162nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 9:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and pagers 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. Holy God, who are sovereign in all of Your ways, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God omnipotent, the God omniscient, and the God omnipresent. We ask and pray Your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House and all of its Members. May You impress upon their hearts to do that which honor You the most, to do that that brings You glory. Father as they deliberate this day may You grant them wisdom from on high, may they be led and guided by Your most precious spirit that they may do that which is good, that they may do that which is the most prefect will of God in Your sight. This we pray in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Mautino: "We will be led in the Pledge today by Representative Harris."
- Harris et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Mautino: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Bost."

162nd Legislative Day

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Mulligan and Watson are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect no excused absences among House Democrats today."
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 answering the call, a quorum is present and the House is prepared to do its business. On page 10 of the Calendar under concurrence is House Bill 5178, Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Concurrence Motion on the Brookfield Zoo issue. I would prevent a local municipality from imposing an amusement tax on a local zoo. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5178. And on this question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Osterman."
- Osterman: "Representative Bradley, this would oppose putting the tax on a municipality allowing for a zoo?"
- Bradley: "Correct."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reis, the Gentleman from Jasper."
- Reis: "Inquiry... or a point of personal privilege, I guess. We have a lot of Members and we don't how they're going to vote on this particular Bill. Is there something... could we pull this out of the record until we get more people here?"

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

Bradley: "I... David, could... we could take like a couple of minutes. I'd rather just move this... 'cause I need to go work on comp."

Reis: "Why don't you go ahead and explain the Bill some more...
and my computer's is not even up yet."

Bradley: "Actually I think most of your side is cosponsors on it."

Reis: "Just want to make sure. So, if you could explain the Bill and give us a couple of minutes here."

Bradley: "This would keep a local taxing body from putting a...

Reis: "Representative, we had a flood of people that just came in the door.

Bradley: "...taxing on... I'm not done yet..."

Reis: "Okay."

Bradley: "...a zoo."

Speaker Mautino: "Your turn."

Reis: "We had a flood of people that came in there during that well-define explanation of your Bill. Representative, I intend to support it. Thank you."

Bradley: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Moffitt: "Representative does this preempt Home Rule then?"

Bradley: "No."

Moffitt: "Because the village is not a Home Rule unit?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Moffitt: "So..."

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

Bradley: "It's my understanding."

Moffitt: "What vote will... percentage will this take?"

Bradley: "My understanding it's a simple Majority."

Moffitt: "Have we done this to any other community, where we said, you cannot put a certain tax on you? We're kind of being rather specific."

Bradley: "I don't know that any other community's been crazy enough to try this."

Moffitt: "You don't think there are any other local tax..."

Bradley: "I don't know, Don. I'm not an expert on that. I don't know. I don't know."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Seeing no further questions, the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5178. All in favor will 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 Zalewski, Representative Biggins, do you wish to be record? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5178. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on January 07, 2011: approved for floor consideration is Amendment #3 Senate Bill 1927. On the Order of Concurrence, recommends be adopted, is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5424."

162nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "On page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1927. Representative Reitz. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Bring this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Motions pending?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Reitz."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2, is just a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Reitz."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Reitz on Floor Amendment #3."
- Reitz: "Amendment #3 addresses concerns that Ameren utilities had. It addresses the physical capacity of a gas utility to accept natural gas. It removes their objections."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #3. And on that question, Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask Representative Reitz a couple of questions, if he will yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."
- Tryon: "Representative Reitz, I know that you've worked very hard... hard in trying to work out all the opposition. I just

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

want to know, is there anybody that's still opposed to this Bill?"

Reitz: "At the end, the only one Peoples Gas. We met with all of the gas companies and all the interested parties last night. We addressed the concerns that Ameren had. Peoples and all the other gas companies were okay with the Amendment. Peoples is still opposed, but they're just opposed to the concept as they were with Leucadia project."

Tryon: "So they have the same opposition that they had with Leucadia, correct?"

Reitz: "Excuse me?"

Tryon: "They have the same opposition that they've had with Leucadia, is that correct?"

Reitz: "Correct."

