137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Speaker Lang: "The House shall be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Major Juan Alarcon who is with the Salvation Army in Hanover Park, Illinois. Major Alarcon is the guest of Representative Mussman. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Major."
- Major Alarcon: "Let us pray. Eternal God, who blesses the earth from north to south and from east to the west, our God, who sends the rain and the sun to give us our daily bread and who meets our families every need, we gather today in the House of Representative of Illinois for the General Assembly with its Members. We pray a blessing on each... on one of them, on each of one of us. We thank Him for living in a nation that allows us to pray and recognize Him as the God of the heaven on earth. That his blessing might go down over all those gathered here today. We pray this in Your name and the people say, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan 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 Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Carli is excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative McAuliffe is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leaders. Representative Will Davis, Representative Turner. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 116 Members present and the House does have a quorum. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 16, 2012: approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is Senate Bill 1673. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3798; recommends be adopted is Floor #1 Senate Bill 32... correction... Amendment to Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3518. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 16, is 2012: do Short Debate Senate Bill pass Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 16, 2012: do pass Short Debate Senate Bill 3146. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 16, 2012: recommends be

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 5 to House Bill 3188, and House Resolution 963. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1053, offered by Representative Sente. This is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Krezwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

Krezwick: "I'd like the House to welcome my son and his wife,
 Rick and Kristen, standing up here in the gallery. If you
 could welcome them, please. Stand up Rick and Kristen, or
 wave your hand. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield, we're happy to have you here. Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You look very fantastic today. I'd like everybody to stand and congratulate my seatmate on his birthday today, Representative Crespo. He's 35 years old. Yea. Woo. Can I go on? Woo."

Speaker Lang: "I assume there's an appropriate cake somewhere, Representative. I'm sure you'll take care of that for us. Members, on page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2450. Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz on the Amendment."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment to this Bill addresses an issue that many of us have been hearing from... from our constituents regarding the payment of child care providers in our community. The other piece of this legislation moves money around so we can pay Medicaid bills."

Speaker Lang: "We're going to move this to Third. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2450, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Ladies and Gentlemen, many of us have been hearing from constituents and our child care center providers about the fact that we've run out of appropriations. This is a supplemental so that we can continue to pay them through FY12 and as well as some Medicaid bills that our providers in other sectors have been waiting to get paid. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "Representative, you said it is a supplemental. It's not exactly a supplemental. Would you consider it a remreallocation?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Bost: "Okay. And I think that's an important thing to realize.

 We're not moving off the number we set last year on the budget. This is just a shift from one line item to another allowing that shift?"
- Feigenholtz: "That's correct. It... it's a shift."
- Bost: "Can you tell me, I... first off, I felt like and maybe I'm wrong, I felt like in last year's budget when we put this together we actually put enough money in that line item for child care, didn't we?"
- Feigenholtz: "We did. But unfortunately, we had a greater demand and under appropriated for this."
- Bost: "Okay. Okay. So, exactly where did the Governor move money from and to... 'cause I'm assuming that had to be done under the Governor's authority to make that move, correct?"
- Feigenholtz: "There... there was unexpended money for Medicare Part B. It was essentially an offset. So, going back to what you said Representative Bost about this being a shift, we're not spending more money. We're staying under our cap; it's just moving money from one line to the other to pay our providers."
- Bost: "No, I don't think that's what I'm asking. What I'm asking is we put enough money in our child care line items to cover child care through the end of the year at the level we've been running. Is that not correct? Is that not correct? Okay. I think we're paused here."
- Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry. We... apparently there's more pressure on the fund than we thought there would be when we finalized our budget last spring."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Bost: "Well, okay. Maybe I'm getting misinformation. Is... is it not correct that the Governor's Office made a choice to move money from TANF over... out of this line item to a different line item and that's why we're short in this particular line item?"

Feigenholtz: "It's all pressure on the same fund, Representative Bost."

Bost: "No. No. No. No. No. No. Representative, it's not pressure on the state funds. It is... we allocated enough money specifically for taking care of children and day care in the State of Illinois, we put it in there. We, the General Assembly, did that. The Governor made a choice to remove money out of that and move it over to another line. Is that not correct? And... and Representative, know this, I'm not directing this at you. I'm just wanting to make sure we know on the record why it is we're having to do this."

Feigenholtz: "Why do we have to do this, Representative?"

Bost: "No. No. No. Okay. Why do we have to… yes, why is it we're filling back in the hole that has been created in the child care line item? Because the mon… the hole that has been created in the child care line item has been created because money has been moved out of that line to another area of the budget. And I'm just trying to clarify exactly what was done. I… and I'm standing to make sure that we do take care of this need, but I do want to know, for public record, what was done and why?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I thought I explained myself earlier that TANF cash grant and the child care line are

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

relatively fluid. It... so... so, the object in this legislation is to pay what is immediately needed."

Bost: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Let me... let me tell you that I'm standing in support of the Bill. I'm standing in support because I think it's a vitally important thing that we do provide funding for the child care needs that are still out there, which we actually put in the budget. But yet, the Governor and through his agencies made a very clear choice to take out of that and put into another fund that then it would make it more difficult for us not to allow this opportunity to occur because if we don't then we don't care for the day care or for the child care that needs to be provided for. So, let's be honest about what is happened. The Governor is trying to pull a fast one so he can try to shift things around. And if he would have got his original intent, he would have looked for new revenues to move those lines. Thank heaven, we have worked in a way that we are still not increasing the budget, but we have to shift out of another area to cover this. Let me comment that the Legislators that have worked on that, we thank you for that. We think that's wonderful because we know these needs need to be provided for. But it was a scam... a scam by the Governor's Office to remove that money, put it into a different account and then come back and say, oh, we need it for child care. I'm supporting the Bill. I'm supporting the Bill. But this was exactly what I said. It was a scam by the Governor's Office to shift money around and he thought he'd get more money out of the deal. As it is we're not going to overspend on the state budget, what we

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

provided for last year, I thank you for that. But let's call it what it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, just very quickly in response to the previous speaker's statements about another fund. The dollars that we're talking about in terms of where the x... where the dollars were shifted to, what was that for?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Davis, W.: "You didn't hear my question."

Feigenholtz: "I apologize."

Davis, W.: "So... so, the other speaker is talking about another fund where the dollars were put into for the other fund. So the other fund that he's talking about which is... which created the shortage in the child care dollars, what was that other fund?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, the child care dollars and the TANF dollars sort of flow out of the same fund."

Davis, W.: "Right. So, we're talking about TANF dollars? So, the dollars were spent on TANF, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "All right. Temporary assistance for needy families?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "I just want the Body to know that we're not just willy-nilly, I guess, spending money on whatever comes. But he used the dollars to support increases in the TANF rolls.

Now, maybe that Representative doesn't have TANF families

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

in his district, I don't know, but if he does, then he can at least understand the need to support more TANF families on the rolls and that this is needed so that we can make sure that child care providers are indeed supported. So, what I wanted to ask you, Representative, very quickly is, is there anyway that we can prevent this type of thing from happening again? Is there anyway to prevent this from happening again creating..."

Feigenholtz: "We could try to predict caseloads better,
Representative Davis. And we're... in the AppropriationsHuman Services Committee we are committed to doing that and
so that we can avoid this kind of a problem for FY13."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, certainly is it possible that we can work with the secretary of Human Services and maybe put some type of benchmark measures in place? Because of this year there was an increase in the TANF rolls so obviously now we see what happens when those increases occur. So, is it possible to maybe go back and look and maybe whether it's monthly, every two months or three months that we can look at the numbers of TANF recipients..."

