140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Mike Burdick who is the Pastor of the Immanuel Lutheran Church and Student Center in Macomb, Illinois. Reverend Burdick is the guest of Representative Norine Hammond. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all electronic equipment and rise for the invocation and The Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Mike Burdick."

Reverend Burdick: "I invite you to join me in prayer for our state and for the House. Oh mighty God, our heavenly Father, You have given us this good land as our heritage. Grant that we remember Your generosity and constantly do Your will. Bless our state with honest industry, truthful education and an honorable way of life. Save us from violence, discord and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil course of action. Support us in defending our liberties and give those to whom we have entrusted the authority of government the spirit of wisdom that there may be justice and peace in our state. When times are prosperous, make our hearts thankful and in troubled times, do not let our trust in You fail. Lord of Lords, You come and give all rule and authority. Graciously regard these, Your servants, assembled here today in this House chamber, quide them and all who make, administer and judge the laws of this state. Enlighten, encourage, and defend them that under their peaceable governance Your

140th Legislative Day

- people may be guarded and directed in righteousness, quietness, and unity through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Karen Yarbrough, would you please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Yarbrough 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 Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, how the Democrats doing today?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that not a single House Democrat is excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Michael Bost, how are the Republicans doing?"
- Bost: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present and do the work... ready to do the work of the people. So we have a full 118 here today."
- Speaker Lyons: "We don't see that very often, Leader, do we?"
 Bost: "No, we really don't."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take the order. There's 118 of us prepared to do the work of the State of Illinois, a quorum is present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee... Committee Reports. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2706, Senate Bill 3259; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3826, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4278. Representative

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 69. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1351; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 278, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2934. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass Short Debate is House Bill 5457, Senate Bill 3277; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 548; do pass as amended Standard Debate is Senate Bill 2194; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Telecommunications reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 555. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment & Energy reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor 2867. Introduction Amendment #2 to Senate Bill of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 88, offered by Representative Watson, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia, on a point of personal privilege. Jim."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, in a former life I spent 28 years of it as an FBI agent and 26 of those years was in Rockford, Illinois. Twenty-plus of

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

those years my partner, good friend, fellow special agent, who retired from the FBI, as I did, and is now a State Representative in the great State of Missouri is here today in the gallery. His name is Gary Fuhr. He's with his lovely wife Denise. State Representative Gary Fuhr from the great State of Missouri."

Speaker Lyons: "Gary, welcome to our Capitol. It's a privilege to have you here, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a special guest that will be speaking and will be addressing the Assembly. I'm asking all Members to please be seated. Staff, retire to the rear of the chamber. All Members in their seats, please. In the absence of Speaker Madigan, who is tied up in other affairs as we can all well imagine, it's my privilege and my honor to introduce to us as a Body will be addressing us from the Taiwan Economic and Cultural Office in Chicago, the Director General of that office, the Honorable Baushuan Ger. Director General Baushuan Ger."

Baushuan Ger: "Mr. Speaker, I thank you for inviting me to speak in this auspicious chamber. I really... I'm really honored. First of all, I want to thank... extend my sincere appreciation to the House of Representatives of Illinois for passing so many Resolutions over the years in support of Taiwan. Especially those that... those that support our bid to the international organizations like ICAO, UNFCCC. The Republic of China and the United States of America enjoyed a very strong friendship since the republic was founded in 1911. This centennial friendship has grown stronger even after the Republic of China moved its capital

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

from mainland China to Taiwan in 1949. While both countries share many values such as democracy, freedom, love of law, human rights. So... so, that's why we in international arena we support the United States like the embargo on North Korea, economic sanctions on Iran, and many other things and we will continue to do so. With a population of only 23 million and the size of only onethird of Illinois, Taiwan ranks now the 18th economy in the... in the world and with the United States, actually, we are the ninth largest trading partner of the U.S. and fifth largest agricultural export market for U.S. And with... with Illinois, actually, last year we consumed one... one billion U.S. dollars agricultural products from Illinois. So, we can see how much this kind of economic relations we have with the U.S. and with Illinois particular, and we have sole desire to continue strengthen this very good relationship. Taiwan and the State of Illinois establish its sister relationship in 1992 and it's my mission... my office's mission to strengthen this very good relations and I believe that I can count on your support in the years ahead and that we hope that you can give us more courage and support. I hope more of you will visit Taiwan in the near future and I believe that through this kind of personal experience you will know that we are very democratic, free, and prosperous society and we are a strong ally of you... United States. Once again, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak here. This is my lifelong honor and long live the Land of Lincoln. Thank you very much for today. Thank you."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "There will be photo opportunities to my right, your left, for anybody who would like to take a photograph with the Counsel General. Members, I'll be starting on some of the Concurrences starting on the bottom of page 15 so we'll be working up on page 16 to most of them not all of them are quite ready to be put to the floor, but I'll be starting on the bottom of page 15 working on page 16 on the Order of Concurrences. Representative Linda Chapa LaVia, on the Order of Concurrences you have, on page 15, House Bill 4029."

Chapa LaVia: "Hi there, Speaker. You look mighty fine today." Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative, you too."

Chapa LaVia: "That's good. Okay. So, House Bill 4029 restores the Bill to current law so that districts must rebid a contract if it receives a timely request on any other interested contractor and it clarifies that a cause of action cannot lie against the school board for awarding a student transportation contract to the lowest responsible bidder. There is no opposition at the time. It was brought on by the Teamsters Joint Council 25 and there's no position from the State Board of Education, the Illinois State School Management Alliance. I know of no opponents. I ask for Concurrence."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

140th Legislative Day

- Bost: "Representative, could you go over that one more time.

 It's kind of loud in here. Could you go over what exactly was the change in the Senate was."
- Chapa LaVia: "So, the change in the Senate... Bill still provides that school district must consider safety, comfort, and stability before price when awarding student transportation contracts. So, the Amendment restores the Bill to current law so that districts must rebid a contract if it receives a timely request from another interested contract; so, that stays the same. So, the last piece of legislation changed it; so, this puts it back to the original language before. And then also clarifies that a cause of action cannot lie for а against a school board awarding transportation contract to the lowest responsible bidder. Before I put a stipulation in that of... a school board could be penalized for doing this. This removes that."
- Bost: "Okay. Okay. So, it actually takes away the ability for...

 for them to be... So, what holds them being responsible to
 maybe an improper bid or something?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's all local control. And the issue that's arose was sometimes... specially in education for special needs and I couldn't be... couldn't say just special needs 'cause it highlights special needs. It doesn't give the same affordability across the board for transportation, but the reason why we started this is because we'll find some companies that deal with our most vulnerable children maybe don't have camera equipment or don't have the proper training for their school bus drivers to take care of these kids. So this just helps them..."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Bost: "To make..."

