to the best of our abilities and you know, and I've tried to do that to the best of my abilities. You know, to the extent that you talk about the passion I bring to the job, I believe in this job dearly. If I've ever offended anybody by my passion, I apologize. I assure you that it really was trying to do what was right and I may not always be right, but always did what I thought was right. And I realize along the way and I learned so much during this job, that you cannot ask anybody and I hope you remember this, that you cannot ask anybody to show you anymore respect for your opinions than you're willing to show them for theirs. And that's led me to be able to work with my friends from downstate, from across the aisle, from this side of the aisle on issues that you agree with and issues that you don't and reaching compromises. Yes, you know, being able to fight to the end on this House Floor with somebody and go out and have dinner with them that night and realize that you're both trying to do the job to the best of your abilities and that's what we're here to do. doing this job for 14 years. As Sara mentioned, you know, my daughter was born less than a month before my first Primary. You know, she's now 14 and you know, as I tell people, you know, she may want me around less, but I want

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

to be around more. So, yes, I'm leaving on my own terms. It's bittersweet. This has been just such a privilege and honor and joy to do and to work with people. So many of you, you know, we never would have met each other. And not just me and you guys, but you and each other. We never would have met each other, but for this job. people I've met, the places I've been, the things I've learned are things that I never would have occasion to come across, but for the privilege of serving in the General Assembly. And that's something that I will always be thankful to my constituents for and to all of you for, I guess let me just say this, you know, the truly. partisanship kind of comes and goes here and I think that, you know, all too often I think we focus on the aisle in the middle of this Body as something that divides us. think the more important feature to look at in this room isn't the aisle, but the door to this chamber. When we come through that door we're united in a duty and a service to the people that we represent and to the people of Illinois. For 14 years I've tried to do the best that I could to represent those people well and to work with you so you could represent those people well also. Thank you for letting me work with you, thank you for the opportunity and the privilege. God bless each and every one of you. God bless your families and God bless the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Miller asks leave that all Members can be added to this Resolution and House Resolution 1245. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution

142nd Legislative Day

- 1245 pass?' And it does. And we will now go to the Agreed Resolutions Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 1287, offered by Representative Hannig. House Resolution 1288, offered by Representative Tryon. House Resolution 1289, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 1290, offered by Representative Bost. House Resolution 1291, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 1292, offered by Representative Joyce and House Resolution 1293, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Miller."
- Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a purpose of an announcement. This celebration of John Fritchey will continue at the Globe over at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, for those who want to go."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned... Ladies and Gentlemen, can I have your attention? The plan... the plan is to adjourn for the week on Thursday, tomorrow. So, we will be adjourning tomorrow... that's the plan. And that plan can work, we all pray hard tonight. But we intend to adjourn tomorrow. And with that, Representative Currie moves that the House stands adjourned until Thursday, May 27 at the hour of 11 a.m., the hour of 11 a.m. Allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned."

142nd Legislative Day

5/26/2010

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading. House Bill 6885, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. First Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."