Feigenholtz: "I think that'd be a great idea."

Davis, W.: "...as a way to kind of judge whether or not we may need this kind of help. 'Cause I think some of the angst that Members are feeling is the fact that this is happening at this time of the year. And maybe this is something that we maybe should have known about a month ago or even two months ago because of the increase in the TANF roll. So, is there something that can be done to measure that type of

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

usage at an earlier stage so that we don't run into this problem next year at this time of the year?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, I... I think we... we need to look at this year and... and it's obvious we ran out of this funding long before the fiscal year ended. And we at least need to try to appropriate at a 12-month level, but I would be glad to investigate any tool that we could use to try and measure this as you've just recommended. And I'd be glad to work with you on that."

Davis, W.: "Okay. And I think some would appreciate some type of response in writing from the secretary of Human Services relative to this situation in terms of how she thinks she can help prevent this type of thing from happening in the future."

Feigenholtz: "I would greatly support that."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, in House Resolution 158 it states that we're to use any excess revenue to pay bills. Does this Bill comply with that previous law that we have passed?"

Feigenholtz: "The answer is yes, Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "And I'm assuming it's yes because this is an unpaid bill, which House Resolution 158 specified that we should use excess revenue for. Can... can you give me a quick summary as to why these providers can't wait to be paid like we're making all other kinds of providers wait?"

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Feigenholtz: "Representative Pritchard, I... I believe that providers are getting paid as they are stacked up in a pile in the Comptroller's Office unless, of course, there's an expedited payment issue. But this is a transfer of appropriations so that we can pay Medicaid bills down."

Pritchard: "But, we're going to use those Medicaid dollars to help restore this funding, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Feigenholtz: "So, as I've been listening to const... to providers in my district, part of the reason that they can't wait like other providers is because of the nature of their business. Where they're mostly nonprofits, where they're mostly poorly capitalized to be able to have the kinds of reserves that other providers seem to have. Would you tend to agree with that generalization?"

Feigenholtz: "And the… the… I've just been informed by staff...
by our budget director that there is a small group of bills
that are waiting that are... that are very dependent on state
dollars predominately that are not-for-profits. The ones
that you're referring to that are likely to be the ones
that are in great distress."

Pritchard: "It... it... can you verbalize why we should prioritize what early childhood services are providing our citizens as opposed to some other services that may be for seniors or the disabled?"

Feigenholtz: "I think that many of these are smaller providers, they're probably many of whom are not... they don't have relationships where they can get lines of credit. They're operating in the margins on month to month payments from

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

us. And we, of course, need to encourage that people stay in the workplace. If parents don't have dependable day care and child care, that can't happen. It only exacerbates the problems that we have. So, I believe that doing what we're doing today is going to assist in alleviating some of the pressure on that problem."

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Pritchard: Gentlemen, we have all probably heard from child care providers in our district about the important work that they do and how getting a child started on his learning curve is so critical to the success that they experience through the rest of their education and through life. It's also critical that we keep these providers working because by providing child care citizens of our state can work, they can go to school to get better education and get to be contributing members of society. And in general, improve what a lot of people are struggling to do right now and that's make ends meet. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would direct your attention back here to the balcony where there are 49 child care providers today from the DeKalb and Sycamore area watching our action, watching how we're moving to support what they're doing. And I would ask for your encouragement of their efforts and efforts of all our child care providers around the state. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Mulligan: "Representative, I don't think people are against this. I think they're trying to make a point of mismanagement. But isn't it true when we get money back we... most of it does not go into a special fund, it goes into general revenue? So, you get the money back you put it in general revenue then when you want to use it for something you need to do an appropriation and move it out. Is that not correct?"
- Feigenholtz: "Well, I mean, you know that if a match goes into general revenue it's a very big pot of money and it's... it's sort of difficult to track it. But I think the answer is yes."
- Mulligan: "Right. Because basically, except for maybe the Tobacco Fund or a few things, we don't take that money back and put it into a fund that is... I'm sor..."
- Feigenholtz: "Speaker, could we have some order in this chamber? I can't hear Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "I also have an allergy voice today. But..."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen... excuse me, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very important piece of legislation. We can move through this more expeditiously if the chamber is a little bit more peaceful. So, if we could do that, the Chair would be appreciative. Representative, please proceed."
- Mulligan: "So, basically in order for you to make this allocation for child care providers who need the money, you have to take the money that we've received, put in general revenue funds, back out for the allocation that you want for child care. Is that not correct?"

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Feigenholtz: "The 151 is a transfer, Representative Mulligan.

The 73 is from the TANF line."

Mulligan: "All right. But TANF was more..."

Feigenholtz: "Child care, I'm sorry."

Mulligan: "...than what we expected. Sometimes I have a problem with some of the agencies when we're... we have a downturn in the economy you know you're going to use more for TANF or something else. So, usually you ask for a little more because you know more people are going to be out of work and they're going to use it. So, then, also the other thing is, you get the money back and because we don't set it aside for... for any specific allocation, we then are able to look at what is necessary for a supplemental, take it back out of the General Revenue Fund, put it in the line item we need, pass a supplemental. Take care of the children's providers so they don't go out of business, is that not correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is very correct. Well said. Well put."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to take this opportunity to thank the Lady for this fantastic piece of legislation. So many people of the State of Illinois is depending on child care in order to go to work. And by more people being able to go work, that's more moneys that's being paid into the coffers and less money that the state would have to give out in regards to public assistance. So, Representative, thank you very much for this restoration along with the

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

other increases in various levels of funding in regards to other entities. And I just wanted to say, once again, congratulations and thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a extremely frustrating vote I think for everyone in this chamber. This was frankly not the cause or the fault of anything that was done in last year's budget. It is the cause and the fault of one Governor who spent the money somewhere else. And now we are all being called on to fix it on behalf of our constituents. The long and the short of it is that as this type of chicanery continues, it draws all of our budget-making efforts in the next year's budget into doubt. I've had more than one person ask me, hey, if we vote for the upcoming budget Bills will they just be changed again, spent somewhere else again? This reminds me of what happened with MAP last year. The Governor goes out and tells ISAC to overissue MAP grants, more than what they had money for and then create a crisis where suddenly it's underfunded even though they were the ones that sent out the award letters to students everywhere saying, oh, we've got all this money, don't worry about it, you're fine. And then they come running to us, oh, we're short money; we need millions of dollars extra. So, I suspect this Bill will pass. I'm going to probably vote for it, but at some point in time the Governor's Office has to realize that this is what it is. This is what's in a line, this is what the purpose of the line is. In this particular line, the purpose was child care; you shouldn't have spent