Chapa LaVia: "...in that sense."

Bost: "So... so basically it allows them to make... make sure they have the opportunity to have a properly... If they... if the company does not have a properly equipped bus per se..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Bost: "...or transportation."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. It doesn't strap their hands to bidding...
to bidding on the lowest bidder. It gives them the
flexibility as a school board..."

Bost: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...a school board to make the decision on whether they want to do another bidder that has the right equipment to help accommodate..."

Bost: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...their children."

Bost: "What... what would be... And my only concern and it is... I understand that it's local control, but my only concern is that, you know, a lot of these rules are put in on these bids so that somebody can't get a special contact because of a con... a connection or anything like that. What... what is still in place to stop that from occurring? You understand what I'm asking?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah. Well... Currently the law requires school districts to rebid a student transportation contract every five years. Okay."

Bost: "Okay."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Chapa LaVia: "This is helping it so they can... they still have to do it... rebid in a timely fashion, but it also... there are transparencies here..."

Bost: "I..."

Chapa LaVia: "...for the school board to review it..."

Bost: "Okay."

Chapa LaVia: "...and..."

Bost: "I... I just want to make sure that we're not freeing up the opportunity for things that we've been trying to stop for years which is bid rigging."

Chapa LaVia: "No. The Amendment actually addresses that."

Bost: "Okay. All right. That's what I wanted to know."

Chapa LaVia: "So it took it back to the original law."

Bost: "All right. Thank..."

Chapa LaVia: "That's what the issue was with the Concurrence."

Bost: "Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "You answered my question."

Bost: "So, that's all right."

Chapa LaVia: "I understand what you're saying now."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should House Bi... Does the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4029?' This is final action. 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? Brady, Golar, Hays, Jackson, Jefferson, May, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 71 Members voting 'yes', 46 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- 4029. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, for an announcement, Representative du Buclet. We have a special guest on the floor."
- du Buclet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take this time out to introduce a very special guest, Cook County Board President Toni Preckwinkle. She's going to be roaming around the floor. Please... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Welcome Madam President. Glad to have you on the House Floor. Nice change of pace from the county building. Representative Scott Penny, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative?"

Penny: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Moment of personal privilege." Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Scott."

- Penny: "I would like to introduce my son who's with me today, Scott Penny, Jr. Scott recently graduated from NIU with a teaching degree. He was a two time all-state wrestler and a three time all-American wrestler and he was a Division I college wrestler. He went on a scholarship also. Also in the gallery is my wife, Sheila; who is taking photographs of us. I'm very glad to be here, very proud to be here and I'm proud that they're with me today. Thank you, Sir."
- Speaker Lyons: "Scott, Mrs. Penny, welcome to your Capitol.

 It's a privilege to have you. All right, Members, I'll be continuing with Concurrences on page 16 of the Calendar.

 Representative Jerry Costello, on the top of page 16 you have House Bill 4129. Representative Jerry Costello."

140th Legislative Day

- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I ask for Concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4129. It's a page and line Amendment. It clarifies that the duty to notify is with the clerk of the Circuit Court not the court; for example, the office of the chief judge. This does not change the underlying substance of the Bill. And this Bill passed out of the House unanimously. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House... of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4129 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mussman, Ramey, Chapin Rose. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4129. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rita Mayfield, Rita, you have, on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 4145. Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "Basically what this Amendment does it just provides a notification to the homeowner prior to the removing of the vehicle. This... there's no opposition to this Bill and I'd recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4145 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4145. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Elaine Nekritz, what purpose do you seek recognition, Representative."

Nekritz: "Point... Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Elaine."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my... I know he's indicated he's already said hello to the... most of the floor, but it's my pleasure to welcome back my seatmate Representative Mark Walker to the chamber today. It's good to see him and good to have him here."

Speaker Lyons: "Mark Walker, welcome home, good to see you.

Page 16 of the Calendar, Representative Ann Williams has
House Bill 4190. Representative Williams, House Bill 4190."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 for House Bill 4190. It simply adds an immediate affective date to the Bill which provides that Illinois False Claims Act will be consistent with the Federal False Claims Act. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4190 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, Jakobsson, Rosenthal, Sente, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4190. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lisa Dugan, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 4479. Representative Lisa Dugan, House Bill 4479.

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's really just a technical change adding ICC to instances of language. So, it really stands for the International Code Council and they just wanted to clarify. So, it's just a technical change and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? 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 looking at our analysis and it talks about imposing fines by the Office of the State Fire Marshal as a mechanism. Can you explain that?"

Dugan: "Well, this... that was I think the original Bill, Representative. And there was confusion as to for... whether or not this was actually a fee increase, which it was not. And of course the Bill passed out of the House, but there was some questions on a fee increase which the original Bill does not do. So, it already did pass the House, but

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

when it got to the Senate they just wanted to make a technical Amendment making sure that the International Code Council was listed as other than just the ICC."

Reboletti: "And I also see that the City of Chicago opposed. Is that... is that changed by the Senate Amendment #1?"

Dugan: "I... I'm not sure on that, Representative."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further questions, the question is, 'Should the Sen... should the House agree... adopt Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4479?' This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Barickman, Brauer, Sullivan. Take the record. On this Bill, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 50 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4479. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Durkin, you have, on the Order of Concurrences, Jim, House Bill 4596. Concurrence. Out of the record. Representative Carli, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 4673. Representative Carli on House Bill 4673."

Carli: "Good morning. I'd like to... this is a Concurrence to my
House Bill 4673 which basically narrows the scope to
require FOID exemptions for an active duty officer only if
he or she seeks mental health treatment due to work related
duties and receives treatment from a licensed health
professional."

140th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "...the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, could you explain a situ… the situation that's been happening. Why… why this is necessary. Walk us through an example."
- Carli: "This is necessary because when officers are going in and seek any type of therapy or treatment, their FOID card is being revoked and it's automatically put us on mental, a no pay status, even if they're released from institution one to two days later. It puts them in a no-pay status for a long period of time."
- Reboletti: "How does the department find out if they go into an employee assistance program or they seek some type of physiological or psychiatric assistance?"
- Carli: "We have a medical unit which we are to report to."
- Reboletti: "And then it's automatically revoked at that time."
- Carli: "The state police does revoke it."
- Reboletti: "Is it revoked for a certain period of time, or is it revoked forever until there is some type of appeal process to get the reinstatement of the FOID card."
- Carli: "Right now, it's approximately six months, I believe, but it's been going longer for some officers."
- Reboletti: "Are the officers then put on desk duty or are they basically on paid administrative leave what's... Thank you, Speaker. What's their status?"

