11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

- Speaker Mautino: "The hour of 1:00 having arrived, the House will be in order. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most Holy God, who art in Heaven, sovereign God, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, dear God omnipotent, God omniscient, dear God omnipresent. We ask and pray Your blessing upon this august assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, and upon all of its Members. I pray that You impress upon their hearts to do that which honors You the most and that that brings You glory. Father, as they do Your business this day, I pray that You would grant them wisdom. I pray that You would guide them by Your most precious spirit that they may do that which is good; they may do that which is the most perfect, the will of God. In your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Mautino: "We will be led in the Pledge today by Representative Mussman."
- Mussman 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."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Mulligan and Reboletti are excused today."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Golar."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Harris, Representative Morthland, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 115 Members having answered the Roll, a quorum is present, and the House is prepared to do its business.

 Page 2 of the Calendar under the Order of Resolutions, appears House Resolution 35. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 35, offered by Representative Currie, adopts the House Rules for the 97th General Assembly."
- Speaker Mautino: "On House Resolution 35, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. These are the proposed rules that will guide our operations during the next biennium. There are several changes in these rules from those that governed during the 96th General Assembly and these proposed changes, I think, will increase the accountability, the openness, the opportunity for public participation in the work of this chamber. We also have some additional efficiencies. For example, under these rules the number of committees will be 36, rather than 49. Special committees will fall from 11 to 8. The first item, I think, for your consideration is that there will be an opportunity for a delay when the Rules Committee reports Amendments, whatever, to the floor or to a committee. Today, once an Amendment has been proposed by

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

the Rules Committee to go to the floor, floor action can begin immediately. Under this proposal, there will be at least a one-hour delay before floor consideration can Secondly, under past practice if the Rules Committee referred an Amendment to a Committee, there was a one-hour posting requirement. Under this change, there This will provide much more notice to will be two hours. the public. This information will be available to the General Assembly Web site as well as in the Clerk's office. Third, there is a new procedure for discharging Bills from the House Rules Committee. Now as you all know, we will keep the language that says that in the first year of the biennium all substantive Bills will be reported to a substantive committee within three legislative days. Rule is retained, but in addition, this would provide for opportunity for Members to discharge the committee and identify a committee where a substantive Bill might be heard. If three-fifths of the Members of each caucus sign on as cosponsors and sign a petition, that petition will result in the discharge of Rules Committee. That will not require unanimous consent for Bills; It will require, instead, the three-fifths support from the Members of both caucus, encouraging bipartisanship, encouraging cooperation and joint activity among the Members of the Legislature. And then finally, people have complained that sometimes a Bill that they have, they'd like a particular Senator to carry, rather than a different Senator. That's not been our practice in the past, but this will provide if the Senate is reciprocal, that Senators can identify who

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

they want to be the Sponsor of their Bill in this chamber and that's important because we'll then be able to control sponsorship in the other chamber. The only requirement is that the new Sponsor, the one that's been designated, be willing to say, yes, I'll take it on. There are several technical Amendments as well, and I do want to read for the record an interpretation of what the changes with respect to Committee Amendments means. This came about through very cooperative and helpful work between the Clerk, the Assistant Clerk, members of the Republican staff, as well as the staffers for LIS. And the idea here is to identify when an Amendment is a Committee Amendment and when it's a Floor Amendment. All of the Amendments filed while a Bill or a Resolution is before a committee are considered Committee Amendments. Any Amendment that is filed after a Bill has been approved by committee that will be a Floor Amendment. So any Committee Amendments that are not adopted in a committee or a Committee Amendment that's sitting in Rules when the Bill is moved out of the committee, then that would disappear and if someone who wants to file it would that be required to file it again as a new... as a Floor Amendment. So... and if there is an Amendment pending when a Bill is rejected by committee, that Amendment will be tabled... say there are several technical issues. I want to make the one final point, and this is very important, the rules create a framework under which this House will operate. The rules do not guarantee an outcome. The rules don't say your Bill gets heard and my Bill doesn't. The rules do not determine how we behave

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

equitably and fairly with one another in this chamber. And I would point out that in the 94th General Assembly, when the other Party was in power and some of these rules came into being, only 5 percent, only 5 percent of the Bills that passed this House were sponsored by the then Members of the Minority Party, the Democrats. Let me tell you what's happened in the last three biennia, the last three Sessions of the Illinois General Assembly."

Speaker Mautino: "Excuse me, Majority Leader. I would ask the Members of the House to please bring the volume down. The staff are having discussions, take them to the back of the chamber. Please give the Majority Leader your attention."

"What happened in the last three biennia is that there Currie: has been parity; there has been fair play. Approximately 60 percent of the Bills introduced in the 94th General Assembly were introduced by Democrats, 40 percent by Republicans. And guess what the percentage passage was in the House of Representatives, 60 percent of the Democratic Bills, 40 percent of the Republican Bills. In the 95th General Assembly; 61 percent of the Bills introduced were introduced by Democrats; 53 percent of those passed the House, actually less than a proportional majority; 39 percent were introduced by Members of the Minority Party, that is to say by Republicans, and 47 percent of the Bills that passed the House were sponsored by Republicans. the last Session, the 96th: 61 percent were sponsored by Democrats and about 65 percent of the total number were sponsored by Democrats; 39 percent from the Republicans, 35 percent of those that were totally passed. The point, the

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

point is the same rules can lead to very different outcomes depending on how we behave toward one another, depending on whether we are willing to work in a bipartisan spirit of cooperation and fair play. And I would submit to the Members of this chamber that under the rules that we have operated under during these last several Sessions, there has been fair play. There has not been any effort to trample upon the legitimate rights of Members of the Minority Party. So, I would urge the Members of this Assembly to adopt House Resolution 35, establish the rules that will be the framework for governance in this chamber. Let's then get on with solving the important issues and problems that today face the people of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved the adoption of House Resolution 35. This does require a recorded vote. We have a number of speakers; first, the Gentlemen from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Eddy: "Under House Rule 18(g), I move for the discharge of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 35 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. And upon conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49, Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, 'Any vote shall be by record vote whenever five Representatives shall so request.' Mr. Speaker, there are at least five

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge Amendment #1 to House Resolution 35 from the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Mautino: "That's... the Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, is seeking recognition."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment must have been very recently filed. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "There being an objection, the Motion fails."

Eddy: "Speaker." Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "I rise to a point of order. We specifically requested a Roll Call vote on my Motion pursuant to rights granted in the House Rules and the Illinois Constitution. This breech of the rules should be corrected immediately with a Roll Call vote on my Motion to Discharge. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, these rules are going to affect each and every one of you. I think it's very important for at least the next several minutes that you pay close attention to what's being proposed, because you are going to have to live by those rules. There are some significant differences in the proposals related to how the House shall be governed by these rules, and I think it's important that we debate that and we discuss those. So, Mr. Speaker, under House Rule 57(a), I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair that there be no recorded vote to discharge Amendment #1 to House Resolution 35 from the House Rules Committee. And I wish to debate that Motion."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Eddy, if you'd like another minute to address your Motion, please go right ahead, and then I'll go to the Roll Call."

Eddy: "I think we have several on our side of the aisle who would like to address my Motion and there are at least three Representatives that I know of that want to make points about that Amendment. So, I would request that those individuals be allowed to make their points and then I am allowed to close on my Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "That request will be granted. Representative Tryon, you're seeking recognition on the Motion?"

Tryon: "Yes. I rise to support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Mautino: "This would be on the Motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair, correct?"

Tryon: "Well, absolutely. I rise because..."

Speaker Mautino: "Continue."