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

it somewhere else. And now, we're all asking to bail out that decision again just like MAP grants. As we progress in the next two weeks with budgeting, I don't want to hear any whining from the Governor's Office like we did this week when our Medicaid team comes in and says, we want certain controls for outside enforcement, outside the boundaries of the second floor, outside the auspice of the executive department... the Executive Branch, to make sure that things like what we're doing here today don't happen in the next budget. And I don't want to hear any whining from the Governor's Office when they come in and say, oh, you can't do this to us, trust us. Well, this is two examples now and this isn't namby-pamby chump change; this is big money. Two examples now where it was spent somewhere else. So, as we move forward and institute and actually frankly demand these additional controls be put into place, I don't want to hear any whining from the second floor about why we're doing those additional controls. And so, with that I intend to vote for the Bill, but with a big warning there's a lot of people and not just on this side of the aisle, on both sides of the aisle, that are very wary... very wary as we move forward in the next budget season. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Minority Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll do my best to keep this quiet. And I think Representative Rose... or keep this short, maybe you could help me keep it quiet. Representative Rose did a very good job outlining it. And to those of you that are in the gallery that are child care providers, thank you

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

for what you do. But I think Representative Rose said this, this Body, a year ago, passed a budget with money in the budget for you. To take care of child care providers throughout the State of Illinois, we appropriated that money. We get the importance of what you do, we appreciate what you do, we support what you do and we did that by passing a budget that fully funded your needs. And I think as Chapin said, if he didn't, the Governor shorted another line and used your money to fund that line. And the ironic thing about the shorting of that other line, and the Governor's very good about saying two different things, he shorted the TANF line and he said he shorted it because more people were in the need of TANF. But at other times, depending on where he is, he says the economy's improving... economy's improving in the State of Illinois, we have less unemployment and people don't need state services. So, he talks in an inconsistent way and contradicts himself, but the reality is, at the end of the day, we had money in there for you and we supported it. We are now having to correct a problem that he created because he didn't stay within his budget. We're going to do that, I think, today. This Bill also provides the opportunity to use \$150 million of money we didn't spend to pay down old bills, people have alluded to that and that's important. But I think the most important message for us... I'm going to... if we could just have a couple of minutes, Representative... or Speaker. We're going to pass, if we go through what we think we're going to go through in the next couple weeks, assuming... I think we're going to do it in a bipartisan manner assuming some

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

other things work out, one of the toughest budgets we've done in a long time. We're going to cut almost a billion dollars. We have no choice. Next year's budget will be even tighter than this year's budget. It is imperative that we all recognize that, but perhaps even more importantly that the Governor realizes he has to live within the means of that budget we're going to pass for 2013. Can't go over and come back and say, oh, I'm going to... I'm going to take some money out of the child care provider line or the TANF line or whatever and raise hysteria in certain groups. He play used you, folks, of the child care community; let's be honest about it, he used you. And we're going to take care of it, but we can't let that go on anymore. If we're going to really get out of this hole and we're going to really have a rendezvous with reality, that means we're going to have to have a budget that we truly live within our means and we don't deviate. And we don't come back to this General Assembly and say, oops, I spent more than I should have; I need some help. Those days have got to be over. So, we'll pass this, I think. I assume it'll pass in the Senate. We'll restore the money to the child care providers and again, thank you for what you do, no one's questioning that. But we need to have an understanding in this Body that we cannot keep doing this because of a Governor that continues to be chronic spender. Those days have got to stop. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bellock: "I just had a couple of questions. Number one is how does this affect... who does this affect on a presumptive eligibility within the child care or does it? Isn't there something in this Bill about presumptive eligibility or that..."

Feigenholtz: "There's nothing substantive in this Bill, Representative. It's an approp Bill."

Bellock: "Okay. That's in another Bill? Does this have anything to do… so this is just the financial part of the Bill? It doesn't have anything to do with the eligibility?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Bellock: "Are you decreasing the eligibility in child care?"

Feigenholtz: "I am not."

Bellock: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "Not in this Bill."

Bellock: "Thank you. One other question I'd like to bring up that Representative Cross just mentioned. In our analysis of the Bill, you are going to take \$151 million of this, put it in the special health care provider fund, match it to 300 million and are you going to pay down old Medicaid bills from 2012?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. This is our extra revenue that we committed to pay down bills. That's what this 151 million is."

Bellock: "So, does that..."

Feigenholtz: "We churn it and it doubles, you know that."

Bellock: "Okay. Does that go into the Medicaid liability of the \$2.7 billion?"

Feigenholtz: "It lowers it."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. We've heard a lot from Members, most important is that we get our bills paid and our providers paid so they can continue to go to work and have their children in safe child care every day. I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representatives Bost, Brauer, Saviano, Zalewski. Mr. Bost. Mr. Bost. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 3 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 16 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, appears House Resolution 993. Representative Lyons. Leader Lyons. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 993,

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to honor Chicago White Sox legend Billy Pierce for his baseball career and continuing humanitarian work; and

WHEREAS, Billy Pierce was born in Detroit on April 2, 1927; he played baseball for Highland Park (Michigan) High School; he came to the Chicago White Sox in a trade with the Detroit Tigers on November 10, 1948; and

WHEREAS, During his major league career, he accumulated the following awards and stellar statistics: 211 wins; 1,999 strikeouts; 193 complete games; a 3.27 earned run average;

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

38 shutouts; and 5 one-hitters; he is the White Sox career leader in strikeouts with 1,796; he was the starting pitcher for the American League in the 1953, 1955, and 1956 All-Star games, and was a member of the American League All-Star team in 1953, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1961; he was the 1956 and 1957 Sporting News Pitcher of the Year; he accumulated more wins than any other pitcher for the Chicago White Sox during the 1950s; his 182 wins are the most wins of any lefty in White Sox history; he pitched 39 and 2/3 consecutive scoreless innings for the White Sox in 1953; in 1955, he had an earned run average of 1.97; with the exception of 1954, he had at least 14 wins every season from 1951 to 1960; and

WHEREAS, He is considered to be one of the greatest pitchers in Chicago White Sox history; in addition to his 7 all-star selections in the 13 years he spent with the White Sox, he won 186 games and struck out 1,796 batters; as a member of the 1959 American League Champion White Sox, he threw 4 scoreless innings out of the bullpen during the World Series; he was also a member of World Series teams in Detroit in 1945 and San Francisco in 1962; in the 1962 3 game National League playoff against the Los Angeles Dodgers, he was the winning pitcher in game one over Hall of Famer Sandy Koufax, throwing a 3-hit shutout and saving game 3 by pitching a perfect ninth inning; in game 6 of the 1962 World Series, he again only gave up 3 hits in a complete game victory over Hall of Famer Whitey Ford and the New York Yankees, forcing a seventh game; he retired from baseball in 1964; and

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

WHEREAS, He continues to serve as an ambassador for the White Sox organization, appearing at various community events on its behalf; and

WHEREAS, He is also known for his continuous work raising money for the Chicago Baseball Cancer Charities, raising over \$13 million for the organization, which has gone toward cancer patient care, education, and research programs; and

WHEREAS, He played his last 3 seasons with the Giants, but moved his family back to Chicago, where he owned an automobile dealership for 2 years, worked as a stockbroker, and was an unofficial scout for the White Sox; he later worked for and retired from Continental Envelope Company; and

WHEREAS, In 1987, the Chicago White Sox retired his number 19; upon Nellie Fox's selection to the National Baseball Hall of Fame, the Nellie Fox Society was renamed the Billy Pierce Society, in part to create awareness of the fact that Billy Pierce belongs in the National Baseball Hall of Fame; in 2007, a bronze likeness of Billy Pierce was unveiled at U.S. Cellular Field; and

WHEREAS, He and his wife of over 60 years, Gloria, have 3 children, Bill, Patti, and Bob; and 5 grandchildren; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we declare May 16, 2012 as Billy Pierce Day in the State of Illinois in honor of his baseball career and continuing humanitarian work; and be it further