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Carli: "They are no... they are not being paid. They go into a no-pay status."

Reboletti: "And they are on no-pay status until they can get their FOID card back. Is that..."

Carli: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Carli: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, what if the law enforcement officer has lost his job and he's applying for a job at a different... either a different town or a different county, different state."

Carli: "If he went through the procedures to receive his FOID card again, after that then he can apply to anywhere he'd like to apply. It depends on the… the place that he's applying for, their restrictions."

Mulligan: "But you think he should still be eligible for a FOID card if he's lost his job over say something to do with domestic violence or..."

Carli: "I can't answer that due to the fact that I don't know what the restrictions of the..."

Mulligan: "Well I think you should be..."

Carli: "...agency."

Mulligan: "...able to answer it because it's your Bill."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- Carli: "I don't know what the... You're telling me if he's applying for a different job. What is he applying for, a law enforcement job or to deliver dog food?"
- Mulligan: "He may be applying at a different department because he's lost his job at a different... a department for either domestic violence or some kind of a case that's happened. We have someone in our district that had a problem with picketers for a clinic that was involved in a suit for quite some time. So, how would you decide whether that person should be eligible or not to lose the card?"
- Carli: "That's up to the state… the FO… FOID card is given out by the state. If they feel them not fit, they won't give them an FOID card."
- Mulligan: "But you're making a Bill that regulates what the state does and probably the rules would come through JCAR, which I serve on. And so that would then be amended and it would make it different than what the current rules are."
- Carli: "The... No, it doesn't make it any different. It just... it just speeds up the process for the officer to get his FOID card if he has shown he is fit and he has passed all the mental and physical requirements needed. It does not change that fact."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Carli moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4673. This is final action. 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 Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, take

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4673. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sandy Pihos, you have House Bill 4687. Representative Sandy Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #3. As promised when this Bill went over to the Senate we worked with the opposition to make sure that they were satisfied with the wording of this proposed legislation which now says; listing the title of any Motion, Resolution, or ordinance shall satisfy the requirement that the agenda item be sufficiently descriptive. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mike Zalewski."

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

Zalewski: "Thank you for the explanation, Representative. Our analysis says that the IML is a proponent of the Bill and I just want to know to make clear that that includes the IML and all the municipalities that were originally opposed to the Bill."

Pihos: "That's correct. I know of no one that's in opposition to the Bill at this point."

Zalewski: "And so the... the sufficiently descriptive language that has to be put in the agenda will say... the agendas will

140th Legislative Day

- be more clear about what the town or the village intends to do at that particular meeting."
- Pihos: "Yes. We wanted to be transparent so tran... the public can engage if they so choose. And this language is agreed to."
- Zalewski: "To the Bill. I thank the Sponsor for accepting the Senate's changes. This makes it a much better Bill and I'm...
 I'd urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House approve... adopt Amendment... Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4687?' This is final action. 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? Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment #... Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4687. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, House Resolution 105. Mr. Clerk. 1051, 1051. Leader Mike Bost. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1051, offered by Representative Bost.
 - WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of Ben C. Harpstrite of New Baden, who passed away on April 24, 2012; and
 - WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite was born on June 10, 1926, in Trenton; he married Eleanor E. "Ellie", nee Schmidt, Harpstrite on June 19, 1947, in Trenton; and

140th Legislative Day

- WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite was a farmer and operated Harpstrite Farms with his wife and his brother, Howard; he was also an insurance agent for Harpstrite Insurance Agency; and
- WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite served on the Clinton County Board of School Trustees from 1950 until 1956; he also served as the Lookingglass Township Assessor from 1956 until 1960 and was a member of the Clinton County Board of Supervisors from 1960 until 1966; and
- WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite served as an Illinois State Representative from 1967 until 1974, during the 75th through the 78th General Assemblies; he focused mainly on rural issues during his tenure in the Illinois House of Representatives; and
- WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite was a member of the First United Methodist Church in Trenton; he was a charter member of the New Baden Lions Club for 60 years; he was a member of Trenton Masonic Lodge 109, the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite Valley of Southern Illinois, the Ainad Shriners, the Silver Lake Shrine Club, the MI-CLI-BO Shrine Club, the Centralia Shrine Club, and the Ainad Temple Nuts and Bolts Club; he was a sponsor at Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children and a member of the Eastern Star Trenton Chapter 756; he was also a member of the New Baden Chamber of Commerce and the Clinton County Farm Bureau; and
- WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite was preceded in death by his wife, Eleanor E. "Ellie", nee Schmidt, Harpstrite; his parents, Benjamin A. and Ella M., nee Bassler, Harpstrite; his son, James Benjamin Harpstrite; his great-grandson, Nathan Lintzenich; his son-in-law, Dale Roy Zeller; his

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, Wilbur A. Schmidt, Jr., Robert Schmidt, Delores Provaznik, and Gladys and Walter Pendracky; his father-in-law and mother-in-law, Wilbur A. and Emma M., nee Slavik, Schmidt, Sr.; and his step father-in-law, William Masek; and

WHEREAS, Ben Harpstrite is survived by his children, Janice L. (Michael) Hamilton, Karen S. (Mike) Riley, Cheryl A. Parkin, and Janine M. (Ed) Wuebbles; (Rick) grandchildren, Dawn M. (Jim) Lintzenich, Ashley Hamilton, Jami S. (Jay) Staser, Michael J. Riley, Rick L. Riley, Kyle A. (Kristy) Bingaman, Jared J. (Kalena) Bingaman, Heidi L. (Tom) Kirchgesner, Craig W. Parkin (fiancee, Lauren Momot), Melanie M. Wuebbles, and Joshua J. Wuebbles; his great-grandchildren, Mikaela Lintzenich, Caleb Lintzenich, Ethan Riley Lemberger, Olivia Bingaman, Gryphon Kirchgesner, Aidan Hamilton, Destiny Wuebbles, Kaitlyn Staser, Torre Parsons, Kolten Staser, Hunter Parsons, Gabe Parkin, Logan Bingaman, and Payton Bingaman; his brother, Howard D. Harpstrite (special friend, Jackie Rickert); his brother-in-law, Frank Provaznik; sister-in-law, Kathy Schmidt; and his many nieces, nephews, and cousins; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family and friends, the passing of Ben C. Harpstrite; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Ben Harpstrite as an expression of our sympathy."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

"Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ben Harpstrite... there's not a Member... only one Member left that actually served with him and that's our Speaker. But Ben proved out that, from talking with his family and visiting with friends and people who did serve with him, he proved out that a public servant doesn't stop when you leave this building. Many of us have served in other places before we got here. He did; he served his township, he served his county, but then came and served here. And then after not returning after a... after not being elected, he worked... went to his community and continued to work in community; was well respected in his community. And not only that, he also was very active with the Shriners and when the parades would happen in the community and not only in his community but all over he would ride a three wheel... or a two wheeled motorcycle and he would have the American flag at the front of the group. And he always was a leader in that way. After visiting with his family, and this is something that I want to say. First off, I want to thank the family for first being here today and they're seated in the gallery and not all the family but most of them are here and it's a very large family. They're very proud of their father and brother as well they should be. He... We want to thank them for allowing him to serve because I'm going to tell you after visiting with his daughters, you know, each one of us as we come to these places and our children quite often have to deal with the situation at home where either mom or dad are taking some votes that

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

sometimes are a little rough. And they've got to hear the complaints or sometimes the praises that's... that's pretty good, but you want to... I just want to say God bless them for putting up with that over the years, but also bless him in the fact that he served his community so well. We want to thank them; we want to thank him. He will be missed by his community, by his friends; he was active in the Farm Bureau. And I... I appreciate the opportunity to have this Resolution passed today for them."

- Speaker Lyons: "We'll have a moment of silence. May the soul of Ben Harpstrite rest in peace, Amen. All those in favor of the adoption of House Resolution 1051 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Resolution 1051 is unanimously adopted. Family, God bless you for coming here. Colleagues, we're going to be working on Senate Bills-Third Reading. I'll be starting on the bottom of page 4 and then going to page 5. So, to any of you Representatives who have a Bill on page 4 or page 5, heads-up, we'll go through most of them, not all of them. First one, Representative Dennis Reboletti. On page 4, Dennis, we have Senate Bill 180. Out of the record. Representative Bob Pritchard, you have Senate Bill 275. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 275, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Civil Administrative Code of

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Illinois and also the School Code to provide an easier transition for our military service people who move into Illinois and for their spouse to be able to transfer their license and add to the family income. I would ask for your support."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 275 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? Ken Dunkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', `no'. This Bill, having voting received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Sara Feigenholtz, on Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 278. 278, Sara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 278, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz, would you like to move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 278 was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Gabel, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #2."

140th Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is...
 simply incorporates the Illinois Maternal and Child Care
 Group into this commission."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation of Floor Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment... Representative Mulligan did you have a question? No question. The Lady does not seek recognition. All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Kelly Cassidy, Senate Bill 409. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 409, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Lady from Cook, Representative Kelly Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 409 creates some layers of transparency and more information available to residents in areas for special service areas. Amends the Tax Code addressing special service areas. Ensures that people will be informed of what the proposed tax levy amount will be for new special service areas, requiring public hearings within an appropriate time frame and requiring additional public hearings any time the levy will increase by a significant amount. Special service areas do great work within our

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

communities. This, however, will allow for greater understanding and greater clarity for the people affected by them. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Are you hungry?"

Cassidy: "A little peckish, yeah."

Franks: "Okay. Good. Listen, you'll get a chance to eat in just a minute, but I want to ask a few questions about the Bill. I'm not sure I understand what this Bill does. It's dealing with special service areas and it... it requires additional requirements on municipalities and counties. But what are those requirements?"

Cassidy: "The requirements are around providing information and transparency when a special service area is created or changed. Special service areas are a group of properties that... that agree to pay additional property taxes to pay for infrastructure to benefit that area. So a business district could benefit by infrastructure improvements, a neighborhood could improve by... get public safety improvements and it would be... it would require that the residents or the affected taxpayers in that area be better informed when these are implemented."

Franks: "Well, the problem where I have with the SSAs is the way it's currently set up is you have to prove a negative. So, instead of having to prove a positive, you're requiring those that... who are against something to actually jump

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

through more hoops than those who are for something. Are... are you familiar with how they do the levies on the SSAs? And that concerns me because Ι think it's almost anticonsumer because instead of having the people who want to raise your taxes have to affirmatively show that the majority of the people want their taxes increased, instead you are requiring people who don't want their taxes increased to have to prove that. Would you agree that's how it's set up now?"

Cassidy: "I don't know that I would go that far. What I will say is that this change will create a better mechanism whereby people who are affected by the SSAs can be informed and get... and be engaged because too often they happen in a vacuum."

Franks: "I... I agree and they... and this does do part of that but I wonder if you'd be willing to maybe take this to Second and add another Amendment because right now it still requires folks who don't want something to happen... Because if you object to an SSA, you have to get the folks who are registered to vote and actually own property and you have to get, I think, 50-plus... 50 percent plus one to go... to appeal, correct?"

Cassidy: "I believe so."

Franks: "I'm sorry."

Cassidy: "I believe that's correct, yes."

Franks: "Right. But the problem is oftentimes the voter lists are incorrect and the ownership list it's hard... it's hard to track down some of the owners if they don't live in the area because they could be for renters. So I find the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

people who are objecting to the tax increase have to do so much more work as opposed to the folks who want it. You could have a minority of the folks saying I want a tax increase, but everyone who's against it has to go through 20 times more work than those who are for it. So I'd like to change the burden of proof and for those who want the tax increase have them show that 50 percent plus one actually want it, instead of those who are against it disproving. Is there any way we can change that?"

Cassidy: "I would be willing to work with you on future legislation in that... with regard to SSA reform. This will take an important first step towards that. Right now we aren't getting enough people to participate. This will help improve that. There's a great deal that can be done to improve this really useful tool. And I'd be delighted to work with you in the future, but I would ask that we take this first step now."

Franks: "Okay. That's reasonable and just... I just... I've seen some abuses and I just want to curve those abuses."

Cassidy: "And this is a step towards those curves without a doubt."

Franks: "All right. Thank... thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Our analysis of this Bill shows that you're doing it after the fact. I don't think that's fair. We used to... I

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

used to do this 20 years ago with a law firm I was with, you send out notices. You're ou... You have to send out notices before you do it not after you do it. What good does it do the person afterwards to find out that they're being assessed if not everybody wanted it."