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

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman 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 and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1927, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. A Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is for a coal to SNG gas plant in Jefferson County, would start a mine in Washington County. There'd be about... over 1500 construction

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

jobs, and around 700 permanent facility jobs between the mine and the plant. This is similar to the Leucadia project other the fact that it's actually a little stronger language than in the Leucadia project. It has price caps for the price of the gas that are in this Bill. And it also has a 10-year true up instead of a 30-year true up in the Leucadia project. I think as we talked about with all those projects it's about trying to create jobs and produce energy here in the State of Illinois. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Senate Bill 1927. And on that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Representative Reitz, I understand that when we look at the fact that we've had really three coal gasification projects and they're all structured a little differently, and especially when it comes with purchase agreements for future energy that's produced. What kind of purchase agreement will this have for this facility?"
- Reitz: "Well, it will require that they buy the gas, I guess, the difference in this one. They will sign a contract. Basically, it just allows them to sign a contract to have the gas... This one, as I said, has price caps in it where the other ones don't. I think at the end, of all the three proposals that are there, this one has the most... more stringent safeguards in for consumers."
- Tryon: "Well... okay. And when you say it had a price gap, so it...
 it's going to be the... the price gap difference between what
 market is and what the actual contract purchase price in

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

the future is would be. That's what you're talking about correct, the gap?"

Reitz: "Correct."

Tryon: "Okay. So, in the end, when we look at... when we look at like Leucadia and when Leucadia was structured, the actual money used to construct the capital cost of Leucadia wasn't passing on additional profits from the use of that money as part of the rate. In Tenaska, when we looked at Tenaska, Tenaska was borrowing \$3 billion and because we were guaranteeing the fact that Tenaska was going to have gas purchased in the future they went ahead and structured that so that they were making 11 percent on the actual capital investment that they were getting. No structure like that exists in this Bill, is that correct?

Reitz: "That's correct."

Tryon: "So, the ratepayer who's guaranteeing the future purchases of the power or the fuel isn't paying anything as far as a premium for the capital being the bonds or the money being borrowed?"

Reitz: "No. They're paying exactly what we think the gas is going to cost and its cap. And then the… our holding in this case would be exposed after that cap, if it cost more."

Tryon: "Right. To the Bill. I look at our power portfolio with wind, and with the nuclear power plants we have as being an integraded power portfolio and certainly I support the use of Illinois coal for Illinois coal gasification prog... projects and these are the types of questions I think we have to ask because we don't want to create rate structures

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

that ratepayers unfairly have to subsidize any type of profit margin on borrowed money that the ratepayers are actually facilitating that these projects get lower interest rates on. So, it... and I look at the structure of Leucadia and I look at the structure of this and I hope we come back with a Tenaska structure that's structured the same way. But because of the way that this project is, I think we need to do this to protect this project with the same market provisions that were providing with Leucadia. So, I'm going to support the Bill. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be very brief. I Colvin: simply rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I think this is an excellent time in our state's peculiar history at this moment in time. Real briefly, as we are all aware the of Leucadia project that passed out of here with about 86 votes, just a few weeks ago Illinois took a very important and very bold step forward, and as it passed out of the Senate yesterday or the day before yesterday, we're creating a project that I think is going to impact the State of Illinois in three very important ways. I'd like to call them the three 'Es'. First, it's going to impact our environment. This technology of coal gasification and CO2 sequestration will emit no harmful elements into atmosphere. For the first time ever we'll be able to use Illinois coal, a product right here, where Illinois's workers will be able to mine it from the ground, ship it across the state to the Illinois Power Holdings facility,

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

to the Leucadia facility on the southeast side of Chicago, putting thousands of Illinoisans to work in the coal industry, in the transportation industry, in the insurance industry and the like. This is going to be good. For the second, 'E' is perfect segue for our economy, the creation of jobs, the creation of new taxpayers, the expansion of tax base. These are privately held companies that will pay sales tax. They will pay income tax for the employees who work there. They will pay real estate taxes which will be in 10s if not 100s of thousands of dollars for the Leucadia plant alone. The impact to the City of Chicago with respect to the taxes that they hope to receive from their plant, going forward, will be significant for the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. And thirdly, it's all about energy. And it's about a brand new energy source that will create an abundance of energy of natural gas, not only for Illinois but for the entire country. This is new technology and going forward, it will become more affordable, it'll be easier to produce, cheaper to produce, but this a very important step that the state is taking in an effort to move us into the 21st century. And we are not creating the will here; we're simply catching up with other states. The State of Illinois (sic-Indiana) the Governor, Mitch Daniels, recently signed a Bill that creates the exact type of plant, that creates the exact type of energy, under the exact same circumstances, in Indiana. And Indiana labor, Indiana business, Indiana environmentalists are reached an agreement. In the plant that they are going to... that they have received state approval to build, will do

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

the exact same thing that Leucadia is doing. So I want to thank the Sponsor for his hard work and effort in putting this plan forward. This is good for our economy, our environment, and of course, it's a brand new energy source for the United States of America. Please vote 'yes'."