Tryon: "...I actually believe that the Resolution to support House Resolution 25 (sic-23), which is the House Republicans request for rule changes, is a very important request. It doesn't just address the issue of having to have a change or a needed change in the process to which we discharge from the Rules Committee or discharge a Motion to the House Floor, but more importantly, it's filled with mechanisms that I think provides more..."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Tryon, if you could..."

Tryon: "...of an opportunity..."

Speaker Mautino: "I would ask the Members to please bring the noise level down and give your attention Representative Tryon. Thank you."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Tryon: "I think one of the most significant changes in this request is that we will be having a budget process that provides more sunshine on the budget before we vote on it. It provides for a 72-hour posting period for a final action to be taken on a budget. We have been criticized by nearly every media outlet across the state for the way that we present our final budget for a vote. The first year that I sat in this chamber, I didn't get the final budget that we voted on until after we had entered into the debate on the budget. How could you possibly make a decision on a multibillion dollar budget if you haven't seen the budget? And that process needs to be changed. It needs to be changed for every single Illinoisan that depends on the outcome of that budget. Whether you're a social service agency, whether you're a unit of government at the local level, they need an opportunity to see what's in there because they need you to advocate on their behalf if the budget is unfairly treating them in a manner of which it shouldn't. So, therefore, I think for that reason alone, that's a rule that we should debate that's not contained in House Resolution 35. I would urge that we sit down, we work out this process, and we come up with rules that we can agree on as a chamber because this framework in which we operate is important to the orderly conduct of this chamber. It's important that we don't erode our own rights that we, as individual Members, take care of our individual rights and not succumb to the powers of the Leadership. were elected with equal powers and we shouldn't have to bend down on bended knee to the caucus Leaders to get

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

things corrected and considered in front of the chamber. Let's vote for more sunshine. Let's overturn the Chair's ruling. Let's consider House Resolution 23, Amendment #1, so that we can have a fair debate. Thank you."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Leitch: I would... as well am honored to add my voice in support of the Motion before us. I think, especially, for newer Members, and for those who have been here a long time but don't know any better, the importance of this issue, yeah including you, Mr. Stephens, the importance of this mission... of this issue can not be understated. Year in, year out, slowly but surely, your individual rights of Members have been eroding and eroding and eroding and There was actually a day on the floor of this House when individual appropriation Bills per agency were considered, and individual Members could Amendments that were heard and considered on those measures. There was collaboration between whomever was in the Governor's Office, the agency liaisons, and respected Members across the aisle. There was camaraderie. was respect for individual Members on both sides respect for the constituents whom we represent. haven't even seen or heard of a Conference Committee Report in the last eight to nine years. Most Members on this floor have never even heard of a Conference Committee Report. The whole system works better when we have an open system that enables individual Members to have the rights

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

to pursue the interests of their constituents. And that's why the rules that we propose are so important. If 71 of our Members decide that we think a Bill is important enough that it should be released from Rules, and not, no, not go to committee, where it might not be heard, but come to the floor on a special order in the Calendar to assure that that measure will be heard. That is a very appropriate mechanism to accomplish that as opposed to having one person stand up and say, no, your measure won't be heard. To assure that the measure is heard on the floor, using the special Calendar, your idea endorsed by 71 Members or your colleagues will be considered. Why would you, for any reason, not want to be a full-fledged partner in this process and let your rights be dissipated? Not only your rights, but why would you want to dilute the rights of the people whom you represent, disenfranchising the people you So, while I know many people view this as represent? inside baseball, many people don't understand the consequence or the impact or the fact that these rules have real consequences. I would just invite you as individual Members to support us, and to secure a fair and open process. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion on the Motion, which is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion. Can we have some decorum in the chamber? This is very important. It is very..."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Speaker Mautino: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd ask that you bring the noise level down."

Rose: "Thank you, Speaker. There are very important distinctions between the rules offered by the Majority and the rules offered by our side of the aisle. And it starts with, quite frankly, how they were offered. We published our rules during the last General Assembly and sent a copy to each one of you, every Member of this Body. We also published them to the world through our media to the citizens of Illinois. We have had ours out for over a month now. The rules urged by the Majority popped out of nowhere yesterday morning about 9 a.m. and were voted on in committee shortly thereafter. That's a very important way of looking at how this whole thing is going to work. you talk about transparency, but you don't offer them for public inspection until the day of, it sort of defeats the whole concept and purpose of openness and transparency. here's what our agenda would do and what our rules would First and foremost for budgeting, we would propose. institute performance-based budgeting. We would empower every Member of this General Assembly on a year round basis to review the agencies' budgets, how they are implementing those budgets, not just when we're here. For taxpayers, we take those reviews, those budgets hearings out of Springfield and out of Chicago, and take them to the citizens of Illinois. That's a totally different way of doing budgeting than what we have done here in the time I've been in Springfield. That would be one change. Here's one from a taxpayer's standpoint. We would cut the

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

number of committees to no more than 30. We're up at over 60 committees in years past. That's a cost... it's a cost to the taxpayers, and the last time I checked our bank account isn't exactly the healthiest. So we would cut the number the bureaucracy. committees, cut Openness transparency that we talked about, the Rules Committee, itself, would for the first time ever, have an advanced notice requirement for consideration of Floor Amendments. And I do want to acknowledge the fact that the Majority has included a few of these items or very similar things in their rules, but we'd have a 72 advanced notice requirement for referral of Bills to committees, 24-hour advanced notice for other hearings. But Ladies and Gentlemen, and most importantly on the notice requirement, any budget that passes the State of Illinois would get 72 hours of sunlight before we could vote on it. Any budget that would pass would have to have 72 hours of sunlight and public inspection before we can vote on it. That in itself would be a vast improvement, and that is missing from the rules of the Majority. The last two points are critical, I believe, Mr. Speaker. First, with respect to the discharge petition, our package would apply that 71 Members file a letter with the Clerk; it would be kicked to the floor and we'd have a vote on it by all Members. The rules offered by the Majority would kick a Bill that had been sent back from a substantive committee back to the committee that previously killed it. I question the effectiveness of such a rule. If so and so committee just got done killing a Bill, why would we think or expect any opposite conclusion

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

if all the rule change in the Majority does is send that discharged Bill back to the committee that just got done killing it. That on its face is laughable. The last thing, and in the same part of the Majority's rules... Mr. Speaker, this... Mr. Speaker, every Member of this chamber is being asked to give up their appeal rights. Every Member of this chamber is being asked to give up their appeal rights. That's substantive and due process of the United States Constitution and Mr. Speaker, we should have order in here. Rule 18(g)... Mr. Speaker, before we give up our appeal rights as Members, Mr. Speaker, we ought to at least know what we're doing. Can we get some decorum in here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Mautino: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will staff and other Members who are having conservations please move to the back of the chamber, and please give attention to the Representative on his points."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Rule 18(g) of the Majority's proposed rules, limit our appeal rights. I've spent... since 2 p.m. yesterday, I've wracked my brain thinking of any governmental body anywhere in the United States of America that waives appeal rights. It's a fundamental part of the United States Constitution procedural due process that you can appeal a decision of a governmental body. Yet, 18(g) waives that for every Member of this Body. More importantly, it waives it for anyone who wouldn't agree with that Member of the Body. It is fundamental to the very core of democracy that you be allowed to appeal. I do not think it is in the best

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

interest of this chamber or democracy as a whole to waive any Member's right to appeal and in so doing, waive all the Members' rights to agree with that Member. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The question has been put and has been debated. And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' There will be a Roll Call. Representative Eddy, you're seeking recognition?"

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Could I just take a minute to close on my Motion?"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "If we could have some order in the chamber?"