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Billy Pierce as a symbol of our respect and esteem."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Before I turn this over to Leader Lyons, may I just say, Mr. Pierce, as a lifelong Sox fan I'm honored to be in the Chair during this... during this wonderful event. Leader Lyons."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Lyons: House. I know there's a lot of noise on the floor, we just passed a major piece of legislation, but if I can pull my Chuck Hartke again, shhhh. Thank you. Thank you very, very much. It's... it's one of my honors of life to have somebody that I grew up looking up to and was a legend in the Lyons household for the whole Lyons family, being White Sox fans in the 1950s and '60s. The Go Go White Sox in '59. There was no better representative of the team than the three guys that I loved, Nellie Fox, Luis Aparicio up the middle and Billy Pierce on the mound. And as all of you know we started the White Sox Legislative Caucus about 11 years ago. I always said, I know what Springfield is, it's about 60 percent Cardinals, 40 percent Cubs, but there's a little sliver of us down here that are White Sox fans. The first party we did over at Boone's we had about a dozen people show up. And as all of you know now, when we have our White Sox Caucus meetings, we have 150, 200 people that show up for the night, which is a good tribute from all my Cub and Cardinal fans who want to be part of a little fun for my Chicago White Sox. But as my swan song, as I leave this august Body and I'll be counting the days here, to be able

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

to have, again, a legend from the Chicago White Sox. We didn't hear a lot of the statistics that were read in the Resolution, a hundred and what... 90-some complete games in baseball. Unbelievable, when you think about now counting pitches and getting guys out after the sixth inning. What this man did for the White Sox in the '50s, I had a great lunch one time with Moose Skowron, the late Bill 'Moose' Skowron and Hank Bauer. And he told me, for all those magical Yankees teams in the '50s, the pitcher they feared the most was #19, Billy Pierce. So, without further ado, Bill, if you'd like to just say hello to everybody, my hero, a great White Sox legend, Billy Pierce."

Billy Pierce: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, it's quite a thrill being here. I've never been... actually I've never been on the floor here but I haven't been in the Capitol too many times. But it's a great thrill and a great honor to receive this. Joe, I thank you and everyone else on here very, very much. And I'll let you get back to your... the work so you can take care of my area where I live. Thank you very much."

Lyons: "Thank you, Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do know Patti Bellock certainly wants to say something as part of the White Sox Caucus and Billy will be available for some photos down in the front of the well. But I think Patti Bellock, you certainly will have a few words to say."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say on behalf of the White Sox Caucus also how honored we are to have Billy Pierce with us today. And my sister

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

actually even came down from Chicago because she heard he was coming. And he, we think, was the best pitcher that ever lived, but for sure the best pitcher of the White Sox. And we were there the night, I think it was, that it was the second out in the ninth inning when he lost a no-hitter. So, we're honored to have him here today. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. You finished? Leader Lyons, you have something else to say on this?"

Lyons: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say, with leave of the House with all my Cub and Cardinal fans if you'd like to have all of... all 118 of us, on the Resolution it would be my privilege with the agreement of the Body. So, I think we'd like to make it unanimous for Billy Pierce on the first Billy Pierce day. And his son, Bob and his wife Jeanette are up here, so I just wanted to acknowledge them. But thank you everybody for making Billy Pierce Day a reality. Thanks for sharing a part of American... Illinois history to one of our proudest people in Bill Pierce. And I ask for passage of this Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Lyons moves that all Members be added as cosponsors. With leave of the Body, that will be done. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Mr. Pierce. Thank you, Leader Lyons. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Ford: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would like the Body to recognize my friend and your colleague on his birthday today, Fred Crespo. Please join me in wishing him a very happy birthday."
- Speaker Lang: "That's very kind of you, Sir. That's the second cake you owe us, Mr. Crespo. The Chair recognizes Mr. Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like you to join in recognizing my colleague on his birthday, Representative Wayne Rosenthal. You know, Mr. Speaker, we all have unique strengths and unique backgrounds. I think I can honestly say I have the only seatmate that has survived a mid-air collision with an F-4 and lived to tell about it."
- Speaker Lang: "And we're glad you're here, too, happy birthday, Sir. House Resolution 1049, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1049, offered by Representatives Osmond, Cross, Lyons, Cole and Kosel."

WHEREAS, In 1900, Charles "The Old Roman" Comiskey became involved in the birth and development of the American League; in January of 1900, Comiskey became the owner of the Chicago White Stockings and moved the franchise to Chicago to be a part of the newly formed League; and

WHEREAS, As the White Stockings, the team played the first-ever game of the American League on April 21, 1900; and

WHEREAS, The people of Chicago soon shortened the team's name to "White Sox"; the new name was accepted by the

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Comiskey family and eventually became the team's official name; and

WHEREAS, In 1910, Charles Comiskey oversaw the building of Comiskey Park, the home of the White Sox for more than 8 decades; Comiskey served as the owner of the team until his death in 1931; and

WHEREAS, J. Louis Comiskey, Charles' only child, inherited and owned the team until his death in 1939; ownership of the Chicago White Sox was then passed onto his wife, Grace; and

WHEREAS, Grace Comiskey served as the owner of the Chicago White Sox from 1939 to 1956; she was baseball's second female executive and the first in the American League; and WHEREAS, Under the ownership of Grace Comiskey, the White Sox signed Minnie Minoso, the team's first African-American player, and Luis Aparicio, the league's first Hispanic American Rookie of the Year winner; and

WHEREAS, Grace Comiskey passed away in 1956, leaving the controlling share of the team to her first child, Dorothy Comiskey Rigney, the wife of former White Sox pitcher John Rigney; and

WHEREAS, Dorothy Comiskey Rigney, along with her mother, was a sports pioneer, being one of the few women to have served as principal owner of a Major League Baseball team; and

WHEREAS, After the 1958 season, Dorothy Comiskey Rigney sold the White Sox to Bill Veeck, ending the Comiskey family's 58-year control of the franchise; and

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

WHEREAS, John and Dorothy are the parents of Illinois State Representative Patti Bellock; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we recognize the legacy of the Comiskey family and the family's contribution to the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois; and be it further

RESOLVED, That we honor the history made by Grace and Dorothy Comiskey as two of the first women to have served as owners of a Major League Baseball team; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to Illinois State Representative Patti Bellock as a symbol of our great esteem and respect."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you can tell from the Osmond: board, I am the Sponsor of House Resolution 1049 along with Leader Cross. It is widely known throughout this House that are huge Chicago Cub Fans as are Representative Feigenholtz, Mell and others. Despite our allegiance to the bovs on the north side, we recognize all women exceptional strength and rise today to honor two women who carried the burden of a struggle... struggling White Sox team in a male dominated world of professional sports. Comiskey family is one of the oldest and best known families in baseball. But what is... what isn't widely known is that two Comiskey women, Grace and her daughter Dorothy, were pioneers. They were among the first women ever to own and run a Major League Baseball club. Grace Comiskey fought

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

the trustees of her husband's estate when they proposed to sell the White Sox..."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let's give the speaker your attention. Please proceed."