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

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

Pritchard: "Representative, could you amplify a little bit. I'm sorry if you've already said this, but I didn't hear it, what the cost differential is going to be for this kind of SNG gas versus currant rates that utility users are paying?"

Reitz: "It's projected at the cost of maybe about \$2-plus... \$2 higher on the projections over what the current gas price would be. And I think, in defense of that, the difference in... in that with any of these projects that we've done that use Illinois coal we're going to create the economic development and have other moneys going in through the state."

Pritchard: "So, it's two dollars on the monthly bill, is that what you are saying, for an average consumer."

Reitz: "That's projected to be the difference between the SNG price and the natural gas price. So, to buy... to purchase the gas."

Pritchard: "And that's a per unit or is that per month?"
Reitz: "Per unit."

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

Pritchard: "So that's... would be sizeable if we had an industrial-type user wouldn't it?"

Reitz: "Per million BTU."

Pritchard: "Per million BTU. There's also some concern from the Citizens Utility Board about the consumer protection reserve account. There would be none under this proposal, is that correct?"

Reitz: "There will be a reconciliation account; it just doesn't have an amount in it. We actually had expected it will exceed what's in Leucadia. They're using a number different... by the products and a number of different other resources that are going to come in for producing the gas, to put into that reconciliation account, to make sure that we can lower the price of gas."

Pritchard: "Has there been any attempt to deal with some of the other utilities like Peoples Energy and North Shore, who are opposed to this proposal to reconcile some of their concerns?"

Reitz: "We've met with them a number times, as they have with the Leucadia project and I think... and we met again last night trying to address the concerns that Ameren had about being to take the volume that they've projected to take. They are just... my opinion and what they expressed to me and I think others is they're just... they're opposed to the concept of being forced to take this. I think it's just, as any other project, it's kind of a public policy as far as that we're going to use Illinois fuel and invest that for consumers in Illinois. And... but I... they have not really expressed tremendous opposition. It's just they're... they

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

are opposed to the concept of being forced to take a certain amount of gas."

Pritchard: "Okay. And the difference between this proposal and the Leucadia project proposal was those were voluntary contracts. This is a mandatory consumption or utilization."

Reitz: "No. It's... it's the same thing. This is... actually Power Holdings was set up to be a voluntary contract and they were close to signing two contracts that... The reason we're doing this is because of... It's basically kind of a me too. After... after Leucadia passed, it really made it... you know, it was imperative that we try to get this part in there, too, so they'd take it. So, I don't know that... as I said, they haven't really expressed much opposition to... to the way the Bill is moving through, it's just they're opposed to the concept in general, as they were with Leucadia."

Pritchard: "Okay. Are the Illinois taxpayers liable for any subsidy or contributions to this project?"

Reitz: "Excuse me?"

Pritchard: "Is... are the Illinois taxpayers liable for any contributions to this project?"

Reitz: "I don't know that there's... I don't know of any tax money that's in this. No. So, as far as the taxpayers' liability they have, I don't think so."

Pritchard: "Okay. And the final question deals with the volume we're talking about here. Is this in the 5 percent range of normal state gas utilization?"

Reitz: "Yes."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

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

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A tremendous amount of work has gone into making this proposal and the Leucadia proposal very good for Illinois. I want to thank Representative Colvin for his fine work on the Leucadia part. We have these two mirrored; we have them tied together. One... this one's not going to go without the other one. This is, in my belief, where Illinois should be going for future technology. We have to tie them together; we're not picking one company over the other company through legislation. So, a tremendous amount of work has gone into to making this a wonderful proposal. Representative Colvin said, you know, very succinctly, other states are trying to get out ahead of us. This company can break ground in the next 13 months. They are just waiting for this one last piece of legislation to start building a plant, creating jobs, and more importantly using Illinois coal. They're going to open up another coalmine. That's going to be a tremendous amount of jobs for southern Illinois, an area desperately needing more people... or putting more people to work. So, I want to thank the two people that worked on the two separate proposals; they've done a wonderful job. Now is the time to move forward with this type of technology. This is going to be needed in the future and we certainly need the jobs now. Please vote 'aye'."