Cassidy: "This doesn't change the way SSAs are created initially. This addresses the way that people the... the level of communication. This doesn't change the way they are created initially."

Mulligan: "But you're saying you're giving them notice after it's done."

Cassidy: "After the ordinance is proposed not after it's done.

Before it is approved. After the ordinance is proposed."

Mulligan: "Before... before it's..."

Cassidy: "It is something that has to be proposed."

Mulligan: "...approved..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...so that they can be at the meeting..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...and argue against having it approved if they don't want it."

Cassidy: "Right. But the en... the ordinance has to be introduced before the question can even be raised."

Mulligan: "Sometimes the way the property is situated means that maybe three or four people will pay for it because their property is long and they're the only ones that are adjacent but maybe one or two in... around the block would... should be paying for it too so that if they're getting the benefit of, say, a new sewer or something different that

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

would help the community that more people should be involved, but normally you have to send a notice. How would you... how would you do the notice? Would it just go to everybody that was in a certain range or everybody adjacent? How would you handle that?"

Cassidy: "It doesn't change the in... the underlying definition.

It does make it tougher to establish an SSA without community involvement because it requires more community involvement."

Mulligan: "It just seems to me that the notice is after the fact and maybe it's just the way our analysis was written. So a public hearing... it says a public hearing must be held within 60 days of the adoption of the ordinance proposing the establishment of a special service area. So that's within 60 days of an adoption not before."

Cassidy: "Of the ordinance that proposes. They have to pass an ordinance to propose the creation and then they have to approve the creation after the public hearing. But you have to pass an ordinance to propose it to put the wheels in motion to create it. So it's not... the ord... the SSA is not created by the passage of the ordinance that triggers the public hearing. The public hearing is not after the fact. The public hearing is part of the approval process."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "This wil... will take an important step towards reforming SSAs and getting more community involvement into... to making better use of this tool. And I ask for your support."

140th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Gen... Representative Cassidy moves for the passage of Senate Bill 409. 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? Pritchard, Sosnowski, Dave Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 85 Members voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Skip Saviano, you have Senate Bill 679. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 679, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Skip Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 679 is sort of a cleanup provision and... and a protective safeguard. A few years ago we passed insurance coverage for early intervention on autistic children which we... we mandated insurance companies cover the treatments whether it be speech therapy, diagnostic services, whatever the case may be 'cause we felt that'd be a good investment in children who are diagnosed with autism. This Bill simply protects people who were previously enrolled in those programs... under that coverage. Looking forward to the Obama Care provisions and everything else, we just want to make sure there was no break in service to these children. This is an agreed Bill. I thank my cosponsors on this. Also we had... it came out of committee unanimously. And I would ask for your approval."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patti Bellock."

- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. I want to thank Representative Saviano for doing this Bill and this is going to be a huge issue coming in the next year with the Federal Government and different people trying to change the definition of autism. And so what we're doing is trying to provide services for the children who are already receiving services in Illinois to assure that their care continues. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Saviano and Representative Bellock move for the passage of Senate Bill 679. 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? Evans, Lilly, Penny. Scott Penny, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Fortner, point of personal privilege."
- Fortner: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. On House Bill 4479 I was recorded as a 'no' vote. I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1673, Barbara. Leader Currie. Senate Bill 1673, Barb. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1673, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a... a measure that would say the people who are working for a labor organization, new hires and current employees who get to take a leave of absence, are not to earn credit under the state pension system and it also includes language that says that pension fraud is to be reported to the Pension Systems Board of Trustees. So, this is an effort to make clear exactly what happens with respect to current annuitants. It does not apply to local units of government, but it does apply to state systems. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Leader, now this only affects the retirees of the Cook County?"

Currie: "No. I believe this has to do with the state systems."

Bost: "The whole state system. Okay."

Currie: "New... new hires and if there is somebody who has not yet taken a leave of absence it would apply to them as well."

Bost: "Okay. I'm..."

Currie: "So it does not affect people who have already performed the leave absence to go work, for example, for a labor union. So that would... that would count for them."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Bost: "Okay. So... so, they can take... take a leave of absences to go work for... Oh, this is... this is if they would be working for as a lobbyist possibly."

Currie: "For a labor organization. For example, there are some instances wherein work for a labor organization entitled individuals to participation in the state pen... pension fund or the teachers' retirement fund. And this is meant to close the door."

Bost: "Okay. Do..."

Currie: "So, it applies to new hires. It applies to people who have not yet taken leave from their current job as a teacher, for example, to go work for the labor organization. So..."

Bost: "So... so, those that have already started doing it, it doesn't change that, but..."

Currie: "It doesn't..."

Bost: "...but anything in the future."

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Currie: "So, I would... I would call this an example of the kind of pension reform we've been talking about all season and I would appreciate your 'yes' vote."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Mulligan: "Representative, how does that treat an employee that's retired and comes back as a consultant, which we do have a number of those in the different state departments.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

They retire, then they come back and they serve on the staff as a consultant."

Currie: "They would not be entitled to a state or a downstate teacher pension under current law and under this."

Mulligan: "All right. So it wouldn't affect anybody..."

Currie: "No."

Mulligan: "...that's in that... All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm looking at the list of opponents here and I see that the Illinois Federation of Teachers is opposed. Have they told you why they're opposed?"

Currie: "They have not. And let me just say, Representative, that this Bill is relatively new to me in that the original House Sponsor is a Member who has since left the Body. So, I suspect that what... I can imagine that their argument would be that we thought this was a perk that we were entitled to in perpetuity and we don't want it taken away even for new people for... which are the ones that this would apply to. And I personally think that that position is not sustainable in this or any other political environment."

Franks: "You say that very nicely. I think it's more than not sustainable. I think it's just wrong for people who haven't worked for the state just because they happen to lobby for somebody doesn't mean that they should be somehow given the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

ability to be in our state pension system. Wouldn't you agree?"

Currie: "I do."

Franks: "As I'm looking at this opponent, it was the Federation of Teachers, as I recall, who had two of their lobbyists, who had never taught a day and never spent a day in administration as well, who had two of their members placed in the… …in this… I think it was that Teachers Retirement System and it cost in excess of a million dollars per person."

Currie: "First of all... first of all, I think there was a requirement that they do some substitute teaching and second, I don't know that either one of them has actually applied for that pension."

Franks: "But I think we changed the law where they would not be eligible anyway. I think that... that Bill passed last year."