"Grace Comiskey fought the trustees of her husband's Osmond: estate when they were proposed to sell the White Sox and regained control for her family. She was the first woman ever to serve as President of an American League team. Her daughter, Dorothy Comiskey Rigney, worked her way through the organization. She began as secretary for her father, later served on the board of directors and eventually became the team's principal owner, one of few women ever to serve as the principal owner of a Major League Baseball team. As we prepare for the annual Cubs/Sox cross town classic that gets under way this weekend, we want to recognize the strong Comiskey women, the strong Comiskey women who are with us today in the House. Our dear friend, Representative Patti Bellock and her sister Mary Sharon, right up here, and their... and her husband Bill and their granddaughter Emily Bittman, who is now paging tonight for us on the Republican side. I would like to ask you all to stand and recognize a history of strong, strong women."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "As someone who went to her first Cub game at the age of 4, Patti is my roommate. And it's very interesting when they won the World Series, Patti and her sister were on the phone, Patti in our apartment with every single pitch. And so, I sat there and listened and tried to be delighted as the Sox won. And then she went out and she bought every

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

white sock in Springfield, came in and put them on everybody's microphones the next day. It was really a treat. And she's a delightful, happy person to be as a roommate. So, I forgive her the fact that she makes me feel very inferior with my Cubs, but she's so delightful and it's such a wonderful thing to have someone with a family history like that be in the General Assembly. She never really talks about it a whole lot, but I'll tell you, when the Sox won we all heard about it a lot. So, I, too, like to honor Patti and her family. I think this is a wonderful thing to have here in the Illinois General Assembly."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank... I just want to say thank you very much to everybody. This was totally a surprise, I didn't know anything about it and on behalf of my family, the Comiskey family and especially having my sister here today, I just thank all of you. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Back to the pressing business of the State of Illinois. On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2888, Mr. Mathias. Please read the Bill. Oh, excuse me, Mr. Mathias, the Chair was in error. We forgot to adopt that Resolution. So, on Representative Osmond's Resolution, those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Sorry to confuse you, Mr. Clerk, my error. Now on Mr. Mathias's Bill. Please read the Bill. 2888."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2888, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's actually with much sadness that I present this Bill today to... to the House. If we could have a little decorum, I would really appreciate it. Senate Bill 2888 prohibits court supervision for speeding 31 miles per hour or more above the posted speed limit; today the law is 40 miles per hour or more. It also prohibits it for speeding 25 miles an hour or more in an urban district. And the reason we need this Bill, which we are going to call Julie's Law, and you may have read in the Chicago Tribune I believe it was last month, about the circumstances surrounding this Bill. As Julie's mother, Pamela, who's with us today with her family and introduce them after my presentation, Julie Gorczynski's life was senselessly taken away by an excessive speeder on June 10 of 2011, just 6 days prior to her 18th birthday and exactly one week after her high school graduation from Lincoln Way North High. The man driving the speeding vehicle had received 7 supervisions in a few years time, two of which were within 7 days of each other. And as a result of these multiple supervisions, continued driving and continued to avoid convictions. Hopefully, Senate Bill 2888 will make it a little bit harder, hopefully a lot harder, for chronic speeders to receive court supervision and to receive the convictions that they need to receive on their record. I want to introduce in the gallery here today Julie's parents, Richard and Pamela Gorczynski, as well as John Sendra, who is Pamela's father, and also Diane and Stan Kozacek, all grandparents of Julie. And hopefully we can... also at this stage even though it's... it's passed the

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

time of... way past the time when this accident happened, have a moment of silence before the vote in honor and in memory of Julie. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask this Body to vote in favor of Senate Bill 2888."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias has moved for the passage of the Bill. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand why you're bringing this Bill, it's quite a tragedy and I think it makes some sense. But yesterday we had a very long debate on a Bill that was similar that would take away judicial discretion and require and it should be a 'shall' and not a 'may'. How is this Bill materially different than the one that failed yesterday that takes away judicial discretion?"

Mathias: "Well, the law today already does that. So, we're not, in effect, changing discretion because the law today already prohibits it if you're going 40 miles per hour or more. This Bill just lowers the threshold and I believe..."

Franks: "Well... well, that is a change. I mean, 'cause right now..."

Mathias: "...it is..."

Franks: "...right now there is discretion, correct? I mean, right now if you go anything under 40 there is discretion, correct? Yes or no?"

Mathias: "Right now, the law is 40 miles per hour or more."

Franks: "Correct. So, if you go less than 40 over, there is discretion. So, what you're saying is we should not allow

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

judicial discretion for anything over 25 instead of over 40, correct?"

Mathias: "That's what the Bill states, yes."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just... 'cause yesterday we heard many of the people argue that we shouldn't take away judicial discretion. I want to know how you're going to answer that to those critics, mostly that are on your side?"

Mathias: "And as I stated, this Body previously already took away that discretion with this Bill by limiting it already to 40 miles an hour. This just lowers the amount of where you can speed. The decision already was made by this Body that we should limit in certain circumstances court supervision."

Franks: "Is there any Bar Associations weighed in on this or the Criminal Bar?"

Mathias: "Not the bar. I know this is supported by the Illinois Secretary of State. I have not heard from any of the Bar Associations. No one spoke to my knowledge in either the Senate or the House in opposition to the Bill. It did pass the Senate unanimously as well as committee."

Franks: "So, did the Bill yesterday that failed. It passed unanimously in the Senate. I'm just wondering because there was a lot of argument yesterday based on that discretion issue. And I didn't agree, I got up and defended it. But there was many people who voted against it on that issue and I'm wondering how they're going to vote now. I... I don't even know how you voted yesterday because it was Postponed. How did you vote yesterday?"

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Mathias: "You know, I'm dealing with this Bill and I'd be glad to look it up and let you know."

Franks: "I'd like to... well, I'll wait. We can take it out of the record, I'd like to know."

Mathias: "Well..."

Franks: "I think... I think it's pertinent because you're arguing to take away discretion when yesterday the argument was not to take away that discretion. So, I just want to know how you voted?"

Mathias: "How I voted on another Bill is the way I voted on that Bill and it may have been for various reasons. And so, I don't think we have ever challenged a Member's vote on any Bill and the reasons behind it."

Franks: "No, but I... I... but the people who argued against it yesterday that was the only reason. And I just... I don't want this to become a political football here and I think that's what it's becoming. And I don't think it's fair to Sponsors who have good Bills, who get beaten up for trumped up reasons for political reasons. Now that Bill should have passed yesterday as this Bill should pass. But I don't think that we should be playing those games. And I don't want to reward people who do. So, I think... I think we should vote for this Bill, but I think we also ought to be honest and quit playing games."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, help me understand and it is indeed a very tragic event when a young girl loses her life

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

to a speeder who is a... driving at an excessive rate of speed. But you indicated that the driver, I believe you said, had 7 court supervisions on his record, is that correct?"

Mathias: "Over a period of time, that's correct."

