23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order and Members are asked to please be at your desks. We'll be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center here 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 for the Pledge of Allegiance. Lee Crawford."

Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and sovereign God, who art holy in all of Your ways, God who is immutable and God who is infallible, we come before Your throne of grace with humble hearts and with sincere thoughts asking You to bestow Your blessings upon this august Assembly, Your blessings upon the Speaker of this House, Your blessings upon the Leaders of this Assembly, Your blessings upon all the Members of this House. And God, it's in times such as these we ask for Your guidance, we ask for Your wisdom, we ask for Your mercy, we ask for Your help, we ask for Your strength, we ask for Your courage, we ask for Your passion, we ask for Your insight, we ask for Your unselfishness, we ask for Your spirit that we might do that which honors You the most and we might do that which is the good and that which is the most perfect will of God. This we ask in Your precious Son's name, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris, would you lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."

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

23rd Legislative Day

- stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Golar is excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Michael Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Bellock is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 115 Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. We're prepared to do the work of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1283 and House Bill 1427. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1151, House Bill 1527, House Bill 1542, House Bill 1560, House Bill 1670, House Bill 1717, House Bill 1882, House Bill 2858, House Bill 2891; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1553; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 13, House Resolution 84, House Resolution 86, House Resolution 92, and House Resolution 94. Representative Ford, Chairperson from the Committee on

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Small Business Empowerment & Workforce Development reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1100, House Bill 1262, House Bill 2073, and House Bill 2083. Representative Lyons, Chairperson from the Committee on Tollway Oversight reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1889, House Bill 1890. Representative Holbrook, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1093, House Bill 1558, House Bill 1563, House Bill 1657, House Bill 2001; recommends be adopted is House Resolution Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1864, House Bill 1876, House Bill 1877, House Bill 1957, House Bill 2051. Representative Farnham, Chairperson from the Committee on Disability Services reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1663. Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law reports the following committee action taken on March 02, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 297, House Bill 1074, House Bill 1112, House Bill 1254, House Bill 1258, House Bill 1271, House Bill 1272, House Bill 1554, House Bill 1927, House Bill 1929, and House Bill 1985; do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 220 and House Bill 1073. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 110. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass Short Debate is 1605 and House Bill 1888. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Aging reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 2019 and House Bill 2020. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Telecommunications reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1610. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 60. Representative McCarthy, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass Short is Bill 1471 and House Bill Debate House 1956. Representative McAuliffe, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 1445; do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1537. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption Reform reports the following committee action taken on March 03, 2011: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 1149, House Bill 1255, House Bill 1698 and House Bill 1699. Referred to the House Committee on Rules is Resolution 141, offered by Representative William Davis."

23rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record would also reflect that Representative Jerry Mitchell is excused on the Republican side of the aisle as well today."
- Speaker Lyons: "So noted, Mr. Bost. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, remove Representative Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 139, offered by Representative Dan Burke and House Resolution 140, offered by Representative Mayfield."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Joint Resolution 26, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, March 03, 2011, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, March 08, 2011 at 12:00 noon."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves for the Adjournment Resolution, House (sic-Senate) Joint Resolution 26. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Speaker Madigan in the Chair. Joe Lyons still in the Chair. Representative Chapa LaVia, for what purpose do you rise, Ma'am?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah, Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I just want everybody to be aware that tomorrow is Representative Al Riley's birthday and then on Saturday Representative Sacia's birthday. So, if you could wel... congratulate them and give them a hug. They need it 'cause they're very old. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention. We'd like the Members to take their seats and we'd like the staff to retire to the rear of the chamber. We have a distinguished guest today. So, if Members could take their seats. Staff could retire to the rear of the chamber. We're very pleased to have with us today the Consul General assigned to Chicago from the Peoples Republic of China. We all know that there is a tremendous trade between America and China and particularly between Illinois and China and the Consul General will speak to all of that. It is my pleasure to introduce you to him and I'm going to work my way through his name and I know he'll bear with me and so will you, Guoqiang Yang."

Guoqiang Yang: "Thank you, my most respected Speaker and thank you other Representatives of the House of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel so privileged and so honored to be invited by his Excellency, the Speaker of the House and to visit you, the great city, great town. Probably the most of great city in the U.S. because this is the place where your greatest President, Abraham Lincoln, lived and worked right here and from here he created the United States and he offered the liberty and freedom to the people of the United

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

States. And he is one of the most leaders of the world that mostly respected and admired by people in China and by leaders of China. And I feel so privileged to have the opportunity to visit you who represent the great State of Illinois and people of Illinois. What I would like to say in a few words, in a few minutes as a... of your precious time, I want to bring to you about the result of the Jintao's visit recently to President Hu Illinois Chicago. This is the only place he chose to stop outside Washington, D.C., of his first state visit to the United States and the only state visit that President Obama invited for the whole year around in the United States to the world leaders. As a result of his visit to D.C., the two countries' leaders decided in next 5 to 10 to 20 to 30 or more years, China and the U.S. will establish a cooperative honor relationship with mutual respect and mutual benefit. And all these will mean the two greatest countries and the two greatest people become the most friendly and most friends. I'm honest. And this will lead the two greatest people to realize the common dream, which is a peaceful world with better lif... better life. And we're going to work jointly for this economically, educationally, humility and we're going to have lots of program to be carried out in the next 5 or 10 or 20, 40 years. We're going to work hard on people-to-people exchange. President Obama offered the opportunity for American young people to travel to China in the next 5 years for 100 thousand of them. And President Hu Jintao offered Chinese young people the opportunity of sending 10 thousand Ph.D. study students