Speaker Mautino: "Ask the Members to please give your attention to Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "I think Representative Rose made a great point about paying attention to what we're voting on here. I want to give you one major difference in the proposals that you have before you today as a Member of the House of Representatives that I would hope would help you to at least support our position that House Amendment #1 should be brought to the floor for a full debate. Let me give you one major difference. Under the proposed rules, there is, for the first time since I've been here, an opportunity to discharge a Bill from Rules Committee, but in doing so, Members lose one of the most basic and important rights they have to due process. You're trading your empowerment for a rule that's not going to do you any good. Contrast that with our proposal. Our proposal uses the same number, 71, but it guarantees that if you do the work and get 71

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

signatures on a petition, that your Bill will be brought to the House Floor, not sent to a committee. And it's 71 Members of the Body; it's a simple supermajority. It's not a beach party. It empowers you much more for you to be able to bring to this Body the things that are important to your constituents and then we guarantee you a vote on that Bill. We create a petition calendar. Not only can you get the Bill out if you work hard and get 71 signatures on the petition, you're guaranteed a vote on that proposal. that's one difference. Another major difference... I applaud that we're doing something different Committee Amendments. Our proposal takes care of Floor Amendments as well and requires that Floor Amendments see the light of day and have an opportunity for posting and a hearing. It goes farther. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't to want to disparage any attempt to change rules that need to be changed, but this does not do it. This is not our best effort. Please vote with us on this If you do, you're empowering yourself. This is issue. about your empowerment. It's about being responsible for yourself and not blaming someone else because you couldn't get a Bill out of Rules Committee. You're not going to have that excuse anymore. Right now you can go home and say, I couldn't get it out of Rules Committee. We're taking that excuse away. If you work hard and you get 71 signatures on a petition, not only do you get the Bill out of Rules Committee, you get to have an up or down vote and you can go back and tell your constituents that you went to Springfield and you served their interests. Today, you can

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

go back and blame the Speaker. You're responsible for this vote right now. All this vote is, is a vote to discharge a different set of rules so that you can vote to empower yourself. I request that you vote against the Chair. Do not sustain the Chair. Hit the red button. If we always do what we've always done and this is pretty much the same old same old, bury Bills in committee, we're always going to get what we got and it's not good for the people of this state. It hasn't been good for a long time. Vote with us. Vote red. Let's get that Amendment out here and really make some changes to the House Rules."

Speaker Mautino: "And the question is, 'Shall the Chair be sustained?' All of those in favor of Sustaining the Chair will vote 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bost, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 63 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', and 0 voting present, then the Chair is sustained. We now return to House Resolution 35. Representative Currie has presented the Motion and on that Motion, Representative Reis."

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

Reis: "Representative Currie, it's our understanding that in doing away with the Motion to Discharge, that you would have to go through a procedure that would require the signatures of three-fifths of... is it both caucuses or three-fifths of the General Assembly, the whole chamber?"

Currie: "It's three-fifths of the Members of each caucus, which I think is maybe... the number would be sort of around 71,

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

but it would require cooperation. It would require support in a bipartisan cooperative fashion."

Reis: "Well, it seems now our side... the Minority is the one that usually plays this out. And we have 54 Members and we had 7 Members of your side, wouldn't that be bipartisan? It would be over 60, which would be the threshold to actually pass the Bill."

"We adopted this from rules that currently govern in Currie: the Illinois State Senate, and I believe they adopted that proposal from having looked at other state practices. thought this is something that we should try. Maybe we should go back to the old rule. Maybe we should say the only way to discharge the Rules Committee is with unanimous consent, but we have heard from many of your colleagues and mine that there ought to be some other way of discharging the Rules Committee from consideration of a particular Bill. And we said, okay, we're willing to look at that question. Let's say three-fifths of the Members of each caucus sign a petition, sign on as cosponsors and then that Bill will move. Let us try it. I think that this House operated fairly and equitably in the last Session and the one before that. Again, rules are only a framework. But I'm willing to try this new method for discharging the Rules Committee, and I invite you to join me. Give it a whirl; let's see how it works."

Reis: "Well, let's take this same analogy, if we will, Leader Currie, to the change in Bill sponsorship. Why not require those same supermajorities of both caucuses in order to

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

change the Sponsor of a Bill? Why is it fair for one part of the legislative process, but not fair for another part?" Currie: "The idea behind this rule change, Representative, is to give more autonomy, more authority to the Members of Republican Members, Democratic Members, House: Majority Party Members, Minority Party Members. So, here we're talking about your right to control what happens to the Bill you passed in this chamber when it gets over to the other side of the rotunda. Maybe somebody who doesn't like your Bill, picked up that Bill. And what this rule change... what this says is, as long as the Senate is reciprocal, you get to choose a Sponsor that likes your idea, not one that detests it. I think every Member of this chamber ought to be in favor of a rules change that gives you more authority, gives you more control over your good ideas than you've had in the last several General Assemblies."

Reis: "I couldn't agree with you more."

Currie: "Good."

Reis: "So why don't we go back and apply those same line of thinking to discharging a Bill that is very important to us, and maybe very important to those on the Senate side, by having those same simple Majority thresholds in order to move a Bill. We're being contradictory here."

Currie: "But under the sponsorship rule, it's a Majority of one. And I don't think that it would makes sense to say that one person... one person can say I'm going to discharge the Rules Committee and assign my measure to a substantive committee."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Reis: "But yet one person can stop it."

Currie: "I invite you to join me in supporting these rules as they contain, as I say, many provisions that have been recommended to the Rules Committee by Members of your Party as well as my own."

Reis: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Many of you may have saw that former Representative Bill Black was here today and he still may be on the floor. And to borrow one his phrases that he used to say is that there's been more bologna come out here in the last hour than in an Oscar-Mayer bologna plant. Talk about fairness, we did exactly the opposite of what fairness is being promoted in these House Rules. When we just voted on a Motion to Discharge some ideas that we have, there was no fairness in that debate. There was no fairness in that vote. This is exactly what happens, and you can throw out all the statistics you want to about 40 percent of our Bills have passed, it's the meaningful Bill, it's the meaningful Amendments that we can never get to the floor. We represent, give or take a hundred thousand people, 5.5 million people now, the Minority caucus, and we have absolutely no say in State Government. They have absolutely no say in State Government; it all comes down to one person. And these House Rules are not about change. They're not about openness and transparency. It's squeezing down honestly, it's the exact opposite. individual Member's rights, both the Majority Party and the Minority Party. This is all about power. You feel it slipping away and you want to control your caucus, you want to control ours. This is not what the people voted for

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

last November. And quite honestly, this is about as un-American as you can get not even to allow a vote on a Motion to Discharge. It's bad enough that Members on your side of the aisle are scared to take a vote, want to bottle up the process, so we just eliminate the vote, give all the power to the Majority Party and the Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I spoke with our staff in December and January. I think we should go to a Committee of the Whole on the rules process. Let's openly discuss each side. If you don't like our proposals, vote them down, but this is going in the wrong direction. If any of you have courage on that side, let's vote it down. Let's go back to the drawing board. The next two years of this General Assembly all hinge on this vote. If that's the vote you're willing to take, so be it. Don't go home and tell your constituents that you voted for change."

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Madam Leader, I have a question. This question... I usually don't look to Washington, D.C., but they have a discharge petition process and it's quite different from the process that the Majority rules. Could you... do you understand what their discharge petition is in D.C.?"

Currie: "I'm not familiar with federal procedures."