- Harris, D.: "So my question really is, is the issue the speed at which someone is driving or is the issue how many times someone should be allowed to have court supervision and still keep their license or still be allowed to... to operate a motor vehicle?"
- Mathias: "Well, I think there's two issues there. And you're correct, they're... they both are issues. This deal... this Bill deals with allowing court supervision, under what circumstances do we allow court supervision? I believe we can address separately the issue of how many times. In fact, I think this Body has in recent years dealt with that issue already. Although I'm not positive of what the amount was, but I... I know the law today does limit how many times you can receive court supervision."
- Harris, D.: "And... and am I correct, speeding at this rate or at 40 miles an hour... in excess of 40 miles an hour, is that considered a reckless driving charge?"
- Mathias: "Well, it may or... if it's... if you're speeding more than 40, I think even with reckless driving I don't know if speeding in itself, I think you must have some other action such as weaving or... I don't believe... I believe though, yes, if you're speeding over 40 miles an hour, that is considered reckless driving."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Harris, D.: "And... and... thank you. And I think aren't you limited to one court supervision if you have a reckless driving charge? Is that not now the law?"
- Mathias: "I know there is a limit on court supervisions. Unfortunately, what happens, and I'm an attorney and practice in that field, not every court is aware of... you know, they are aware of convictions because they receive that from the Secretary of State, but sometimes courts aren't aware of court supervisions, especially if they happen closely together. I know some counties around here get those records, but others may not. And I think when you are driving basically recklessly, you may not... or should not be entitled to court supervision."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. And thank you very much. Just an observation that you really have a serious situation here and... and it is a tragic situation where someone has lost their life to someone... to a driver who has been speeding excessively. I'm not sure that this Bill really gets to the heart of the matter and that troubles me a little bit. But I certainly do recognize your... your very good intent in trying to solve a serious problem because too often we read about situations where people are either... they're driving a vehicle when they have had multiple supervisions or they've had multiple DUIs on their record and they're still operating a motor vehicle. It seems to me that's what we need to solve; take away their ability to operate a motor vehicle. Thank you."
- Mathias: "Well, I appreciate that. And once they have that conviction, obviously, as you know if you get a number of

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

convictions on your record your license will be suspended. This helps through that process."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still six people who wish to debate this Bill... now seven. This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. I'm asking you to restrain yourselves. Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Zalewski: "So, Representative, I... I find myself agreeing with the Gentleman from McHenry. We stood up here, myself included, yesterday and thundered away at a Bill that took away judicial discretion. And today we're back with a Bill that flatly says that a judge can impose court supervision for the offenses of aggravated speeding. I... if you could just reiterate why you believe..."

Mathias: "Well..."

Zalewski: "...this Bill is different than the one we heard yesterday?

Mathias: "Well, I... as I stated before, this Body has already decided, when it comes to speeding, that at a certain amount over the limit court supervision is not... you're not eligible for it. Today it's... I mean the current law is 40 miles an hour over. So, that Body... that's decided already by this Body that there... when it comes to speeding there should be some limit on court supervision. We are just..."

Zalewski: "Wait, that's not what your... that's, Representative that..."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Mathias: "...we're just lowering the bar. We're not coming up with a new concept or changing. We are just lowering the bar on that... on what the miles are."

Zalewski: "Respectfully, Sid, that's, in my opinion not what your Bill does. Your Bill deletes 601.5 from the... from the statute dealing with court supervision. So, what you're saying is, correct me if I'm wrong, but can a... can a driver still get court supervision for driving under the influence of alcohol?"

Mathias: "Can a driver get..."

Zalewski: "Can a DUI driver get court supervision today?"

Mathias: "That's correct."

Zalewski: "So, you are creating a situation where a driver could be 25 miles over the speed limit, they could get court supervision for DUI, but they have to take a conviction for the speeder."

Mathias: "And that would be the case today if they were driving 40... 40 miles over the speed limit. Now, it's today if they were driving 40 miles over the... they would not be eligible for supervision even though... Yes, your statement is correct, but that's what the law is today. I'm just saying is we're changing the miles, we're not coming up with a new concept; since if you were more than 40 miles an hour today, you would not be eligible for court supervision."

Zalewski: "Forty miles over is a separate offense under the Criminal Code that's aggravated speeding?"

Mathias: "Yes."

Zalewski: "Okay. To the... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. And I, again, the Sponsor's intentions here are clear and I... I

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

certainly empathize and sympathize with the family. But again, we thundered away yesterday on a Bill that took away judicial discretion and here we are today simply doing the exact same Bill. So, I... I'll take my time and think about the Bill, but I want the Body to be cognizant of what we're doing here."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Rose: "Representative Mathias, what is the definition of an urban district?"

Mathias: "An urban district is the territory contiguous to and including any street that is built up with structures devoted to business, industry or dwelling houses situated at intervals of less than 100 feet for a distance of a quarter of a mile or more."

Rose: "And then it would drop to 25 miles per an hour under your Bill?"

Mathias: "Then it would draw the 25, yes."

Rose: "Can you explain to me what county was this person granted all these court supervisions in? Because several years ago the State of Illinois required the circuit clerk to report all court supervisions so that prosecutors and the courts would have access to that data. In the counties that I've appeared in, in downstate Illinois, the judge always requires a Secretary of State's abstract to be presented at the time of sentencing to ensure that the awful tragedy that happened here does not occur. So, I'm... I respect why you're here very much so, Sid, and I feel awful

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

for the folks involved in this. But I'm not sure why this person was ever granted this many court supervisions anyway because, like you, I practice law back home and appeared in a number of counties in east central Illinois and all of them require an abstract that would clearly delineate the number of court supervisions prior to any sentence."

Mathias: "Well, I can't speak obviously for the judges in each of these cases, I'm just giving you the facts. I... I don't know why a judge would or wouldn't... why they gave supervision or not. I... I can't answer that. I can just tell you the facts."

Rose: "Okay. Well, I appreciate that. The... the concern I have, to be brutally honest with you, I think this makes a lot more sense in the urban zone at a lower rate than on a highway at a higher rate and here's why. You know, facts circumstance, an otherwise law-abiding, honest citizen could be simply late for work at 5 a.m. in the morning, traveling, you know, trying to get to their job on the Interstate and be 31 or over with no one else on the road besides them and the police officer that pulled them over. And now that person, who's never had a ticket in their life, suddenly is not eligible for court supervision when they would be, quite frankly, the perfect candidate for court supervision under those... under that fact scenario."

Mathias: "I... that's why we raised it to 31 miles for, I think somebody in the highways around here where the speed limit is 90... is 65, I believe that someone going close to 100 miles an hour I don't know if we could... if we do want to give that consideration. That's the... right now, of course,

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

they'd have to go over 105 which certainly I... I don't know if anyone would argue that that isn't certainly excessive. This would make it nonsense."

Rose: "Right. And... but, 40 and over is a misdemeanor offense, correct?"

Mathias: "Yes."

Rose: "Yes. And so, 30 to 40 over is up to the judge and I think that a judge would be free to look circumstances include prior traffic history someone's 35, 40 years old and never had a ticket in their life and they get a ticket like this on their way to work, which I would pause it happens more frequently than not, is in a different category than the person you just outlined who shouldn't have had a license. And to be completely frank with you, I'm baffled that they were allowed to keep their license because the whole reason we send in this notice of court supervisions is so that this exactly doesn't happen. I'll listen to debate, Representative Mathias and we'll go from there, but I'm... the reason you have court supervision is a lot of the judges take all the circumstances into account and I would pause it that the individual that you're discussing is a far different individual than someone who's driven for 20 or 30 years with no blemishes on their record and for whatever reason happens to be at that speed limit. I mean, if they're 40 miles an hour and over, it's a misdemeanor. But I think what Representative Harris said makes eminently good sense; you ought to limit the number of chances you can get at court supervision and in fact, I believe we already have.