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

to the U.S. And right at the scene of saying good-bye, a bon voyage to our President, he talked to our ambassador and me in a suave way. Now, many people thought it was about the good words about the good job that we have done and we may be promoted, but actually was not. The words that he told us is that we should try to ask the investors from China, entrepreneurs who develop their business in the U.S. and establish U.S. companies, to join the stream of the businesses who chose to support President Obama's plan to send 100 thousand students to China. And he told both Mr. Ambassador and me we should support him and call on them and to choose the same attitude and gesture as who are Boeing and Motorola did. And they're going contribute, each of them, 100 thousand U.S. dollars to support the students' program. So, the Chinese investors in the U.S. will do as the President asks and they're going to do the same and they will support this people-to-people exchange. Now, all this will leaves our two great countries with more closer relationship. Now, all this will benefit the people on both sides. They will see more investors come to the midland, the heartland of America, to looking for opportunities to create jobs and to create economic development and they are doing so. So far, there is as many as 30 Chinese companies headquartered being the hub city of midland, Chicago and in Illinois there are as many as over Now, all Chinese ventures invested. this thousands of job opportunities and at the same because of the domestic consumers' markets booming China, we can see lots of American products to be exported

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

to China. There is an extreme example. I have just talked to his Excellency, the great Mr. Speaker, that Caterpillar received great increase of market share in China. Their products exported to China increased by 300 times... no, 300 percent. I'm sorry, three times. And all this represents the opening of Chinese import market and consumers' market and I can tell you any products marked, 'Made in the U.S.' can enjoy a high retail value markup, mostly worked on. So, these will really provide great opportunities and that is a result of the President's visit. The contract signed in Chicago amounted about 23 billion U.S. dollars and many of them be shared by Illinois. Our only contract on the import of sardines amounted to 1.9 billion U.S. dollars. That's enormous market in China. And, we need to work together and to compete with other competitors from Europe, from Asia, from Japan, from Australia, and anywhere else. If we can do a better export increase to China, the average increase by 40 percent last year, for U.S. only increased by 27 percent. Now, there's a gap. If we could do, why not us? Why not the U.S.? Why not Illinois? Why not Midwest? So, when we work together and as the Consul General here, I want to be your partner. I want to be your assistant. At any time my office will be ready to serve these papers and let's work jointly for the dream of America and dream of China. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "For those of you who wish to greet the Consul General, he's agreed to be available right down here in the well for a certain period of time. So, feel free to greet him and exchange greetings. So, thank you very much."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair.

Representative Burns, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Burns: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Burns: "Thank you very much, Speaker. In the gallery on the Republican side of the chambers there are a group of University of Chicago students led by Dylan Ziegler. They're here visiting the State of Illinois, that is Springfield, the State Capital, learning about Springfield today. They've met with me. They've met with Leader Currie and hopefully some of them will be joining our staffs in the years to come. I'd like them to be recognized and welcomed to Springfield."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, University of Chicago. Enjoy your day in Springfield. Glad to have you. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I hope everybody will join me in congratulating the new alderman of the 4th Ward in the City of Chicago and the new clerk of the City of Chicago, Will Burns, 4th Ward alderman, Susana Mendoza, City Clerk. Yeah. And I also... also in absentia... in absentia we should also congratulate Harry Osterman who won with only more than 80 percent of the vote. It was so tiring that he is still resting up so that he can come back and meet the challenges of the state before confronting the challenges of the city."

23rd Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "On page 8 of the Calendar, Representative Dunkin has, under the Order of Resolutions, House Joint Resolution #4. Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. House Joint Resolution 4 extends the reporting date for the Recess In Schools Task Force. It really just changes the date. It gives us more time. And I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Joint Resolution #4 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Joint Resolution #4 is adopted. Members of the House, I'm going to start on page 6, where we left off with Third Reading Bills. And Representative Jack Franks, you have House Bill 102. Representative Franks, page 6 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 102, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was brought to me by a constituent. We were able to pass this unanimously in committee because what it really does is it defines the crime of 'property of another'. Right now there is no definition. It's... for instance, someone who is a renter or someone who is staying in a property would pretty much trash it, there's no crime for that. So, this would... this

23rd Legislative Day

- would define that and also clarify case law. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Davis, M.: "You know, I apologize, but I didn't hear you..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis... Representative Davis, one minute. Ladies and Gentlemen, can we bring the noise level down. There's a discussion on a Third Reading Bill, please. Shhh. Thank you very much. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Yes. I wanted him to kindly explain what his Bill does. I didn't hear him the first time."
- Franks: "Sure. This Bill was brought to me by a constituent. And what it would do is it would define the crime of damage to property of another. Currently, under the statutes, it's undefined. So, this will give us some clarity and also have it mirror the interpretation of statute which is in case law."
- Davis, M.: "So, in other words, you're saying if the property is valued between \$300 and 10 thousand, then it's a Felony IV. Is that correct?"
- Franks: "Yes. The way this is laid out, in which we've mirrored the case law, Representative, is damage... if it's less than \$300, as it is for all crimes to property, that would be a Class A misdemeanor. And then between the amounts of 300 and 10 thousand, it's a Class IV. Then under..."