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

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Nekritz: "Representative, I think you'd indicated that there were some consumer protections in this Bill. Can you describe those for me?"

Reitz: "We have price caps built in at the beginning of the contract and then also at anytime during the contract term. We also have the Illinois Power Authority that is going to have to approve any of these... any of the contracts that go through and then the ICC will have... will be reviewing the cost also during the process."

Nekritz: "Are those... I thought that there were... are those... when you say price caps, is that the same as a rate cap?"

Reitz: "The price of the SNG, what it will be per million BTU."

Nekritz: "And who... the price... Well, let me ask that... my question again. Is the price cap you're referring to the same as a rate cap for consumers?"

Reitz: "No. It's the price that the utility would pay for gas."

Nekritz: "Okay. So there is a cap on that, but there's no… I mean, you know, we've done a couple of other of these of similar kinds of Bills and one of them had a rate cap in it. So, there's no rate cap for consumers, correct?"

Reitz: "Yes. Tenaska had... they did have a rate cap."

Nekritz: "But this Bill has no rate cap for consumers?"

Reitz: "Right. But we..."

Nekritz: "Okay. And the other one that we did that was..."

Reitz: "We, you know, we believe that the price cap will be reflected in the rate cap and actually will work better than a straight rate cap."

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

- Nekritz: "You may have more faith in the utilities than I do, Representative. And then the rate fund... there was another one that we did that had a rate fund in it. You know, a fund that would... that was established so that if rates went up too much that there was a fall back and the company was going to be paying that. There's no similar kind of rate fund in this... the Bill?"
- Reitz: "Yes, there is. And it will be... it's just a different funding mechanism. Instead of the amount they had up front, they're taking the by-products and a number of other components and putting that into that fund to help subsidize that."
- Nekritz: "I'm sorry. We're putting like pet coke into a rate fund... into a rate fund?"
- Reitz: "No. There's a... just a number of different by-products that you have during the process and their... they just have a funding mechanism for..."

Nekritz: "I see."

- Reitz: "...different things they're putting into that fund to help subsidize that."
- Nekritz: "Okay. So... and I just want to reiterate that there is... there is more opposition to this... I bet you know, CUB is still opposed, the Environmental Law & Policy Center, the Sierra Club are still opposed. And let me... let ask one... let me just persue one other issue. The gas that's being sold is being sold on a percentage basis to... like on an equal percentage basis to the various gas companies around the state?"

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

Reitz: "It is based on basically their volume. The intent is to try and make it inequitable as in the Leucadia project, make it an equitable distribution amongst the gas user."

Nekritz: "Well, I will tell you that in Leucadia it was not... it was hardly equitable because the smallest gas company in the state that perhaps, you know, that serves constituents in an area near mine is being required to buy 25 percent of their... I can't remember if it's 25 percent of their supply or 25 percent of the gas coming out of Leucadia. But it would... but they serve like 2 percent of the customer, and my numbers are going to be wrong, but they serve 2 percent of the customers in the state and they were being forced to buy 25 percent of the gas at a higher price. So, again, the rate impact to consumers at North Shore Gas was way out of proportion with the other rate impact. So, if that's the case in this Bill, that's another really significant problem that I would see. I appreciate your responses."

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

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

Speaker Mautino: "I'm trying to get his attention."

Reis: "He does..."

Speaker Mautino: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Reitz: "Sure.

Speaker Mautino: "He said sure."