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

So, with that, I'll sit down and listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti on a Bill that's on Short Debate." Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And I find it very interesting that people get up to speak about other Bills that were debated and lost for a number of reasons yesterday, but I would be more than glad to work with the Sponsor and the person who spoke against Representative Mathias's Bill. But I find it interesting that somebody who is for freezing property taxes then puts themselves as a cosponsor on a responsible bidder Bill, which is basically unfunded mandate on those same municipalities we're going to cap out. So, while we could have collateral issues regarding other Bills, if you don't like the Gentleman's Bill, vote 'no' or vote' present'. I don't... I agree that there's an issue with discretion here and that we're falling down a slope, but that's what not... this is not about yesterday's Bills. We can debate those again. The Gentle Lady can bring that Bill back today, if she put it on Postponed Consideration, but that's not the only reason. It's not political; that's not the only reason. How about we debate the merits of the Senate Bill 2888 and then we can finish this up, Mr. Speaker, move to the next part of our business. I would just appreciate the fact that people listen to the debate, vote their conscience, vote what they believe and we can move on to the next piece of legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to commend Representative Mathias for, first of all, his... his explanation of the intent of this legislation. This is a Bill that I was planning on taking myself. This tragic accident occurred in my district and certainly the family, I believe, live in what will be my new representative district. We all have to... have to realize that there is a family here and... and they're grieving the loss of their child. And I would just say to the family, thank you very much for coming and that essentially what you see is, as tough as it may sound, it is democracy in action. But I would say that the intent of this Bill is to... is to do good. And it's named in the honor of ... of your daughter. And so, again, I'd like to thank you very much for coming. And I support this Bill wholeheartedly and I hope the rest of you do also. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, whether you support the Bill or whether you don't support the Bill let's keep our debate to what the Bill actually is. And to attack a Member on the floor because there happens to be a... a... and make accusations that it's for political reasons. Let me tell you that our colleague that is presenting this Bill right now; no one can question his integrity on this floor; No one can question that he carries Bills that he feels are responsible. Now, you can agree or disagree but to go after him personally and/or to make comments that it is strictly political, I've know the man for years and so have you. You know for a fact that

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

that is not the case. And I don't know what political games you might be playing. Vote for it, vote against it, agree or disagree, but leave the personal attacks at the door."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, have a great deal of respect for my colleague and friend. I'm... I'm just a little confused. You asked us to stand up and recognize the family... a family who were impacted by an accident... a traffic accident of, I presume, high speed? Is it appropriate to do a House Resolution other than to tie in this legislation? 'Cause I was under a completely different impression of why we were standing up and then we're trying to advance a House Bill. I'm just a bit perplexed."

Mathias: "No, I... I... the Bill stands on the merits of the Bill.

As it... it's trying to prevent what happened to this family from happening, you know, in someway to prevent it from happening to another family."

Dunkin: "Sure. But Representative, most legislation, as you well know, that we present either it stems from a family or a situations or incidences that occur in our state and sometimes across the country. But we stood up and done a moment of silence and I was under the impression that it was a Senate Resolution or a House Resolution and yet we're trying to advance a piece of legislation. I'm just curious whether that was appropriate or why... why you did that?"

Mathias: "I felt since the family wanted to come down here, the Bill was named... is... the legis... the Bill was named after their daughter and I just wanted to recognize them here."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias to close."

Mathias: "I just wanted to add, and I don't want to debate other Bills that happened on other days, only to say that this Bill as opposed to maybe some other Bill is supported by the Illinois Secretary of State. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Greg Harris, Representative Currie. Harris. Currie. Please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declassed... is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

Riley: "If they're still here in the chambers, I'd like to recognize and have us give a round of applause to folks who are representing the University of Illinois Extension 4-H program, members of the Cook County 4-H program, members of the Illinois State 4-H Youth Leadership Team and members of the Speaking for Illinois 4-H Program. And during the last two days, 19 Illinois 4-H youth leaders have represented the approximately 175 thousand Illinois 4-H participants from across Illinois. Please give them a round of applause."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Riley. Welcome to Springfield.

Members, please pay attention. Starting on page 4 of the

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, we're going to begin with Senate Bill 180 and move down the Calendar. Please be ready with your Bills. The first four in line are Reboletti, Feigenholtz, Franks and Golar. Please be ready. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 180, Mr. Reboletti. Out of the record. He was ready. Senate Bill 278, Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 408, Mr. Franks. Out of the record. Senate Bill 680, Representative Golar. Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 680, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Body. Senate Bill 680 is basically a Bill that is an initiative of the MS Society. They did a study; and basically it has to do with patient handling, also workers and just broadens the education and training, minimum policy guidelines under the Act that deals with safe handling of seniors in nursing homes. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1064, Mr. Acevedo. Out of the record.

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Senate Bill 1286, Representative Verschoore. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1286, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. What this Bill does is adds animated films to the already film tax credit. And it is a Bill for my area to spur employment; it would provide probably 60 to 100 jobs. It's a community project. AT&T, the Rock Island Renaissance and the City of Rock Island worked hard to get this. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill.

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Kay. Mr. Kay.

Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

Senate Bill 1617, Mr. Acevedo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1808, Representative Nekritz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2524, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2524, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year we passed a Bill to require substantially higher minimum insurance coverage for vehicles that transport children. Subsequently, we have

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

learned that many entities, especially smaller entities such as day cares or summer programs, have been unable to meet new coverage limits due to budget restraints as well as the budget cycle themselves, resulting in significant noncompliance and a need to reevaluate these limits. This Bill simply reinstates the preexisting limits for 6 months to enable school districts time to incorporate additional expense in their budgets before the new higher limits go into effect. And modifies the previously set limits to provide for 3 separate levels of coverage for different types of vehicles, rather than using a one size fits all approach. This Bill is agreed and is unopposed. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves please, Members. Osmond. Ramey. Representative Osmond. Please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2526, Representative Dan Burke. 011t. οf the record. Senate Bill 2569, Representative Soto. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2643, Representative Lilly. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2935, Representative Yarbrough. Read the Bill, please."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2935, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Yarbrough."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... Senate Bill 2935 is the department's initiative to extend the sunset and provide technical cleanup for the Wholesale Drug Distribution Licensing Act. There's no known opposition to this language and I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2937, Mr. Tryon. Does... does the fact that you're running, Sir, mean you'd like us to read the Bill? Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2937, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2937 will establish the opportunity for the Northwest Metra District to be a part of an option for McHenry County communities to form a mass transit district. Mass transit, as we all know, particularly in the Chicago metropolitan region is very important, not just today but for our future. But for those communities who need to expand mass transit options, even having that opportunity is slipping away from us because we don't have the resources or the money to be able to do the studies, have the necessary federal matches. And as this economy turns around, someday we will see the growth that would generate

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

interest and maybe increasing our mass transit operations. So, this would allow, through a front-door referendum, the opportunity for voters to put transportation district in for planning purposes and also for the ability to fund an extension to the Metra stations in Huntley, Marengo and some of our communities that are most likely to grow. This Bill was ran last year for the south suburban line for communities along that area. And... and I think these are the kind of solutions we need to put forth so that we don't get behind in offering mass transit operations... expansions in operations and put people in communities... make sure it's their money that is actually just funding the federal required matches, not extensions but for planning. So, I would hope that we would all recognize that every community, especially in Chicago metropolitan area, may need some options in the future in order to have funding to meet those requirements. I would urge an 'aye' vote and I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "He certainly does."