23rd Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "So... Thank you. What does... what does the current law say? What happens currently if a person damages someone's property?"
- Franks: "That's the rub. Right now, there is... there's been recent case law, in the case that we have cited is People
 v. Snyder, this is exactly what it does. This would codify the case law, which we do often here, to put this in statute."
- Davis, M.: "So, in other words, there is no attempt to give a judge some discretion?"
- Franks: "Oh, no, of course there's discretion. What we're doing though... it's like anything in the statute, you could have discretion. What we're trying to do though is to codify this instead of having to rely only on case law."
- Davis, M.: "So, we're codifying this, saying that if the property is worth a certain amount of money or if it's a school or a place of worship, then the fine can be, is that, \$25 thousand?"
- Franks: "Representative, we're not changing anything that's already in the case law. If I can direct you to the actual Bill itself and if you look at the Bill, I don't know if you have that pulled up on your computer, but if you'll go and you'll look on pages... it's a... it's a four page Bill."
- Davis, M.: "It's what..."
- Franks: "What we're... what we're amending is the statute that already exists that already deals with all of the penalties that you're already describing. We're not changing any of the penalties. We're not changing anything except defining what that... 'property of another'. That's all we're doing."

23rd Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "Except what?"
- Franks: "Except defining the crime of defacing property of another. That's all we're doing. If you'll look at the… at the actual language…"
- Davis, M.: "Okay. What... Let me just ask you this. What is the definition that you're using for the..."
- Franks: "Okay. On page 2 of the legislation it says, 'For the purpose of this subsection (i), 'property of another' means a building or other property, whether real or personal, in which a person other than the offender has an interest which the offender has no authority to defeat or impair, even though the offender may also have an interest in the building or property'. That's the definition."
- Davis, M.: "So, this is defacing property?"
- Franks: "Or... yeah. Or more than defacing. It would be, you know, someone trashing an apartment building. You know, a renter who decides to leave or is evicted and they trash the property."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. My only concern is, you know, we already have so many laws on the books, so many things in reference to criminal penalties, I want to be really careful about adding to those and also I want to be really careful about taking away a judge's discretion."
- Franks: "There... It doesn't take away."
- Davis, M.: "Because I think cases can be individual and we already know that our prisons and jails are overcrowded mostly with African-American people. Therefore, I am very careful today on those Bills that I will support in reference to criminalizing people or taking away a judge's

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

discretion. However, because you did give a reasonable explanation, I will vote 'aye' on your Bill."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate the questions.

And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 102. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hays, McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 3 voting... 3 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Winters, on the bottom of page 6 you have House Bill 166. Representative Dave Winters, House Bill 166. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 166, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As amended this Bill would create a Higher Education Green Jobs and Technology Act. It creates a mechanism where the universities and community colleges can try to coordinate and publicize over the Internet the different job training programs and courses that they would offer for someone interested in getting into the new area of the economy called green technology and green jobs. This is simply a way to allow them to more fully and quickly identify the institutes of higher

23rd Legislative Day

- education in our state that would offer those courses. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on House Bill 166. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 166 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This 'present' having received... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hays, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Hays: "A point of personal privilege. Mr. Speaker, I'd like the record to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on House Bill 102."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes. On the top of page 7, Representative Hatcher, Kay Hatcher, you have House Bill 180. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 180, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Kay Hatcher."
- Hatcher: "Mr. Speaker, could we return that to Second Reading?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, place the Bill on the Order of Second Reading on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Michael McAuliffe, on the top of page 7, you have House Bill 196. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 196, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mike McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 196 would provide that a prisoner who's serving sentence for the offense of domestic battery or aggravated domestic battery committed after the effective date of this Bill... of this Act would receive no good conduct credit. This Bill is currently supported by the Attorney General's Office and from various violence protection groups throughout the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Speaker Lyons: question is, 'Should House Bill 196 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns, Mary Flowers. Representative Flowers, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 15 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative LaShawn Ford, you have House Bill 204 on the middle of page 7. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 204, a Bill for an Act concerning HIV testing. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 204 simply states that any HIV test offered in the State of Illinois must be approved by the Department of Public Health based on recommendations of the U.S. Center for Disease Control. At this time, there are no opponents on record. And the proponents are the Illinois Department of Public Health, the City of Chicago and the AIDS Foundation of Chicago. And I move for passage of House Bill 204."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bond, Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman yields."

Stephens: "Representative, could you give us the basic mechanism of action of the ELISA test?"

Ford: "Excuse me?"

Stephens: "The basic mechanism of action of the ELISA test."

Ford: "Well, that's the previous. That's why we're getting rid of it. I don't have..."

Stephens: "Was it..."

Ford: "I can't give you that information right now. I can talk to you about it."

Stephens: "What's the mech... what's the mechanism of action of the Western Blot Assay test?"

Ford: "I'm not here to talk to you about medical terms and things like that."

Stephens: "Then why are we changing?"

Ford: "I'm going to tell... I can tell you that."

Stephens: "Okay."

23rd Legislative Day

- Ford: "We're changing it simply because right now the HIV testing system has become a little more advanced. And the Center for Disease Control has found that there are better tests that we could use that's not... that's... better methods that would be used than the previous methods. So, the CDC recommends that we now change the testing and to..."
- Stephens: "So, you would recommend that the State of Illinois always follow the recommendations of the Center for Disease Control?"
- Ford: "I would rec... I would state that Illinois agrees with this. The Illinois Department of Public Health supports this legislation."
- Stephens: "Well, I'm not one who thinks that the bigger the government is the brighter the government is, but I'm going to trust your judgment and follow your lead on this. And I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "No further discussion. Representative Ford to close."
- Ford: "I want to thank my colleague over there for coming together with us. Thank you very much. I move for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate... House Bill 204 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Biss. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Tryon, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to correct a previous vote that I made on House Bill 196 from 'no' to 'yes'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative. Representative Jack Franks, you have, on the middle of page 7, House Bill 222. Out of the record. Representative Watson, you're going to present House Bill 233. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 233, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Watson."

- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 233 will change the Criminal Code to provide that aggravated battery cause... that causes great bodily harm or permanent disability, when it involves the affliction of torture as defined by the statutes, will become a Class X felony. And this is a result of the story that was in the Trib a while back about the... an individual who was beat, over the course of two days, severely. We do have a heinous battery penalty in the statutes, but it only involves caustic substances. So, this would expand it to say if you tortured somebody over three or four days, it would put that at an equal par for penalty."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 233 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed note 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

who wish? Representative Collins, Representative Thapedi, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Monique Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted 'yes' on 196.

 And I wish to be recorded as 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Leitch, you have House Bill 242. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 242, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 242 accomplishes is to make clear a provision in the County Code whereby when a township asks the county to proceed to demolish or otherwise deal with a nuisance property, what this Bill does is say that counties have 60 days in which to accomplish that; otherwise, the townships can proceed to initiate that action. Throughout downstate, and certainly in my area, there have been some conflicts between townships and overworked State's Attorneys Offices who have

23rd Legislative Day

- been unable to get this paperwork moving. This streamlines the system. And to my knowledge, there's no opposition."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 242 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Reitz, on page 7 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 274. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 274, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Dan Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 274 is an initiative of the Department of Professional Regulation. It basically amends the Dental Practice Act to clarify that investigative... information to be disclosed is part of a public record in a proceeding. We had an Amendment the other day that made this an agreed Bill with the dentists and the department. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 274 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin,

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Representative May. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cunningham, you have House Bill 277. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 277, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to present House Bill 277. It amends the Sex Offender Registration Act by adding a harassment provision to it. Under this proposal, a registered sex offender who harasses his former victim or any of his victim's family members can be charged with a Class III felony. This is an initiative by... from the Cook County Sheriff's Police who had a case last summer in Harvey in which a sex offender repeatedly harassed the family of a former victim. They had a difficult time finding felony charges to lodge against him. This Bill would cure that problem. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 277 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Representative Riley, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ford, on the middle of two... page 7, you have House Bill 299. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 299, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative LaShawn Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 299 clarifies the Department of Public Health and it allows for all HIV cases to be reported to the Department of Public Health. Right now, the department only receives the information on those that have AIDS and HIV is not reported to the department. This is supported by the Chicago AIDS Foundation and... with no opposition, the Office of Health Protection. We have those two supporters. And I move for passage of House Bill 299."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 299 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Coladipietro. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapin Rose, on the middle of page 7, you have House Bill 1076. Are we ready to go? Are we all duded up? Okay. Mr. Clerk, read the… read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1076, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This really should be the Representative Will Davis Bill. Last year he made excellent point, I thought, on the House Floor. We were debating an honorary sign designation as we do so often here and he got up and said, 'Hey, we're broke. What's it cost to make these signs?' And it was a really good point, Representative Davis. And I... so, this Bill... it actually costs \$180 thousand a year, according to IDOT, give or take, to make all these signs. So, this Bill would simply say that from now on the taxpayers would not foot that Bill unless we, as a General Assembly, would agree to foot it in the form of an honorary designation. We can still do them, but it would just have to be paid for by either the des... the honoree or an agent, someone, you know, if they're passed away, perhaps their family would want to come up with the cost to make the sign or the local entity, whatever it is. But you know, Representative Davis made an excellent point. I brought the Bill forward. I'm glad he's my hyphenated cosponsor here and I'll let him take over from here. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to commend the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Rose, for taking a statement that was made on the floor and obviously seeing the merit of that statement and crafting it into... into legislation. Certainly, as we talk about how difficult times are and we know that we'll debate over budgetary matters and where to spend money or how to spend money, but this is, as he

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

mentioned, one thing that we can do to help the state just a little bit. I think he mentioned that there was an \$800 thousand price tag on it and that's pretty significant dollars, particularly in tough budgetary times. So, again, I want to commend the Sponsor. Hopefully, everyone will indeed support what will be the first of many Rose-Davis initiatives. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Menard, Representative Rich Brauer."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, just a point of legislative intent. Is it your idea that on these signs that it also will include the high schools for their sports and academic teams?"

Rose: "Yes, Representative, it would. Again, we can still do it, but someone, a local booster club or someone else would have to front the cost unless... unless we, as a Body, decide to go ahead and use taxpayer resources to do that. So, yeah, I don't know how you can end up to pick and choose."

Brauer: "So... so, what cost is that per year?"

Rose: "Well, it's... I asked IDOT. The total amount they spent last year was \$180 thousand. It's anywhere from a couple hundred bucks for a simple sign all the way up to a thousand... thousands of dollars depending on, you know, if you have to put one at each entrance to a town. Like, for example, Mahomet, where I live, has four entrances. You know, so your couple hundred bucks suddenly becomes a couple thousand dollars. So, it just... it depends on what it is and how grandiose you want it to be. I would note

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

though, again, if this Body decides that there are people that we want to honor and we all know there have been several Presidents from our state, if we want to honor them, we can do that still. We just have to on the front end, other words we're just reversing the rule. On the front end we have the state, this is going to be paid for by taxpayer resources, whereas right now it's automatically paid for by taxpayer resources."