Mitchell, B.: "Basically, what it'd say, Leader, is if you have a majority of the Members of the Body sign a petition, the Bill comes directly to the floor for a vote. That's a pretty simple process. It's not three-fifths of the

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Democrats, three-fifths of the Republicans. To the Resolution. Oftentimes, some Bills aren't partisan, aren't Republican or Democrat. They're downstate versus city, urban versus rural, those types of things. And I can tell you, in Central Illinois, and I'm sure it's no different from your district, is I've had Democrats tell me, how come one person, meaning the Speaker of the House, can say 'no' to a Bill?"

- Currie: "Well, under this rule that will not be possible because any time there is a petition signed by three-fifths of the Members of each caucus and those people are cosponsors of the Bill, the Bill will be moved out of the Rules Committee and into a substantive committee or back on the floor if that's where it had earlier been."
- Mitchell, B.: "And I appreciate your response, but call me skeptical maybe even cynical, I think that three-fifths of the Democrats and Republicans for a Bill is hard to get. A simple Majority of 60-plus votes in the Body of 118 shows there's substantial support to debate a Bill on this... we are supposedly the people's House. If you get 60 folks who believe in something, have a debate. I mean, my position might not prevail. Sometimes they don't."
- Currie: "But remember that under these rules as under the rules of the last General Assembly, all Bills in the first year of the term have to be sent to a substantive committee within three legislative days. So your good ideas are going to be heard this year as they were in the last two."
- Mitchell, B.: "Leader, I appreciate your point of view. I've had legislation... I'll talk about something called concealed

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

carry. Concealed carry got out of a committee and yet... and was on Third Reading... or Second Reading and I couldn't move it to Third because the Majority wouldn't let me bring it to the Floor. Now it got out of a substantive committee, but that didn't mean it was going to get a debate on the floor of the House. I would propose that... okay. If that Bill or any other Bill gets 60-plus signatures, that we could at least debate it. This is the people's House. Let democracy work, Madam Leader, let democracy work. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, just kidding. Welcome back, Bill. The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Resolution Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Eddy: "Leader Currie, if I could have you explain again the Committee Amendment filing process for the Committee Amendments? Could you review that?"

Currie: "Sure. Right. And this is an effort to increase accountability and openness. All Committee Amendments must be filed by 3:00 the day before the Bill is scheduled to be heard in committee. That means the Clerk will put that Amendment, that Committee Amendment, on the Internet so everybody will know what's going to be heard in the committee the next day. The Rules Committee will meet and decide whether to send the Amendment to the committee or not and then there is this other thing that happens and that was what I read some language about. And we had

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

wonderful help from the Assistant Clerk, Brad Bolin, as well as Members of your staff and LIS in sorting through what counts as a Committee Amendment, what counts as a Floor Amendment. Do you want me to walk you through that again, Sir?"

Eddy: "No, that... that's fine. I want to make sure, to the point here; a Committee Amendment can be timely filed with the Clerk but never referred to a committee, correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "That's still up to the Rules Committee. How would someone under these proposed rules then be allowed to try to get a Committee Amendment that's been timely filed and sent to Rules out of Rules Committee?"

Currie: "Well, if the Bill gets out of the committee and the Committee Amendment does not... the Committee Amendment didn't go to committee, then the individual would refile the Amendment as a Floor Amendment and then presumably it... presumably the reason the Rules Committee didn't record it was because they ran out of time. So presumably at that point, the Rules Committee would refer the Floor Amendment back to committee if it makes significant changes in the Bill and was not discussed during committee or possibly to the floor."

Eddy: "Well, currently, a Member's... a Committee Amendment isn't required to go to Rules, correct?"

Currie: "That's right. And there were complaints; complaints from Members of this chamber that people didn't know... you don't always know what's going to come up in Committee when a Bill is on the docket. So members of the public had no

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

idea what Amendment might be offered at 10:00 in the morning in the Revenue Committee. So this is a response to that problem. File the Amendment by 3:00 on the day before the Bill is scheduled for hearing, and that means the public will know because the Clerk will put it on the Web site. The public will know what is under consideration with respect to that particular Bill when the committee next meets. So we're trying to be more accountable, more open. That's where this rule came from."

Eddy: "I get that part, but it does diminish the possibility for a Committee Amendment to be filed and actually provides the Rules Committee with power that it doesn't currently have over that Amendment that a Member can file. So it provides more control to that Rules Committee then we have currently."

Currie: "Except that I think the point is to be more accountable and I think what that means is if somebody comes along with an Amendment that reverses the course of the Bill, there'll be an opportunity to look at it more closely."

Eddy: "What about Floor Amendments?"

Currie: "Floor Amendments today go to the Rules Committee.

They will continue to do so, but there'll be more time for the public and everybody else to pay attention before there is action on the Amendment. No delay today or no delay yesterday in the filing of a decision by the Rules Committee to be referred to the floor. There will be at least a one-hour delay if House Resolution 35 is adopted. And when it comes to posting for committees, there has been

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

a one-hour rule, a one-hour delay. That one hour becomes two hours, again, because we want people to know what's happening; we want people to be able to access information about their government at work."

- Eddy: "Well, along those lines, Representative, is there anything in the rule changes or these rules that allow for a certain period of time, like our rules did for three days for a budget to be on display, for example. How long would a budget... under these proposed rules, how long would a budget Bill take from conception in Rules Committee to be voted on on the floor?"
- Currie: "Well... but remember that budget Bills, like any other Bills, have to go to committee. So you'd have the same timetable for Bills dealing with the appropriations process as you do with Bills that deal with the Criminal Code or revenue issues or matters affecting cities and villages. So there's no difference."
- Eddy: "So a Floor Amendment to a budget Bill could be acted upon in Rules and sent to the floor, though, without ever going to a Committee under these proposed rules?"
- Currie: "Well, an Amendment can, but traditionally, Rules Committee does not send brand new ideas that are filed as Amendments to the floor. And remember we have budgeting for outcomes in place in Illinois today, not a function of House Rules but a function of statute passed by the Members of the last General Assembly. So when it comes to clarity about the budget and when it comes to openness and accountability, we're there."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Eddy: "Representative, I remember a Floor Amendment to the income tax increase Bill that came out and made a change that I would consider to be a significant change. It dealt with property tax relief no longer being part of the proposal. Now, I don't think that's a technical Amendment, but that flew out; no one had the opportunity to see that Amendment. That doesn't fix... these rules don't fix that problem."

Currie: "But well, first of all, I don't think it was a significant change, it just restored current language, current statute. But second, under the old rules, that Amendment could have been considered immediately the Rules Committee sent it to the floor. Under the proposed rules, under House Resolution 35, there will be a mandatory one-hour delay. It may take longer than that, but the mandate is one hour."

Eddy: "Representative, I guess my point is we can do better than one hour on a budget Bill that's going to affect the people of the state and spend taxpayer's money. And I think, one of the big contrasts in our approach and what these rules are proposing, we take into account the fact that people should see that budget Bill, have the opportunity to look through it, and in fact, we propose several days for that final version of the budget Bill to be there. I have one quick question for you related to the loss of the… a Member to appeal the ruling on a discharge. Based on these rules, if these rules go into effect, what option is available to a House Member to discharge a legislative matter from the Rules Committee besides the 71,

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

to actually know that you're going to have a vote on that, you're going to have the opportunity to discuss it on the floor? Is there anything in these rules that preserves in any way the right of a Member to appeal?"