Reboletti: "Representative, it says that the board may levy .05 percent property tax without a referendum. Would that be the board of each of those communities you mentioned, Huntley and other... the other towns or would this be the... this new taxing body?"

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Tryon: "No. Actually, Amendment #1 yesterday took that away.

 They can't levy anything without having a referendum."
- Reboletti: "What would..."
- Tryon: "So, the referendum would be countywide, by the way."
- Reboletti: "What would .05 percent be on the average person's property tax bill on 200 thousand, 250 thousand, \$300 thousand dollar property?"
- Tryon: "Well, it would be a nickel for every \$100. It would be \$5 for every thousand. It would be 50 for every 100 thousand and 100 for 200 thousand. And so..."
- Reboletti: "I'm a... I'm a simple lawyer, Representative, that's why I asked this."
- Tryon: "It'd be about \$200 on a home, but that would not be allowed because you would have to have a referendum. So, people will have the opportunity to be able to..."
- Reboletti: "On this new Metra Commuter Rail District, are there representatives from those communities overseeing this expansion?"
- Tryon: "That's correct. They would... the county would convene a planning group and the planning group would then look to see if the expansion met the federal criteria and meet the plan of the Metropolitan Planning... or the MPO, the Metropolitan Planning Organization for those transportation dollars. And then you would petition the Federal Government and then you would... if that went through that approval process, then you would run the referendum."
- Reboletti: "Who would make the appointments to this commission that your county chair..."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Tryon: "It would a County Planning Commission done by the county."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Tryon: "Mmm mmm."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I believe you addressed this in committee but refresh my memory if you would? When we did the south shore... authorized the south shore line, it was the... it was the communities along the line that... that participated in the referendum to raise the dollars. Here, however, you're including all of McHenry County not... all the communities within McHenry county, not just the communities that might be along the Metra line, is that correct?"

Tryon: "That's correct."

Harris, D.: "And... and why is that... why are you doing it that way? Why would a community in the far northeast, perhaps of the county that isn't along the line, why would they be subject to this potential levy?"

Tryon: "Well, McHenry County, as you are well aware, is... is about... is still a collar county and still part of the Metropolitan Planning Organization, but has very little mass transit services. We do a great job of moving people in and out of the City of Chicago from Crystal Lake, McHenry and Woodstock, but we do a really bad job in the rest of the counties. So, there aren't a lot of county

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

options. And we think that this is something our entire county would... would like by increasing access even for some of the more remote communities, if we can demonstrate that we meet the planning criteria required by a Federal Transportation Board."

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon to close."

"I think we've... we've answered all the questions. I... I would like to point out that we amended this Bill so that there was no taxing powers without referendum. certainly, for those of us who have been in charge of planning for our communities as mayors and council members and county board chairmen and county board members, we know how important it is to have the tools to be able to look into the future and say, this is where we are today; this is where we need to... need to go. This is about mass transit, one of the most critical things not just for... for economic development but for choices for people to make in the future as gas goes up, as the reliance on cars needs to come down, we'll need to be looking at more mass transit. want to do that, we've been approached by communities. And I would hope that you would support us in this effort. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Franks. Jakobsson. May. Mr. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

passed. House Bill 2945, Mr. Connelly. Out of the record. House Bill 2946, Representative Hernandez. I'm sorry, Senate Bill 2945. Please read the Bill. 25... I'm sorry, Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2-9-4-6."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2946, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2946 will permit Cook County Forest Preserve to establish compliance with affirmative action regulations with regard to minority and female owned businesses preference and also, small business and construction procurement contracts. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Will Davis, Fortner, Saviano. Please take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2950, Representative Nekritz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2999, Mr. Rose. Mr. Rose. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2569, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2569, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 2569 amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act to 1) place limitations on claims for dissipation of assets and 2) amends the provisions relating to child support to clarify the expenses for which a court may order contribution from a parent. I'm open for questions, if there is any."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Reis: "Representative, can you give several of us on the floor here a little bit more information exactly what your Bill is and... and what's the genesis of the Bill?"
- Soto: "Yes. Senate Bill 2569 amends, again, the Illinois Marriage Dissolution Act. First, it requires notice to impose time limits before a litigant can claim dissipation of marital and non marital assets. Dissipation is when one spouse uses funds for a purpose unrelated to the marriage, such as gambling, when a marriage is irretrievably broken."
- Reis: "Is this an initiative of one of your constituents or ..."
- Soto: "No. This is an initiative of the Healthcare and Family Services and also supported by the Illinois State Bar Association."
- Reis: "And why do they feel... why does the department feel that they need this?"
- Soto: "Well, when there's a... a divorce matter, what happens before the divorce is finalized sometimes one of the

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

spouses will go on a shopping spree. And these are some of the…"

Reis: "One of the spouses?"

Soto: "One or the other, yeah. Either the husband or the wife will go on a shopping spree and spend some of this money because they don't want to, you know, pay child support at a certain amount or even separate the assets. So..."

Reis: "Very good. I think we understand the Bill better. Thank you, Representative."

Soto: "Thank you.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. Gentleman does not wish to speak.

Representative Soto to close."

Soto: "Yes. I urge an 'aye' vote. And I thank you for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lilly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1050, offered by Representative du Buclet. House Resolution 1054, offered by Representative Roth. And House Resolution 1055, offered by Rep... offered by Representative Kelly Burke."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, just for purposes of an announcement before we... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans will meet tomorrow in a caucus one hour prior to Session, I believe that will be 2:00? Is that correct?"

Speaker Lang: "That's correct. Session will be at 3, the Republican Caucus tomorrow is at 2:00. Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, today a former intern of mine, Catelyn Anderson, who started with my office four years ago and a volunteer from Elmhurst College will be leaving the House Republican staff today for greener pastures. She will be attending law school at John Marshall, which I've tried to convince her to go to Valparaiso, but I think I've lost that battle. She has been a tremendous asset to my office and the people of the 46th District and the State of Illinois. And I would ask all of you to join me in wishing her well in her new endeavors. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative May."

May: "Yes, thank you, Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I would like to invite all Members of the General Assembly to a 12:30 p.m. briefing tomorrow with Director Marc Miller of the Department of Natural Resources. He will talk about the budget and changes that are going on. I know this is of concern of many Members and caucuses. So, 12:30 tomorrow in the Stratton building, Director Marc Miller will give a brief presentation and be available to talk to Members about specific concerns. Thank you."

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, an announcement. Immediately following Session today, IDOT will be hosting a briefing on the Illiana Expressway project. It will be immediately following Session in the Governor's Conference Room, Room 205. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader 'Billy Pierce' Lyons."

Lyons: "That works for me, Speaker. Thank you very much. Not that anybody needs reminders, but it is the White Sox Caucus tonight over at DJ Browns about 9:00. Go have dinner, do what you've got to do. The Sox are playing California on the west coast and Billy Pierce will be there waiting for you. Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. Members, an important announcement. Members, I'd like to have your attention. Two bits of information about your schedules. The first one will make you very happy, Friday has been canceled. You're welcome. And Monday's Session will begin midafternoon, the time has yet to be decided, but it could possibly be around 3pm. You will be notified. We'll probably have that information for you tomorrow. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the... allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, May 17 at the hour of 3 p.m., 3 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17 at the hour of 3 p.m."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2979, offered by

137th Legislative Day

5/16/2012

Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. This is referred to the Rules Committee. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 16, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 770. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 770, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6172, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."