Currie: "Yes. Whether that Bill meets constitutional challenge,

I don't know. This Bill actually is a Bill going forward."

Franks: "So... let me ask you this. As someone that's already employed and they're a lobbyist for whoever they're a lobby... and this happened to be a lobbyist for a labor organization as opposed to lobbying for the Cancer Society. Right now, if they're lobbying for a labor organization, they would somehow be able to get into a state retirement system."

Currie: "No, not all of them by any means. There was a particular provision having to do with people who were working for a teacher lobby group that would entitle them to participation in the Downstate Teachers Retirement Fund.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

There also were in the Chicago Municipal Laborers Fund. There also were provisions there that entitled those individuals to participation in a different fund then the laborers fund whence they emerged. This Bill does not deal with the local funds. It only deals with any statewide organization that would... that some... a member might be entitled to move to a lobbying position and still be entitled to a state pension. So, your basic premises is sound. People who are working for a labor organization ought not be eligible for a state pension any more than someone working for the realtors or for any other lobby organization."

Franks: "And this Bill will accomplish that."

Currie: "Exactly."

Franks: "Thank you. It's a good Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady from Cook, Representative Darlene Senger."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Senger: "I just want to ask a couple questions to make sure I understand what this is doing. It appears to me that the wording is such where this only applies to the Tier II, the new employees that have been hired after January 1, '11."

Currie: "No. No. No. No. It applies to somebody who, for example, is working today as a teacher. Okay. So, someone is working as a teacher, they have not taken a leave of absence to work as a lobbyist for that organization, this Bill would apply to them. They no longer would be eligible, if they took that leave of absence to work for the labor organization, they would not be eligible to receive a state

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

pension. This Bill also would apply to new hires. You're right, those would be Tier II hires because by definition they're new, but it also would apply to existing hires who have not taken a leave of absence so as to qualify themselves for a state pension."

Senger: "Okay. That's... that's what I just wanted to make sure that it include both...

Currie: "Yes."

Senger: "...both categories."

Currie: "Yep."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady awaits your question, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. Leader, I just had one question. Our analysis says that this Bill amends the Cook County Employees' Article of the Pension Code. Yet, you said it applies to all state systems and I'm not... I'm not sure I follow that... how that applies to all state systems if it's..."

Currie: "You know... you know, I think the reality is it's the Teachers Retirement System that invited participation by people who had been teachers, for example, had been hired then by the labor organizations. I think it's really only TRS that we are concerned about in this Bill."

Harris, D.: "But the lang..."

Currie: "The other examples..."

Harris, D.: "...the lang..."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Currie: "...didn't come from state systems, they came from local systems."

Harris, D.: "Okay. But the lang... the language of the Bill amends... Pension Code... Okay. I follow. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Reboletti: "What are the status of Amendments 1 and 2?"

Speaker Lyons: "Clerk... the status on which Amendments, Representative."

Reboletti: "1 and 2."

Speaker Lyons: "1 and 2, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Amendments #1 and 2 were tabled."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Am I in the queue now to ask a question of the Majority Leader."

Speaker Lyons: "She awaits your question, Sir."

Reboletti: "Leader, as I read the Bill, without those Amendments it only applies to Cook County. Am I mistaken in my analysis then?"

Currie: "How about if we take the Bill from the record, let me check that out, because it certainly is my intent that it applies to the Downstate Teachers Retirement System."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Currie: "So, with leave, can I take the Bill out of the record?

Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor we'll take that Bill out of the record. Representative Michael

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Zalewski, you have, on page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1692. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1692 is an initiative of the Illinois Attorney General's Office. There's two components of the Bill. The first deals with high risk home loans. The Bill basically mirrors Federal Law when it comes to the fees and commissions associated with these types of loans, FHA, veterans loans. The second component deals with what are called refund anticipation checks or refund anticipation loans. The Attorney General wishes to impose some commonsense regulatory measures to make sure that these loans are... and these checks aren't regular... predatory in nature. I'm happy to answer any questions. And I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? 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 looking at Amendment #4. It talks about removing advertising and marketing requirements because of H&R Block. Can you explain that a little bit."

Zalewski: "I... I would say H&R Block is the largest commercial offer of refund anticipation credit. Their concern was that the advertising aspect of the Bill might be a little cost prohibitive. In the opinion of the Attorney General, who I

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

defer to in this matter, we could accommodate their concerns while still leaving in a disclosure component of the Bill. So, again, I think it's simply just to ensure that... it's accommodation to H&R Block that... that made sense to the Attorney General and myself."

Reboletti: "And with respect to these tax refund anticipation loans, what type of disclosures are being made then. Is that to... to inform the consumer of what actually the interest rates are in the time frame in which the..."

Zalewski: "You're talking about the loan not the check, correct, Representative?"

Reboletti: "Right. That's correct."

Zalewski: "So the disclosures will still require the... the loan maker to disclose that it's a loan, disclose exactly the components of the loan to ensure the consumer's aware of what they're getting into."

Reboletti: "So, it's not a refund; it's actually a loan and then when the..."

Zalewski: "Well, it's... it's important to note to the Body there's two types of commercial transactions we're talking about here. A refund anticipation check basically says you're going to get a refund; in advance of that refund, we're going to offer you the money prematurely almost, but we're going to take a commission on that... on that check. A loan allows the user to loan money based on what they anticipate coming. They're two different products."

Reboletti: "What are the interest rates on those products generally or what's the max cap on those?"

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- Zalewski: "Well, under the… under the Bill, Representative, we're capping that rate at 36 percent. The problem, which the Attorney General identified, is there are often instances where the loans or where the cap… the rates before this Bill will be implemented were wildly predatory in nature, so we're trying to regulate that."
- Reboletti: "And then with respect to the Secretary of State's portion, there's a Class A misdemeanor for fraudulently financing... filing. That's not in the Bill."
- Zalewski: "I believe... we've taken out the UCC portion of the Bill completely as we've dealt with that in subsequent legislation."
- Reboletti: "Well, Representative, I appreciate you bringing this Bill. I haven't dealt with the UCC since law school and the bar exam so. I appreciate that walk back in history. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1692 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 Brady, Riley, and Smith, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Elaine Nekritz, you have Senate Bill 1808, on page 5 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank vou, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1808 is an