Reis: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, so many times in this chamber Members want their cake and eat it too. We have a crisis developing in this state that may not hit us for another 5 or 10 years. But we have power plants

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

that are aging, we haven't had meaningful power plant built in this state in 35 years. We have to try this new technology, we have to do what we can to get them up. Maybe the research that they develop from this power plant can be changed, but we have a lot of power plants in this state that are going to be shutting down or require millions of dollars to become compliant. All those costs are going to go to your consumer too. So, do you want the new green power, do you want the new technology, with perhaps at a higher cost, we don't know that yet, or do you want to continue to just go down the road that we're on and do nothing, build no power plants, Google into your computer what happened in California about eight years ago when they had brownouts. Ask the Governor what happened then. Is that a question that you want? We have to try this new technology. The EPA and the Attorney General's Office is demanding that the only way they'll sign off on new power plants is if we use this new technology. Let's find out how it works. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1927. Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you. I appreciate... I would like to clarify though on the allegation issue. It is divided by therms that they used based in 2008 and we have capped any individual company's percentage at 42 percent. But I... you know, I appreciate all the comments. I think this is a good Bill. We need to build these SNG gas plants in Illinois. This with the Tenaska seems to be up in the air right now, so this will definitely build one in downstate Illinois. We

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

need to use our fuel in the State of Illinois to fuel our state and this is a great process turning it into gas. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of Senate Bill 1927. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Cultra, Ford, Stephens, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 83 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 1927, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the House Calendar, Supplemental #1, appears House Bill 5424, under the Order of Concurrence. Representative Sente."

Sente: "Good morning. Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 3383, the budgeting for outcomes Bill has returned. We passed it two days ago. It returns as House Bill 5424 with one change. The grant programs that will sunset every five years will be reinstituted now via the Bill process as opposed to Joint Resolution. There are no other changes to this Bill. We are looking here at major budget reform, a way to control our spending, a way to get our pension payments made and our debt obligations before we divide up the budget. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Mautino: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5424. No one seeking recognition, all in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

162nd Legislative Day

1/7/2011

Representative Burns. Representative Yarbrough. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 102 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5424. Representative Reis, the Gentleman from Jasper."

Reis: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Mautino: "Yeah, I thought you might have one."

- Reis: "Just wondering for planning purposes, if we know what time we will be in Session or times on Monday, January 10?

 And also Thursday, if we will be in Session for sure on Thursday. So, if you could get us that before we leave?
- Speaker Mautino: "Actually, they're working on that information now and I'll... as soon as I find something, I'll bring it over or make announcements. The Lady from Cook, Representative Mendoza."
- Mendoza: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 5424 I was recorded as voting 'aye', I would like to be recorded as voting 'no'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions to be voted as 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Speaker, I'd like my vote to be changed from 'yes' to 'no' on House Bill 5424."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions. The Gentleman from White, Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, on House Bill 5424 was recorded an 'aye' and I'd like the record to reflect to be recorded as 'no', please."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. Representative Acevedo."

162nd Legislative Day

- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill..."
- Speaker Mautino: "5424."
- Acevedo: "House Bill 5424 I was recorded as 'yes'. I'd like to be... the record to reflect that I was a 'no'."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. Representative Beiser."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, also, on House Bill 5424 would like to be recorded as a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Me, too. I would like to be recorded as a 'no' on that Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, would you like to change your vote as well? 'Cause I would acknowledge you to change your vote as well, if you'd like to."
- Speaker Mautino: "Oh, I'm fine, but thank you for asking. The Gentleman from Rock Island."
- Boland: "Yes, I would like to have my vote changed from 'yes' to 'no'. Thank you."
- Mautino: "The record will reflect. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1581, offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolution 1582, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 1584, offered by Representative Tryon. House Resolution 1585, offered by Representative Sullivan. And House Resolution 1586 and 1587, offered by Representative McCarthy."

162nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution 132, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, January 06, 2011, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, January 10, 2011 at 3:00 p.m., or until the call of the President; and the House of Representatives stands adjourned until Friday, January 07, 2011, at 9:00 a.m., and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Sunday, January 09, 2011, and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Monday, January 10, 2011, or until the call of the Speaker."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McGuire, moves adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the adoption Resolution is... Adjournment Resolution is adopted."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediately. The Rules Committee will meet immediately. Also, the Human Services Committee will meet in Room 118 at 11:30 a.m. That's the Human Services Committee will meet at 11:30 a.m. in Room 118."

162nd Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "And now allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will adjourn to Sunday, January 9 at the hour of 3 p.m. Have a safe trip home."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Attention. The Human Services Committee will meet in Room 118 at 11:30 a.m. Human Services at 11:30 a.m. in Room 118."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction... Referred to the Rules Committee is House Resolution 1583, offered by Representative Flider. Committee Reports. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on January 07, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3088. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."