Brauer: "Well, and I guess I'm just wondering what your view is on recognizing high school achievement. Thank you."

Rose: "Oh, I'm all for recognizing high school achievement.

Again, I think, well, the new people haven't, but it... I would bet most of us in this room have done these at one time or another, so..."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just... is there any guarantee or mechanism in here that the individual who makes the donation or the organization that makes the donation, that there's a flow through of that exact amount to pay for that? That's your intent, right?"

Rose: "Right."

Eddy: "So, if a veteran's organization wants to pay for the cost of honoring someone with a certain part of a road to be named, that they make that donation and that donation specifically go for that cost?"

Rose: "Yeah. And I... well..."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Eddy: "Okay."

Rose: "It goes to reimburse the cost of making the sign and position the sign. I mean, you're going to have to buy it, you know, a 4x4, whatever, con... you know, KwikCrete to put in the ground, et cetera. It... the sign will be made. Okay. Once they post the dollars."

Eddy: "Okay."

Rose: "If we sweep those dollars and do something else with it, it's our own problem, but they get their sign."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Yeah. Representative, I'm trying to understand this. Sometimes these names are used maybe as a memorial for historical purposes to, for instance, to encourage tourism. I know that across Southern Illinois there is a John A. Logan Memorial Highway, which is one of the..."

Rose: "Sure."

Bost: "...gentleman mentioned in our song. Why don't... in a case like that, where we're trying to promote business and we're trying to do that, but... do you see a problem with this?"

Rose: "Well, first of all, again, nothing says in this Bill that you can't allocate taxpayer resources to do that, so because a big promotion of business is a good thing, you would just have to state in your memorial Resolution that this will be paid for out of GRF."

Bost: "Okay."

Rose: "Okay."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Bost: "So, in your Resolution, you can then request that it be paid for. So, yeah..."

Rose: "You... you can... you will sti... you can... If this were to pass and become law, you'll be able... there will be three ways to something to handle. In the case of a university, you and I both represent university towns, if someone memorializes a donation to Carbondale..."

Bost: "Right."

Rose: "...obviously, we're going to memorialize that donation through a sign or a plaque or whatever, right?"

Bost: "Right."

Rose: "So, that gets paid for, in essence, out of their donation."

Bost: "Correct."

Rose: "So, that's exempted automatically. Two, you can state in your Resolution we're going to pay for this out of GRF. In which case, if it passes, fine."

Bost: "Okay."

Rose: "Or three, it'll have to be paid for by someone locally."

Bost: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose to close."

Rose: "Again, I really thought Representative Davis had an outstanding point last year and you know, this isn't going to solve, certainly, the totality of the state's budget problems, but it is, you know, a hundred eighty, two hundred thousand dollars a year that, quite frankly, can't be justified at a current point in time so. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1076 pass?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie, Representative Jefferson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the middle of page 7, Representative JoAnn Osmond, you have House Bill 1127. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1127, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill adds ballot transparency language to the bond referendum so that voters must be told how much bond issue will cost in additional property taxes. This also has a requirement that is already in the statute for corporate tax rate referendums. And this legislation also adds some transparency requirements to the bond referendums. It also allows the Lake County Forest Preserve District to keep its commitment to the voters and not increase tax rates on bonds approved by voters at referendum passed in November of 2008. It permits... it permits extending the deadline for issuing bonds. It does not increase the overall amount of the bonds allowed. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1127 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie,

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Representative David Leitch. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 100… there's 81 Members voting 'yes', 33 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Osmond, don't sit down. You have House Bill 1128. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1128, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1128 is cleanup language for the public adjuster's legislation. And it actually requires to perform relicensing coursework before they take the exam. It also allows the Department of Insurance to conduct fingerprint background checks on all public insurance adjusters."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1128 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rose, Representative Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pritchard, the bottom of page 7, you have House Bill 1139. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1139, a Bill for an Act concerning sex offenders. Third Reading."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker). And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Body has expressed itself many times on tough public policy for sex offenders. The Federal Government has also set standards that they hope will be even more strict that sets up three different tiers of offenses, knowing that not all sex offenders are a risk to society to the same degree. In fact, they have set up an exception to their tough standards called the Romeo and Juliet exemption. What this Bill does is complies with that Federal Law and allows those people that have been convicted of sexual abuse under our legislation offenders due to nonforceable age-based criminal sexual abuse to appeal to a judge that they be taken off the registry of sex offenders. This Bill clearly states that this only applies to those individuals who are older than 14 years of age and where there is four years difference and where force was not an... a factor in their conviction. This does not remove their offense. It simply removes the restrictions from the registry. It is common sense that not all sex offenders are the same degree of risk. And I ask for your support in some moderation to this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Eddy: "Representative, you and I have discussed this on one important aspect and I wanted to get it on the record. You were very gracious in providing the information, I think, that cleared up my concern. Part... part of your Bill talks about a four year age range in the... the initial act being the trigger for the person to be able to seek their name not being on this registry. My concern had to do with the fact if it was an 18-year-old student, high school student, with a 22-year-old teacher and you provided me with a statute that basically says that if the person was under the custodial authority of the offender that they would be prosecuted under a different standard and they would not be eligible for your designation."