- Currie: "You can certainly file a discharge Motion Representative. That's been true for a very long time. I don't know of a time when it was not possible to file a discharge Motion."
- Eddy: "We just couldn't debate or we couldn't try to override the appeal... or the ruling of the Chair."
- Currie: "Well, of course not. Think... think what we're talking..."
- Eddy: "That opportunity is being taken away from Members in these rules."
- Currie: "You're taking nothing away from anybody who can read. Anybody who can read the rule that says it takes unanimous consent. Unanimous consent means something pretty clear. Anybody who's ever looked at an English grammar book knows that. So for somebody not to get unanimous consent and think that they should have a right to appeal the ruling of the Chair that flies in the face of logic; it flies in the face of reality. And the reality, Sir, is that those Motions are made only to make political points, only for sound bytes, only for partisan politics, which have no place in this House of Representatives."
- Eddy: "Wow. I can't believe you even said some of the things you said, but if that's your version of reality, it is for the sole purpose of controlling people and to hold on to that power, the very power that we're trying to eliminate

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

so that Members can be empowered. The point is, you can no longer have the right to appeal the ruling of the Chair. And I, Representative Currie, am able to read, to answer your initial comment. I can read. I can read very well, and what this does is it takes rights away from Members that we currently have. That's what this does. Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you buy into this theory that somehow you're being empowered, you have completely missed the point of representing the people in your district. You are supposed to be here and be responsible not only for filing legislation, but bringing it to a vote so that you, as the elected Representative of the people that send you here, can push for the things that they want. This is a democracy. This is supposed to be the House of the people, not the House of a person. That's what this become. It's become the House of a person. You take away unanimous consent, but you replace it with something that eliminates rights. Every single time the Members of this Body attempt to do something to empower themselves, the reaction is to take power away from you. We saw it when we did campaign finance reform: caps, limits, contribution limits. happened? Everybody in here has contribution limits except for the Leaders. You are empowering the Leaders more, and when you do that you take away your power and your responsibility as an elected Representative. These rules... these rules no matter what the Majority Leader says, do not empower you. They take away a right you currently have. Ladies and Gentlemen, do not fall into this trap. Do not

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

continue to shift power from you to the Speaker. I haven't got anything against the Speaker. This isn't a personal This is a responsibility issue in a democracy and our responsibility on this side of the aisle is to try and provide some balance. And your responsibility is to represent the people that send you here. If you vote for these rules, you're diminishing your power to do what you're sent here to do. Vote 'no' on this Resolution. Let's work together in a bipartisan manner. I love the throwing around the term bipartisan. The rules were posted a few hours yesterday before the Rules Committee met. Ours were weeks ago. You want to work in a bipartisan fashion, let's sit down and work in a bipartisan fashion. Those of you on that side of the aisle that come all the time looking for support on issues, and we work together. You're right, Representative Currie, there have been a number of Bills on both sides that have come out. doesn't diminish the need to open this process up even more so that Members on your side and our side of the aisle can be empowered to do what we're sent here for. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, vote 'no'."

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

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, I just have a few questions and this is a matter that came up about a year ago, and I want to get some clatification on it. But I asked the Gentleman in the Chair a year ago about how a Bill gets posted to

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

committee and it took about three days for a response. I want to make sure that I have this process correct. I file a Bill; it goes to Rules Committee. If I'm fortunate enough to have the Bill sent to a substantive committee, do I have an automatic right to have that Bill called once it has been referred from Rules to a standing committee?"

- Currie: "So in the first place, in the first year of the term your Bill will be under these rules, assigned within three legislative days to a substantive committee. I believe the posting is done... the Chair actually makes the posting and I'm not aware of the Chair's refusing to post. I just am not familiar with that."
- Durkin: "Well, that happened to me last year where I had a Bill that was... I won't mention the committee name because I am, you know, not going to out that person, but the Bill was told it was posted and I... it was unposted by the time it was... the day I appeared in committee to present the Bill. So, it is the chairman, I will make it very clear, is the one who will determine whether or not a Bill is going to be posted for a hearing, correct?"
- Currie: "The Rules do give the chairman the authority to make the posting."
- Durkin: "Okay. If the chairman refuses to post the Bill, do I have any ability to overrule or any type of mechanism to or any avenue of appeal to have that Bill posted for committee if the chairman has decided not to? We do have personalities that sometimes conflict here, and it may be a bad day for the chairman and maybe the day before there's been some type of issue, but those are the realities of how

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

- we operate down here. Can... is there a mechanism for if I have problem with the chairman of the committee, and they've said they're not going to post my Bill for a hearing. What could I do?"
- Currie: "Well, you could ask the Rules Committee to rerefer your Bill to a different substantive committee. You could go complain to whoever appointed that chair to say, wait a minute, can't you control this person. You know, all kinds of options."
- Durkin: "Oh, I know. I know, but we've done... look we've gone down those roads in the past and generally we don't get anywhere. I just want to make sure that we... it's perfectly clear of what is the purpose of posting a Bill since we did have a little bit of an issue on it a few years ago. But it is, I want to make it clear, it is the chairman who will post a Bill for committee and that if that Bill is not posted, I have the right... then I will come to you and ask that you reassign that Bill to another committee where I can get a full hearing on it."
- Currie: "And that would definitely be in your rights. And the point of the posting requirement is so the public knows what is on the committee agenda."
- Durkin: "And will you give deference to that Representative if they have been shut down in a committee, you, as the chairman of the Rules Committee, to have that Bill sent out to a committee for a full hearing?"
- Currie: "I'll certainly give it consideration."
- Durkin: "Since it already has been removed from the Rules Committee one time before, I would hope that you would be

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

able to make that decision that you will abide by your previous ruling. I had sent you a letter... I'm sorry, you were... go ahead."

Currie: "Go ahead."

"I had sent you a letter last week and one of the Durkin: things that's kind of... I see as a bit of a concern is that when we do have certain Bills that are filed, we do have a variety of notes that are filed on those Bills, whether it's a Home Rule note and the one that concerns me the most, particularly in these economic times, is the fiscal I don't see where a fiscal note has any impact upon anything in this Legislature. It is meaningless. in a letter to you if we could consider within the rules that if a fiscal note has been filed and it shows that it will have a negative fiscal impact on the state that we raise the threshold to a supermajority, 71 votes. point I'm trying to make is that I want these notes to have some type of standing. I don't want them to be advisory. They should have some meaning. And I think that everyone in this chamber, I've been around here for about 13 years, knows that these fiscal notes, sometimes they're used for dilatory purposes, but they do have a function. And I'm afraid that they are... the effect of those fiscal notes are meaningless. So..."

Currie: "But, Sir, I would say that all of our votes are important, all of our votes should be taken seriously by each and every Member. The Constitution prescribes that some measures, primarily bonding, will require extraordinary Majority votes, but that is not true for

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

other measures, whether it's enhancing criminal penalties or adopting any other substantive matter. So we did consider your proposal, but we rejected it. And I guess I would only recommend that you might want to try a Constitutional Amendment."

Durkin: "Well, I... don't you believe that we have within our purview as Members of the Legislature under the Constitution, I think we have a plenary authority to make... prescribe the rules that we... on how we operate the chamber and particularly, how we are going to act on certain pieces of legislation. In your legislation, you're not allowing discharge Motions to be... I believe that there's going be no Roll Call taken on there. I will respectfully disagree with your position on that. I think that we do have the authority."

Currie: "I think..."

Durkin: "But I think... as I said in my letter, we need to review this note process because I think, one, it's been abused in the past; and two, it seemingly has absolutely no impact upon Members of the Legislature and we need to put some teeth in these notes. And I hope that we take those up at some point in the near future because I believe it will help this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Deputy Leader Leitch, the Gentleman from Peoria."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I have a... what I consider to be a very legitimate question and I have a bit of curiosity on this point, because since the Magna Carta, representative

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

government has evolved to increase and include protections for the Minority. And to that and for example, in Robert's Rules of Order, one can always appeal the ruling of the Chair. I, for the life of me, cannot understand how by rule... adopting a rule in the General Assembly, we can repeal a right that has been available to Representatives in government for eons. Could you shed some light on that?"