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1808 is an Amendment to the Illinois Eavesdropping Act that we've debated on this floor once before. There is a... you know, I think the need for this legislation still exists. In fact, I think there's even a more compelling reason today than we had last time we debated this Bill. But let me just kin... describe a little bit of the con... the content of the go into those legislation then I'll reasons. legislation creates an additional exception the to Eavesdropping Bill to allow citizens to audio record, doesn't cover video recording that's already... that's already allowed under Illinois law, but allows citizens to audio record, a police officer, a public official on public property during the performance of their public duty. There's... the last time we debated this Bill there'd already been two Illinois courts that had... that had held the current Illinois law unconstitutional. Now, we have the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, a Federal Court, Appeals Court, who has also said that this leg... this ... the existing Illinois law as it applies to police officers on public property performing their public duty is also unconstitutional. And they've issued a 60-some odd page opinion to that effect. So, now we have three Illinois courts telling us, Illinois General Assembly, your statute is unconstitutional; you need to make changes. We did also make one additional change to the Bill and that was to say

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

that... and one of the things we heard during a lot of the discussion and debate was if someone alters an audio tape and then tries to use that as evidence of police misconduct that that... that that shouldn't be allowed. So what we've done in the Bill is add an Amendment that if someone does that and tries to use it as evidence that that has to be referred to a state's attorney. We would leave it to the discretion of a state's attorney whether they would charge someone doing that with a misdemeanor or a felony. Again, the courts are telling us we need to make some changes here. I think this is the appropriate legislation to address the... what... the concerns that have been raised by the difficult... by the controversial prosecutions that have gone on under this Act. Several of the opponents as a result of the Seventh Circuit case have moved to neutral and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, just... I want to make it very clear there were two state court actions in which the eavesdropping statute... this portion of the eavesdropping statute was ruled unconstitutional, correct?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Durkin: "Have they been appealed?"

Nekritz: "One of the… one of them was appealed but that appeal has now been dropped by the Attorney General."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Durkin: "Okay. How about the other one?"

Nekritz: "I don't know..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Nekritz: "...I'm not aware of any appeal in the Drew case."

Durkin: "Okay. So, they've kind of abandoned the appeal from that action, from the Circuit Court, correct?"

Nekritz: "I'm... It's not been pursued. I would... and I shouldn't say, Representative, I don't know for sure, but I've not heard that that's happened."

Durkin: "And the Seventh Circuit... is that a final ruling from the Seventh Circuit or is it more of a..."

Nekritz: "It was a..."

Durkin: "preliminary hearing..."

Nekritz: "...it's a preliminary injunction."

Durkin: "Okay."

Nekritz: "So, it is... it is not a final ruling, but again, they went through the trouble of writing a 60-or 70-page opinion as to why this law was unconstitutional..."

Durkin: "Right."

Nekritz: "...so it's hard to imagine that on a... on the permanent injunction that they would rule any differently."

Durkin: "One of my concerns with the Bill, when you brought it up last time, was that there was absolutely no mechanism in place to pursue an action against an individual who's going to manipulate a tape. And we all raised the NATO... upcoming NATO summits that we saw millions of cameras out there. What have you done in this Bill to ensure that, if there is an individual who is going to manipulate this against a law enforcement officer, that they will be held accountable."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- Nekritz: "We added an Amendment that said that a... if someone manipulates an audio tape and then tries to use that as evidence of misconduct against a police officer that that action gets referred to a state's attorney and then it's up to the state's attorney to determine whether or not they would want to pursue a misdemeanor or a felony prosecution."
- Durkin: "But that would also include if someone has used a tape to perhaps for some type of citizens' complaint, which is just more of a police board proceeding, that would apply to that as well not... correct?"
- Nekritz: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you say your question again."
- Durkin: "I said, I guess it would apply even in those proceedings where it's not... in a police board administrative hearing it would still... if they did manipulate a tape of that proceedings, it would still allow for the prosecution to take place at a later point."

Nekritz: "I believe so, yes."

Durkin: "Okay. All right. We've had a very, very spirited debate a few months ago on this. A number of us had concerns, at least I had a concern, about that very situation at this scenario which may come up where there is going to be the manipulation of the tape. At some point this statute is going to be ruled unconstitutional. The Circuit Courts of Illinois have already stated what their thoughts are on this and the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals will issue a final ruling very soon on this. My recommendation is that we vote for this Bill. I think the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Representative's done a good job of addressing the concerns that we had to protect law enforcement officers in those limited situations. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Scott Penny."

Penny: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Chief."

Penny: "I've been involved in law enforcement for over 35 years and I hate to take a position different from my associates in the police profession, but I would like to say that we are all in a society now days that has changed. We, as police officers, are sometimes slow to embrace change, but everywhere I go we're videotaping with our telephones and electronic devices. We presume that citizens step on to the street and give up their expectation for privacy in public places. Police officers are recording everything for use in in-dash camera videos all the way down to being used on television reality shows. I think that this is a well-designed Bill. It protects police officers from malicious tape recording. I would urge the people here to vote in support of the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how is this Bill different than it was the last time that it... when it failed with a 45-59 vote?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, you know, two things have changed. One is that the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals has now been the third Illinois court to indicate that our

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

existing law is unconstitutional in exactly the circumstances covered under this legislation, so that's one. And the second is we added an Amendment that, if a recorded conversation is used as evidence of misconduct against an officer and is found to have been intentionally altered, then that must be presented to an appropriate state's attorney for determination of prosecution. It's my understanding that that prosecution can be either under a misdemeanor or a felony charge."

- Reboletti: "Does that deal with a third party that may take that and then alter it and put it on YouTube or post it on some other social media site?"
- Nekritz: "I... I don't believe it does, Representative, because it has to be the situation that's addressed in the Amendment is if it's used as evidence of misconduct. So, I don't think that YouTube would be considered evidence of misconduct."
- Reboletti: "With respect to the Federal Court case, would it be fair to say that with strict construction that only would apply to Cook County?"
- Nekritz: "I believe it would apply to the Seventh... is that... if that's the confines of the Seventh Circuit, then I would say yes. But I... I thought the Seventh Circuit actually covered several states."
- Reboletti: "Would you be willing to amend the Bill to carve out some exceptions where maybe only uniformed police officers could be audio recorded?"
- Nekritz: "You know, Representative, we took a look at that and we, you know, unfortunately determined that, you know, that

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

there's plenty of times where I think that would create some confusion and there are, in fact, instances out there where a uni... a ununiformed officer did not identify themselves until later on in the conversation as being a police officer and circumstances like that. So, it seemed to create more confusion than simply leaving the Bill the way it was."

Reboletti: "The other concern I have, Representative, is when police go out on to a scene after a shooting or after some type of violent crime and they're trying to talk to victims or eyewitnesses. Do you think this might be disruptive to that investigita... investigative process."