Pritchard: "Yes, Mr. Eddy, that is correct. That is part of our current law. And this particular Bill that we have before us does not change existing legislation that does not allow those with custodial authority to be exempted from these provisions regardless of their age."

Eddy: "Can you... I think that's an important point here that you're... you're really looking at a very narrow... narrowly defined group of individuals here. This doesn't open up the... a large group of people to being able to be exempt from this. It's very narrow and it's kind of limited to that, as we refer to Romeo and Juliet, maybe there was a teenage romance and then, in some cases, those individuals are now married. And they have children, maybe children attend a school, and because they're on a registry, they are unable to attend those events at the school or daycare or other places we've protected with these laws. Very

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

narrow exception and they do have to go back and have their name taken off that list. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "That's correct."

Eddy: "I thank you, Representative."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm trying to get my arms around this. And you and I have had conversations about it and I know you know my thoughts on it, but for the Body's sake, you have a situation where an 18-year-old, who we will all consider an adult, would have sexual relations with a 14-year-old and what your Bill would do would be allow the judge to make a decision if that person should be a registered sex offender?"

Pritchard: "Yes, that's correct. The judge would be able to take any additional testimony from the victim or from the state's attorney and make a determination whether it's age appropriate and again, verify that there was not force involved."

Reboletti: "Well, one of the things that... the discussion that we've had is really what should the age of consent be in the State of Illinois and I think that's where more of the major issue was at. I'm trying... I struggle with the fact, Representative, what factors would the judge review to make a determination if the person should register as a sex offender? And besides what factors they may use, how long

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

would the judge be able to put the person on to the registry? Is it 2 years, 4 years, 10 years?"

Pritchard: "So, the timeline that's in this Bill simply says that the victim... or the perpetrator in this case can ask the judge to be removed. Obviously, they're on the registry for 10 years, so there would be that 10-year window and this says that the person that's on the registry can't ask that judge to be considered every year. They have to wait for 2-year time period and then come back and ask again. Un..."

Reboletti: "So, under... under your legislation, Representative, then they would have to be on the registry for at least 2 years and then could be removed?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Or could they..."

Pritchard: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...or would they... Okay. So, they wouldn't be able to be sentenced first and then not be put on the registry to start with. Is that... is that correct?"

Pritchard: "That's my understanding, yes."

Reboletti: "But you still believe that... that the... this is a crime that it should potentially be a registerable offense, right?"

Pritchard: "Well, it's registerable because of the failure to…
because of age to give consent. So, those are part of the
extenua... the factors that are considered in the original
charge by the state's attorney and the courts findings."

Reboletti: "Do you have... do you have any concerns about maybe some disparities as how a judge in DuPage County may view a

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

case versus how one in DeKalb versus one in Coles? Do you have any thoughts on that?"

- Pritchard: "Well, the facts of the situation across the state as we have 102 different state's attorneys and judges within those jurisdictions who are all using their own experience and knowledge to interpret and apply the law. So, there is not a guarantee that every one of them will look at a situation and come to the same conclusions. It's all the same with the sex registry offense and whether an individual is charged to be on this registry or it may be some other criminal charge that wouldn't require them to be on the registry."
- Reboletti: "If they were put on the registry for a short period of time, let's say it's 2 years, what would... what should a defendant show to the judge as to why they should be removed from the registry?"
- Pritchard: "Well, as I stated in this Bill, they would be no more than 4 years apart; they would both be at least 14 years of age; that there was not any force involved and that the… both parties were, obviously, of mental state to be able to engage in that kind of activity without coercion."
- Reboletti: "Well, thank you, Representative and to the Bill. It is with reluctance that I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Bill. And I have prosecuted these types of cases many times. And prosecutors struggle with it because of the age difference of the victim, some of them are considered... both would be considered victims, a 16-year-old male, a 15-year-old female. I think what the General

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Assembly needs to do is determine what should the age of consent be for sexual relations in the State of Illinois. Do we believe 17 is the right age? (Which it is now.) Should we reduce it to 16 years or 15 years? I know Representative Collins had a Bill that would have made it 13 years old, which I thought was too far and too extreme, but nonetheless, addressed the issue. I think it's the discretion to be left to the state's attorney who's had a chance to review the case to maybe amend the sentence which has been done in the past to charge a regular misdemeanor battery which is not a registerable sex offense instead of the criminal sexual abuse of a minor. Look at differences, Ladies and Gentlemen, between a 18-year-old adult and a 14-year-old. You could have a situation where a 18-year-old at junior college is having sex with a 14-yearold who's a freshman in high school. We have to look at the mindset of the 14-year-old and what they understand about the consequences of their actions. And so, I think we need to take this Bill, continue to work on it, maybe look at something along the lines of what Representative Senger did with the sexting issue. But I believe that the age limit of 4 years is a great disparity and we are sending a mixed message to the people of the State of Illinois. Last year or the year before, we said that people under the age of 18 should be treated like juveniles. Now, we're saying that these people that are 16 and 15 understand the consequences of their action when it comes to having sexual relations, but they don't understand the consequences of their actions if they hit somebody or they steal somebody's wallet. So, I