Currie: "Sure. As you know, Robert's Rules is the default when our rules are silent on a particular point, but we are not The reason we have our own the same as Robert's Rules. rules is precisely because Robert's doesn't always answer each and every one of our questions, each and every one of our procedures. I would remind you that there are opportunities for appeal all over these rules. The single instance in which these rules say no appeal is the obvious one that if you did not get the unanimous consent, there is no rational point in challenging the ruling of the Chair that the Chair looks and says, you did not get unanimous consent. You know perfectly well you didn't. What is the meaning of an appeal of the ruling of the Chair in that instance? There is no rational basis for an appeal, and to say we're not having it is not to undercut the rights of any Member of this chamber. And again, if you look throughout the rulebook, you will see many, many opportunities for appeal. To talk about this one tiny, tiny issue when the grammar itself will tell you there is nothing to appeal, nothing to appeal, strikes me as a mistake when the point of what we should be doing today and

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

in the months to come is cooperating, working together to solve real problems, and you know what they are. Real problems facing the people of Illinois: budget problems, worker's compensation problems, problems with the way our schools operate. One after the other, those are real, they are earnest. Pension problems. Let's get on with it. Let us not take one tiny little issue and make it seem as if that's all this chamber is about. The rules we are offering are fair. They have been fair in the past. They are more accountable under House Resolution 35 then they were even in the last biennium. Let's get on with it, let's adopt the rules, and let us roll up our sleeves and go to work."

Leitch: "Thank you. I have great respect for you personally and certainly for this process in this chamber. I guess the point that I would raise is, who decides that this is just a little bitty rule that really doesn't matter? It seems to me the entire point of constitutional government, having constitutional rights is that the Minority always has an option to challenge the judgment of the Majority Party. So, it is in that context that I think that it is a very grave error, whomever is writing the rules, whether it's this side or your side. I don't understand how you can go to that extent of repealing a fundamental right of a Minority Party to appeal the ruling of the Chair. Thank you."

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

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Tryon: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask the Lady from Cook a question..."

Speaker Mautino: "Certainly."

Tryon: "...and to speak to the Resolution, if she will yield."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, she will."

Tryon: "Leader Currie, I also have respect for this process and I consider it an honor of a lifetime for each and every one of us to have the opportunity to come down here and represent a constituent base. But I also believe that when it comes to issues on this House Floor, 99 percent of the issues that we consider are not partisan issues; they're issue driven. And Robert's Rules of Order is clear in its mission to protect the rights of the Minority while facilitating the process of the Majority. I'm not talking about the rights of a political Minority. I'm talking about the rights of a Minority for an issue. And when we give up the collective votes of 71 people in this chamber who were sent here to represent their constituent base, to hear a Motion because we want to engage caucus Majority's permission to consider something, I think is fundamentally wrong. Why would I be want be a Democrat and vote for this, if I could have 60 Democrats who want to discharge a Motion for a Bill, but yet, I have to get three-quarters of the Republican Caucus to go along with me. I'm giving something up. A right that I think is inherent in our able to pass legislation that's Constitution to be meaningful for issues that govern our state. That's what I'm objecting to, the right to consider an issue before this Body. It's going to be placed underneath the right of

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

the two political caucuses to provide supermajorities to say its okay to have that debate. So, I'm glad that you agree that unanimous consent needed to be debated, because that flies in the face of democracy. This isn't a democracy if it's ruled by the authority of one. It's a democracy when we vote on stuff and the Majority rules; I agree with that. But we're replacing an impossible process with another impossible process, and I think that's wrong. And that's my reason for not being able to support this. I do have a question. When it comes to sponsorship that comes over from the Senate, I pick up a Bill. I'm working with the Senator in the other chamber and I pick up a Bill that that Senator has and suddenly, he doesn't want me to carry it or she doesn't want me to carry it. Can the Rules Committee deny the change in sponsorship?"

Currie: "Under these rules, again, if they are reciprocal. If the Senate has the same rule and the Senator wants somebody other than you to carry that Bill and that somebody other is willing to do it that will be an automatic shift. The same thing will happen over there. If your Bill passes here and somebody who's hostile to your Bill picks it up, you'll be able to say, no, I want someone friendly to carry that Bill and that will happen automatically as well. This gives you authority. This gives you control. Not to start with your idea when its here in the House, but it will give you authority and control over your idea in the Senate. Many Members have complained that they don't have that; they have not had that authority in the past. So this is to empower individual Members of the Minority and the

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Majority, so that they can pursue their legitimate legislative agendas."

Tryon: "So the answer is, the Rules Committee can't deny the request of a Senate Sponsor."

Currie: "That is correct."

Tryon: "Okay. To the Bill. I also appreciate the Majority's previous history of accommodating the Minorities when we consider Bills. My point here once again, as Members of this chamber, let's not give up our collective right to discharge an issue to the House Floor if we want to do This isn't about Republicans and Democrats. about legislation. Every piece of legislation that doesn't pass out of here with a unanimous vote has a minority. And we need to protect those rights, and we need to be able to discharge to the House Floor, and we need to be able to discharge directly from a committee to the House Floor. Don't vote for this. Let's go back and change this. Let's make 71 votes, no matter who they are, carry the day to bring something forth on behalf of the citizens in Illinois to have a proper debate. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. In the Legislature, as in life, priorities are forever shifting and changing. Few of us actually accomplish what we hope when we arrive in the office in the morning. New problems arise, fires must be put out, and what started out at the top of our 'must do' list yesterday, inevitably waits for tomorrow. So it is with my vote on the House procedural

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

rules today. For the 97th General Assembly, continuing the work to get our fiscal House in order must be our top priority. Both Governor Pat Quinn and former Governor Jim Edgar recognized that increased revenue was a must if we were ever going to responsibly address this state's fiscal Also a must was the hard spending cap that the legislature adopted with the income tax, an important and critical part of achieving fiscal stability for the state. Already, the spending cap has been cited by bond rating agencies as a significant and positive step forward and one of the reasons our bond ratings have stabilized. just about the bond houses, however, citizens demand and deserve fiscal responsibility from us. Part of making the spending cap tamperproof is assuring that it is not easily undone by a simple Majority vote of future General Assemblies. The rules before us today provide that important protection. These rules require a three-fifths vote, a supermajority vote, in fact, a bipartisan supermajority vote for this House of Representatives to either the spending cap or the amend continuing appropriation for the pension payment. Under these rules, a bipartisan supermajority is required for any such legislation to move from Second Reading to Third Reading. The fact that these changes are included in this set of rules demonstrates the commitment of this Body and the Speaker to assuring the integrity of the spending cap. These changes place fiscal stability at the top of our 'must do' list. Furthermore, as the Majority Leader has indicated, there are changes in these rules before us today

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

that empower Members to carry out their responsibilities to those they represent. These include: allowing three-fifths of the Members of the two caucuses to discharge a Bill from Rules Committee where now we require unanimous consent, and I think that dropping the requirement from 118 Members to three-fifths is a very significant change; making Committee Amendments available online for the public and Legislators review and digest before they're considered committee; and increasing the time between the filing of Floor Amendments and their consideration in Committee or on I am encouraged by the direction taken in these new rules. But today's top priority, the item at the top of today's 'must do' list, is the fiscal stability of State Government. It will no doubt remain the top priority for some time to come and certainly the remainder of the 97th General Assembly. With the changes in these rules that provide important protections for the spending cap and the move toward empowering Members, I will be voting 'aye' on House Resolution 35."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters, is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Winters: "Majority Leader, I apologize, I'd been in another meeting and missed much of the debate on this, but I had one question. My understanding is that there is a provision in these rules that would remove the ability of this Body to override a ruling from the Chair."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Currie: "Only in one very limited circumstance, Representative."

Winters: "And that is..."

Currie: "And that is when someone is denied unanimous consent and it's obvious that unanimous consent was denied.

Opportunities for appeals of the ruling of the Chair otherwise abound throughout these House Rules."

Winters: "Are there other… the question I wanted to get at is, are there other parliamentary Bodies that you're aware of that have carved out a specific area that is not allowing any kind of appeal of a ruling of the Chair?"

Currie: "I don't have a list, but I do know there are many Legislative Bodies where there is no right of appeal at all, and here we're talking about something where it's obvious that there is nothing to appeal. There is nothing to appeal. There isn't… it's not a judgment call; were there more 'ayes' than 'nays' on the question, shall we cut off debate. And someone could try to overrule the Chair on that. That doesn't change. But here…"

Winters: "But my understanding, though, the… one of the most profound elements of Robert's Rules in the general parliamentary procedure is that if a chair of the meeting makes a ruling that it is always appealable. And if you could make available instances where there are other Bodies, governmental Bodies, that have ruled that there is no appeal, I would appreciate that."

Currie: "I will do that."

Winters: "Thank you very much."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, before I begin, would Mr. Tryon yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Tryon indicates that he will."

Madigan: "Mr. Tryon, there was a quote in today's <u>Capitol Fax</u> that quotes you as saying that you plan to continue to jamup the works. And I wanted to know if you could tell us whether that's true or false."

Tryon: "I did not use the words, 'jam-up the works'. I think what I referred to was we'll find parts of the process to make our points, which I think the job, Speaker, of the Minority is to challenge the Majority. And I think that's part of being a good Minority Party, not 'jam-up the works'. I didn't… those are not my words."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had a very full debate on the adoption of the set of rules for this Session of the General Assembly. Representative Currie has pointed out on several occasions that the rules constitute a framework for the conduct of business. The rules do not mandate how people should vote. The rules do not solve difficult issues. The rules provide a framework for the conduct of business. The set of rules before the House right now contain changes from the last Session where changes were requested and recommended by both Democrats and Republicans. Many of the suggested They were put into the rules, changes were accepted. others were not. At the end of the day, the rules permit and authorize the Majority Party to operate the House of Representatives, to conduct the operations of the House of

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Representatives, and that's what this set of rules will do. Now that we have had our debate on rules and we're prepared to move forward, I would suggest that all of us just accept that there's a set of rules and function under those rules recognize that there are some really difficult decisions that lie ahead for all of us, Democrats and Republicans. Issues such as a restraint on spending and if it's violated, the recently adopted increase in the income tax would be sunsetted and the state would lose \$6 billion of revenue, not an insignificant issue. An issue that we're all going to be called upon to deal with: a restraint on spending. We may be called upon to revise the funding We're all familiar with the for the Capital Program. decision of the Appellate Court in Cook County, and we may be called upon to rewrite that statute; again, a not There's the continuing problem of insignificant issue. cost in the Worker's Compensation System. It must be addressed and will not be easy to bring down those costs. We're all going to be called upon to make some difficult decisions and probably some tough votes. Unemployment insurance: the unemployment insurance trust fund is in a condition today where interest charges are already accruing against the Illinois fund imposed by the people in the Federal Government in Washington. This will require an It will raise charges, bring down benefits, adjustment. again, tough decision making, tough votes. The TRIP program, the program which provides health insurance for retired school teachers outside the City of Chicago; it's limping along. It needs to be addressed. It needs to be

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

adjusted. If it's not adjusted, it's going to go bankrupt in short order. Again, another case where there may be increased charges, less benefits, tough decision making. Not easy stuff to deal with. Same type of program for the community colleges, that fund is scheduled to go insolvent calendar year, again, maybe increased charges, decreased benefits. We're all familiar with the inadequate funding of the state pension systems, again, tough decision making. Telling people you're not going to get everything you thought you were going to get. Telling people you may have to pay in more. Not easy stuff, so we all better get ready for it. Retiree health care for former employees of the State of Illinois: same story, people are accustomed to one level of benefit, they're going to be told, we're going to change that. It's not going to be as good as it used to Those are just some of the issues that will come be. before this Body and the Senate and the Governor's Office over the next three to four to five months. So as I said, we've had our debate about the rules. We, on this side of the aisle, have heard about the rules for two years. We've read about them in the newspapers. We've read all your campaign literature. Now is the time to get to work on the real issues, the real problem solving problems that we have here in the State of Illinois. So now is the time for people to buckle up and get ready for some tough work. Mr. Speaker, I want compliment Representative Currie for the fine work that she did in drafting these rules and taking suggestions from all Members of the House incorporating some of them but not incorporating others.

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

She did a fine job. She's to be commended and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has closed and Representative Currie now moves that the House adopt House Resolution 35.

All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rita, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 63 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no', and 0 voting present, House Resolution 35 is adopted. Representative Watson is seeking recognition."

Watson: "Point of personal privilege.

Speaker Mautino: "State your point, Sir."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, the Speaker made some comments about the challenges that lie ahead; and, I mean this humbly, the last eight years, I would argue, we partially got into this condition because we had rules that ignored ideas from the Minority Party. And that was our intent to bring up some of these changes and to allow a Bill with 71 votes to be brought to the floor. I understand that there's plenty of games that are played and plenty of partisanship that is played, but you cannot argue that in the course of eight years, our general obligation debt has risen from 7 billion to 27 billion. You cannot argue that GRF spending has grown at the rate of over 2 billion... a billion to 2 billion a year. You cannot argue that short-term loans, payday loans for the state, in 20 years prior to 2003 were five and a half billion dollars. Today, the last eight years, the one-party rule has brought us to twelve and a half

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

billion dollars. I'm prepared, Mr. Speaker, to sit down with you and you know this. You know the level of respect that I hold for you. I'm prepared to sit down and tackle these issues. I only hope I only hope that the way these rules were just handled is not reflective of what we talk about when we say; we're in this together."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Brown, is seeking recognition."

Brown: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Brown: "I move to adopt House Resolution 32, which recognizes my friend in the House gallery today, Nick Webster, Correctional Officer of the Year. If we can recognize Correctional Officer Nick Webster."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, place House Resolution 32, sponsored by Representative Brown. Representative Brown moves to adopt House Resolution 32. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters. There's been a Motion. This requires a voice vote. Representative Brown moves the House adopt House Resolution 32. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Representative Yarbrough is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Yarbrough: "Mr. Speaker and Members of this august Body, this is Black History Month, and every Black History Month the many Members in the Black Caucus share with the Body history of black history. So today I'm going to share with

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

you the history of black history and in future days you will hear from colleagues in this Body about other events. So Americans have recognized black history since 1926, as first as Negro History Week and then later as Black History We owe this celebration of black history to Dr. Carter G. Woodson. He was born of parents who were former slaves. He spent his childhood working in Kentucky coal mines and enrolled in high school at age 20. He graduated within two years and later went on to earn a Ph.D. from Harvard University. The scholar was disturbed to find in his studies that history books largely ignored the black American population and when blacks did figure into the picture, it was generally in ways that reflected inferior social position that they were assigned at the time. Woodson, always one to act on his ambitions, decided to take on the challenge of writing black Americans into the nation's history. He established the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1915, and later founded the widely respected Journal of Negro History. 1926, he launched Negro History Week as an initiative to bring national attention to the contributions of black people throughout American History. He chose the second week of February for Negro History Week because it marks the birthdays of two men who greatly influenced the black American population, Frederick Douglass and Lincoln. However, February has much more than Douglass and Lincoln to show for its significance in black American history. For example, February 23, 1868, W.E.B DuBois, important civil rights leader and cofounder of the NAACP

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

was born. February 3, 1870, the 15th Amendment was passed granting blacks the right to vote. February 25 in 1870, the first black U.S Senator, Hiram R. Revels took his oath of office. And February 12, 1909, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was founded by a group of concerned black and white citizens in New York City. Thank you for allowing me to share with you a bit of black history. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin, is seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Colvin: "Real briefly, the Illinois Press Association's legislative reception that was scheduled for tomorrow evening has been canceled and will be rescheduled at a later date. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

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

Speaker Mautino: "State your point."