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

think that is a disparity. We're sending the wrong message and I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Actually, a couple years ago, we had asked for hearings across this state on the age of consent. What should the age be? And it wasn't 13, remember, Representative Reboletti. trying to get 14, but the question was not that we do 14 but, 'What age should it be?' There... actually, the surrounding states around us, right now, have the age of 14 as the age of consent. We also had a commission to study sex offend... sex offenders... the sex offender registry to see which Bills... which laws should be on that registry. Nobody cooperated so the commission came back with nothing. Actually, we don't have any studies. The laws are steady... still what they are today. And today we're still adding more laws to the state... more offenses to the sex registry. Now, I think this is an excellent Bill. I introduced it before, the Romeo and Juliet. We know that our children are having sex, consensual sex, but in the State of Illinois you cannot consent to sex unless you're 17 years old. Some of our children... actually, when Representative Brosnahan passed the law, about five years ago, I pleaded with him not to pass that law because juveniles would be added to the sex registry. So, and this is a case by case situation, Representative Pritchard, that the kids would be on the registry, go before the judge and decide that they should or should not be on the registry. Some of our children are on the registry for just merely touching a child's breast

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

or raising up a dress or hitting the buttocks and that's simply unacceptable for that our children should go through the rest of their lives being on a sex offender registry for something they did as a child and that it should be treated as a child. Everyone in here is having sex, but nobody wants to talk about sex. As a matter of fact, when we did the hearing around the state, nobody came to the hearing. People wouldn't even... didn't even want to discuss it, but it's something that should be discussed. We should decide that we should put... not have all of our children on the sex registry and we should still have a commission and to decide what offenses... which offenses should be on the sex registry. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pritchard to close."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This issue is one that recognizes that individuals mature differently. It's an issue that is under consideration in nine other states. It's an issue that is a part of the federal, very strict, legislation regarding sexual abuse. It's permitted. It's time that we deal with individuals as they are and not ask young people, who have made a mistake, to continue to pay for it through the next 10 years of their life when they're trying to get a job, they're trying to go to college, they're trying to get established. Let us let them agree that they have made a mistake and start to correct it and move on with their lives. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1139 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Burns, Currie, Durkin, Feigenholtz, Jefferson, Lang, Beiser. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 36 Members voting 'yes', 73 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the Bill fails. Representative Morthland, you have, on the bottom of page 7, House Bill 1161. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1161, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Morthland."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to bring to the Morthland: floor today House Bill 1161, a statute that, if enacted, would end the statute of limitations for sex crimes against children under the age of 18. I am pleased to say that we have cosponsors the Bill and recently on most Representative Jefferson has agreed to help cosponsor the Bill. I appreciate that very much which makes the support bipartisan. He has had a Bill in process that has similar... similar language and similar content. A couple of things to think about as we move forward: there is no statute of limitations in the State of Illinois for fleeing the scene of a fatal accident or an accident where there is personal injury. There is no statute of limitation in the State of Illinois for child pornography. And it seems quite ironic that one who takes pictures of children that are illicit has to stand under the judgment of the law for their entire life whereas someone who actually commits vile physical

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

acts against a child could have it ended when that person passes their 28th birthday. And so, I ask the House to move on this. I had a... I had a witness before committee who was violated as a boy by his Boy Scout leader. This impacted his life greatly. He said, 'I don't know how statutes of limitations are made.' But he says, 'My memory has no statute of limitations.' At the time, he feared bringing it out because he feared his father would kill his perpetrator and he didn't want to have his dad go to prison for the murder of the man who had hurt him. Later on, he did not want to tell his children. Now, as a grown man he feels he can have his story come forward, both his parents are gone and he feels he can have this come out and he is ready to speak and just wants to stop hearing from the state's attorney that, 'It's too late, Sir'."

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

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. It isn't often that I disagree with the State's Attorneys Association, but in this case I do. I think that we should give the benefit of the doubt to the victim who may have some repressed memory or may have had some fear of coming forward and then has some substantive information to give to the prosecutor. The prosecutor would still have discretion to review the case and the evidence based on the timeframe of when the crime occurred and when a prosecution would take place. And so, I still have the faith that the state's attorneys will do their job. They'll review the evidence. If they cannot bring a charge, they will simply inform the victim that

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

they don't have enough to move forward. So, I would urge you to support the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Morthland to close."

Morthland: "Well, again, I'd say to the Members of the House, I ask you to pass this Bill. The only opposition was by the state's attorneys, but let's think about this. The state's attorneys resisted because they were concerned about the process. But the point is that if we put process in that high of place, then eventually we end up putting the perpetrator in the most secure place. But that is not how the law should be in Illinois. We should not protect the perpetrator over process and we should not protect process over victims. I, again, ask the Members of the House to net... to pass this Bill and again, it does have bipartisan support. I'm very honored to bring it forward."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1161 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Collins, Colvin, Jackson, Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 11 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tracy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the prior Bill, House Bill 1157, I was recorded as a 'no' and I would like to ask that that be changed to a green 'yes' vote."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Representative Farnham, on the bottom of page 7, you have House Bill 1263. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the top of page 8, on the House Bills-Third Reading, Representative Rita, you have House Bill 1277. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Rita."
- Rita: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we got House Bill 1277. And what it basically does is makes an exemption in the Open Meetings Act for auditors and dealing with financial crimes, and dealing with possible links to fraud. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Do... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I think the intent here is to carve out a very narrow exception to the… the closed meetings portion so that in cases where they're talking about fraud and specific types of fraud that that can be done in closed session. Is that… is that it?"

Rita: "That's correct."

Eddy: "During that closed session time, there's still a recording of the closed session minutes that's reviewable in judge's chamber by order?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Rita: "I believe..."