Winters: "As we start the new legislative calendar, I would like to ask one request of the Speaker, and that is that the Elections Committee... makes sure that we actually are following state election law. I got a robo call last week from a certain Rahm Emmanuel asking me to vote absentee for him for mayor of Chicago. Now, I live almost 100 miles from Chicago and I was wondering, he did say in the communication that there was no necessary reason that I had

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

to have to vote absentee that you could basically vote absentee as you wish to. I want to make sure that we're not trying to reach out and making every voter in Illinois eligible to vote for the Mayor of Chicago. If that was the case, it might not be a bad idea, but if the Election Committee would double check the eligibility of all Illinoisans and whether or not they can cast their ballot for mayor of Chicago, I would appreciate an answer. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Mautino: "I'm sure they'll look into that directly.

 The Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock, is seeking recognition."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Bellock: "I just wanted to invite all the COWL Members, anyone who's interested, Representative Pihos and I will be hosting a meeting at 4:00 or after committees regarding new leadership for this year. We'd love to have anybody who's interested. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Mautino: "State your point."
- Pritchard: "I would also like to make an announcement about the Legislative Education Caucus is forming again. And you should have all had a letter on your desk, either here in Springfield or in the district office, inviting you to the

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

first meeting on February 14. It is Sweethearts Day, so we will have something for all the sweethearts. But please join us and be a part of education discussions and moving legislation forward that we're all passionate about. Thank you."

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

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair.

I noticed that COWL is meeting for their... forming of their leadership, and I just wondered if the group formerly put together by the original Art Turner, Brotherhood of American Legislative Leaders would be meeting, as well, to try to put their Members together?"

Speaker Mautino: "I will check the schedule and get back to you on that. And now, Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions.

Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 9, offered by Representative McAsey. House Resolution 15, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 16, offered by Representative Will Davis. House Resolution 17, offered by Representative Watson. House Resolution 18, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 24, offered by Representative Brady. House Resolution 27, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 28, offered by House Resolution 29, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 33, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 34, offered by Representative Osmond. Representative Osmond. And House Resolution 36, offered by Representative Bradley.

Speaker Mautino: "Majority Leader Currie."

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to suspend the posting requirement so the House Revenue Committee can have a subject matter hearing at 4:00 this afternoon. I know of no objection."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves the posting requirement be suspended. Is there leave? Leave being granted, and the Motion is adopted. On the ... back to the Order of Agreed Resolutions. Mr. Clerk, Representative Currie now moves adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. Agreed Resolutions are Representative Currie moves... For Members who have not had a chance to see the bulletin, I'd like to let you know that Thursday Session has been canceled. Also tomorrow, the... when the House adjourns until... today until 9 a.m. tomorrow, the Democratic Members should be here early. We're going to have Democratic caucus at 9:00. And for the Members of the Majority Party, committee assignments will be announced and posted this afternoon. For the Minority Members, see your Leadership for your announcements there. And now ... Excuse me, the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Just a clarification. We'll go into Session at 9 a.m. and then go to... you'll go to caucus. Is that correct? We'll sign in first?"

Speaker Mautino: "That is correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The House will come in tomorrow at 9 and there is no Session on Thursday. And now, Representative

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Currie moves the House stand adjourned to Wednesday, February 9, at the hour of 9 a.m. All those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'yeses' have it. And allowing Perfunctory time for the church... for the Clerk... the church, yes... allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourned."

Clerk Bolin: "First Reading and introduction of House Bills. House Bill 1152, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1153, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1154, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1155, offered by Representative Holbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning abandoned vehicles. House Bill 1156, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1157, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1158, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1159, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1160, offered by Representative Morthland, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1161, offered by Representative Morthland, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1162, offered by Representative Morthland, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1163, offered by Representative Morthland, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 1164, offered by Representative Morthland, a Bill for an Act

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

concerning State Government. House Bill 1165, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1166, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. Bill 1167, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1168, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1169, offered Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning warehouses. House Bill 1170, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1171, offered by Representative David (sic-Greg) Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1173, offered Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1174, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1175, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1176, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1177, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1178, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1179, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1180, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1181, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Act concerning government. House Bill 1182, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1183, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Bill 1184, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1185, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1186, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1187, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1188, offered by Representative David (sic-Greg) Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement. House Bill 1189, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 1190, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Bill 1191, offered by Representative David (sic-Greg) Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1192, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. House Bill 1193, offered Representative David (sic-Greg) Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1194, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1195, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning Government. House Bill 1196, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1197, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1198,

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 1199, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an concerning appropriations. House Bill 1200, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1201, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 1202, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1203, offered Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1204, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1205, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1206, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1207, offered by Representative business. Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1208, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1209, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 1210, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning state employment. House Bill 1211, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1212, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1213, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1214, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1215,

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1216, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1217, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Bill 1218, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1219, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1220, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1221, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1222, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1223, offered by Representative Will Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1224, offered by Representative Will Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1225, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1226, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1227, offered by Representative finance. Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1228, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1229, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1230, offered by Representative courts. Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1231, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 1232,

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1233, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning civil House Bill 1234, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1235, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 1236, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. House Bill 1237, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1238, offered by Representative May, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1239, offered Ford, Representative Bill for an Act concerning a education. House Bill 1240, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1241, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 1242, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1243, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1244, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 1245, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1246, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1247, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 1248, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 1249, offered by Representative

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 1250, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1251, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning sex House Bill 1252, offered by Representative offenders. Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of House Bill 1253, Employment Security. offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. House Bill 1254, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1255, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning families. House Bill 1256, offered by Representative Colvin, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1257, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Bill 1258, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1259, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning public House Bill 1260, offered by Representative health. Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 1261, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. House Bill 1262, offered by Representative Mussman (sic-Farnham), a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1263, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1264, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1265, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1266, offered

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1267, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1268, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1269, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 1270, offered by Representative safety. Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 1271, offered by Representative Burns, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 1272, offered by Representative May, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 1273, offered by Representative Burns, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1274, offered by Representative Burns, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1275, offered Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1276, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 1277, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 1278, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 1279, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 1280, offered by Representative McCarthy, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 1281, offered by Representative Colvin, a Bill for an Act concerning civil House Bill 1282, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1283, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act

11th Legislative Day

2/8/2011

concerning transportation. House Bill 1284, offered by Representative Monique Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 1285, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 1286, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. And House Bill 1287, offered by Osmond, a Bill for an Representative Act concerning First Reading of these regulation. House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 10, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 13, offered by House Resolution Representative Jerry Mitchell. offered Representative Cross. House Resolution 20, offered by Representative Reitz. House Resolution 21, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 22, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 25, offered by Representative Hays. House Resolution 26, offered Representative Franks. House Resolution 30, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Resolution 31, offered by House Resolution 37, offered by Representative Kay. Representative Mathias. House Resolution 38, offered by Representative Beaubien. House Resolution 39, offered by Representative Brady. And House Joint Resolution 5, offered by Representative Sacia. These Resolutions are automatically referred to the House Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."