Eddy: "So you're not changing any of that. You're just..."

Rita: "No, we're not changing. We're just... we're just allowing the exemption that they could put that exemption in just for that... for that purposes of fraud or that, but it's not changing anything else for that."

Eddy: "Okay. So, basically, this is to allow the professional opinion of an auditor related to char... or fraud charges to be heard in closed session for the purpose of keeping that confidential and that's all. And that's the exemption that you're seeking?"

Rita: "Yes."

Eddy: "Representative, I think it's a good idea. We support the concept and just want to make sure that... that these are still closed session minutes that are recorded... or closed session discussions that are recorded and available upon..."

Rita: "Yes."

Eddy: "...an order of the court in a judge's chamber. Thank you."

Rita: "Yep."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan, welcome back.

How are you feeling, Representative?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, would these minutes be in the meeting minutes at the end of the year that the public bodily... body usually goes after to sit down and look if at the end of the year they can't release those minutes and then when..."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Rita: "Yes. It would be where they could review it to see if they couldn't be rele… yes."

Mulligan: "All right. So, then would they still be subject to the fact that when the time comes, they may decide they don't want to disclose them so they would be listed as meetings of minutes, et cetera, not to be..."

Rita: "Done."

Mulligan: "...disclosed."

Rita: "Yes. They could do that, too, also."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "I'm just asking for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1277 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Dunkin, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 91 Members voting 'yes', 22 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Representative Brandon Phelps, you have House Bill 1295.
Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1295, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1295 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. It just complies with Federal Law, nothing new. It requires CDL holders to provide a copy of their

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

mental... medical certificate to the Secretary of State's Office. There's no opposition."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions, any discussion? Representative Bost."

Bost: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, if I can, two things. One, I need to excuse two other Members: Schmitz and Sosnowski. We need to excuse both of those and I would like to make a comment on the Bill, if I could."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request on that Bill, Representative Bost. And now, the Gentleman yields for a question on House Bill 1295."

Bost: "Not so much to question it but, Representative, this simply does... it put in place exactly what the Federal Government is requiring us to do with the CDL program. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Absolutely, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you. I rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 1295 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ramey, you have House Bill 1320. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1320, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Randy Ramey."

Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1320 was brought to me by the City of West Chicago. They have a situation dealing with Fermilab where they have properties they would like to annex, but one side of the property is with this federal facility. They will like the ability to use that as the rest of the boundary as we already use rivers, railroads, forest preserves, so that they can annex these properties and have uniform zoning codes. Take any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion on House Bill 1320? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 1320 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Harris, David Harris. Representative Winters, Dave Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 74 Members voting 'yes', 36 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kay, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Kay: "Yeah. A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Kay: "On House Bill 1161, I would like my vote to be recorded
 as a 'no'."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

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

Kay: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tom Holbrook, you have House Bill 1339. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Bill 1339, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tom Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you. House Bill 1339 just provides the statutory authority for what many of our towns are already doing. It allows a processing fee for the bond. Our counties already have this and many of the towns are already doing it. I know of no opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's discussion. Are there any questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative David Leitch."

Leitch: "Excuse me, Mr. Chairman (sic-Speaker). I just wanted to indicate on the previous Bill, I would have vote... I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will reflect your request. Representative Roger Eddy, to the Bill."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, what's the... is there a maximum amount of the processing fee that the municipalities could charge?"

Holbrook: "Some counties have different rates, like DuPage is \$30. This Bill we put in a cap of 20... \$20, which seems to be what a lot of the others are charging al... what they're already charging in many cases."

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

- Eddy: "So, they actually have to affirmatively vote to do this. We're giving them the authority. We're not raising that fee."
- Holbrook: "It's strictly permissive and this will allow the actual statutory authorization for what most of them are doing already."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Mulligan: "Representative, can there only be one fine, either the courts or the city, or can there be more than one... or one fee rather?"
- Holbrook: "There can be one at the county and at the city or village, if they're charging it, just like now."
- Mulligan: "So, are you... are you mean... are you saying in your legislation that there could be two fees as opposed to just one fee?"
- Holbrook: "Yes, which is, again, what many are doing already and this puts a \$20 cap on it."
- Mulligan: "So, if you add two fees, do they have to prove that they're actually processing paperwork in order to charge that fee?"
- Holbrook: "This would be for the village attorney that is actually processing the paperwork, yes."
- Mulligan: "I notice you go around the sitting body of the municipality so they don't have to be on record for voting a fee, but yet you're bringing it to the General Assembly so we can vote on one?"

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Holbrook: "This is a permissive. If they want to do it, they're

going to have to do something to implement it."

Mulligan: "I find this to be..."

Holbrook: "Which most of them are anyway."

Mulligan: "That's a pretty interesting Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tom Holbrook to close."

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

"The question is, 'Should House Bill 1339 pass?' Speaker Lyons: All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Rita, Representative Soto, like to recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 42 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And now, seeing no further business to come before the House, Representative Lou Lang moves that the House stand adjourned to the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday, March 8, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. All those in favor of adjournment signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned. Have a safe weekend. Drive carefully. Thank you."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

Introduction and reading of House Bills-First Reading.

House Bill 3751, offered by Representative Yarbrough, a
Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bills
First Reading. Senate Bill 86, offered by Representative

Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate

23rd Legislative Day

3/3/2011

Bill 165, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1226, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1538, offered by Representative Rose, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1612, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. And Senate Bill 1703, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning fees. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."