Nekritz: "I don't, Representative, and here's why. The existing law permits video recording, so someone can... someone has that ability now to video record as much as they want and so they can video record that conversation as much as they could audio record it. A police o... this... this Bill does not create any new rights. It simply decriminalizes behavior that we... that citizens engage in every day. So, the fact that it doesn't create a new right, which I think clearly give police officers the ability to say I'm conducting an investigation, you have to stand over there while I'm doing it, and you cannot interfere with this investigation and if you do, I can charge you with disorderly conduct."

Reboletti: "Representative, do you support one party consent?

And this is really what the issue is, is that most other states and the Federal Government have one party consent and that would alleviate the concern that way any

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

individual could record any other individual at any other time without their permission."

- Nekritz: "Um, Representative, I personally would prefer not to see the State of Illinois move in that directions, but again, we have courts all over the State of Illinois telling us that our existing law is unconstitutional. This is narrowly crafted to address the concerns raised in those courts."
- Reboletti: "The one... one other issue that this Bill does not address, is its... fair to say that it's still a Class 4 Felony for a parent to record and audio their child at a soccer game."
- Nekritz: "I believe under our… under our existing law that that's probably correct, but again, that… we don't have prosecutions happening under… in circumstances like that.

 We do have prosecutions occurring in the circumstances addressed in this Bill."

Reboletti: "And I... I"

- Nekritz: "Which is why the Circuit Courts have said... or why the courts have said that you need to change this."
- Reboletti: "And I... and I appreciate that fact. I don't know if I... I don't believe I would have prosecuted that case, but I wasn't the person in charge of that."

Nekritz: "I would hope not, Representative."

Reboletti: "But I know they have discretion, but I'm just concerned that we haven't taken all the law enforcement's consideration... points into some type of consideration here. I understand that we have to do something here. And I realize where the Circuit Courts are at and where the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Federal Court is at and that we need to make some changes. I would be more than likely to support the legislation if we had some type of carve outs and I don't see those here, Representative, so thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapin Rose."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support of the Lady's legislation. Like the Chief, who spoke a minute ago, I also come from a law enforcement background as a prosecutor. It is extremely hard to defend on many bases the current state of Illinois law. The court cases that have struck it down have been mentioned, they are numerous. But what it comes down to this, if you, as a society, want to have a criminal law, they should be bright-line rules where any citizen can easily understand them and know whether they're on the right or on the wrong side. When you tell citizens of Illinois... you ask them a question... ask a hundred people a question. Do you think it's a felony offense to take out your cell phone and click the video button and it happens to audio record somebody in the performance of their duties? Ask a hundred people if they think that's a felony offense. I bet you not one of them would agree. Now, the reality is, it... this time has come. I don't think there's many people up there... there's a few who might be more pro law enforcement than... than me, but you can't have a rule that says that people can't pull out their cell phone camera and from a safe distance audio record. It just doesn't make sense. It doesn't compute with the average Joe, the average Jane. We've seen now a proliferation of these cases. In fact five years ago, I put

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

in the first Bill on this topic and couldn't get interest out of really anybody at the time other than the Sponsor across the aisle right now and I thank her for that... for her support back then. And back then not everyone had the cell phone video camera. But here's one. I remember talking to a sheriff who had someone inside of a car in a routine speeding ticket, had been pulled over, and the citizen went to get their camera out to record the stop. The sheriff didn't know what was going on so he pulls his side arm and thankfully nobody got hurt. We have to have a bright-line rule where everyone knows what's going to happen and I don't think anyone... any citizen in the State of Illinois would expect this to be a felony offense which is what it currently is, a. I also believe, as the Lady said, that it's unconstitutional and that has come to fruition to the courts and c) my favorite book happens to be 1984 by George Orwell and we don't need any more of this stuff. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "We have two remaining speakers and then Representative Nekritz to close. Representative Carli and Representative Zalewski. Representative Carli, you're recognized."

Carli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in strong opposition to this Bill. I think it's a liability and a safety issue. I could video record you from here to the balcony perfectly fine, but in order for me to get that audio I have to cl... come into close proximity in order to hear what is being said. I think that's a danger to the officer. I think that a danger to who she's trying to video

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

tape it. I don't think... there should be limitations on how close they get. Close prox... or a safe distance. What is safe distance? Do we know? No. Because you have to come in close to get that audio. Who's going to determine that distance. The Representative also spoke of, you know, he went to pull out his camera phone to record, the officer drawed his weapon. That's another problem that's going to happen. Not of all stops are in daylight on streets with lighting. They're in allies, dark, you don't know what he's pulling out. I think it's a safety issue to anybody who wants to try to record that... that audio. It's... it's definitely... they're coming into close proximity to that situation. It's usually a noisy situation, dark situation. I don't agree with this Bill. I stand in strong opposition. It all comes down to video from a distance is fine. You can pick up that video. In order to get that audio, you have to come in close proximity. It's endangering everybody in that situation. I strongly suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski and then Representative Nekritz to close. Mike Zalewski."

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

Zalewski: "Representative, two questions that I don't know if the Gentleman from Elmhurst touched on these, but I want to make sure the record's clear. There's a concern that your Bill extends out farther than what the Seventh Circuit allow by allowing for circuitous recordings of officers as opposed to open recordings of officers. Can you address that concern?"

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate... very much appreciate the debate today and the..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no, no."

Nekritz: "...discussion on this Bill, previously."

Zalewski: "Elaine, I had a question."

Nekritz: "I think as we, you know, many of us want..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz, I think that was a question."

Nekritz: "Oh. I'm sorry. You had a question."

Speaker Lyons: "I'm sorry, Elaine, yeah."

Nekritz: "All right, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "Mike, why don't you repeat it."

Nekritz: "I was distracted."

Zalewski: "Nice try, Representative. There's con...

Representative, there's a..."

Nekritz: "Did you have an important question?"

Zalewski: "There's a concern that, I don't know if the Gentleman from Elmhurst touched on, that your Bill extends out farther than what the Seventh Circuit touched on which that your Bill allows circuitous recordings of officers whereas the Seventh Circuit only dealt with open recordings of officers. I was just wondering if you could touch on that concern."

Nekritz: "Well, I... I didn't realize... I was not aware, Representative, that the... that the Seventh Circuit had said it had to be open... that it was limited to open recording. I've not... I don't remember reading that and I don't remember anyone else indicating that. It was our sense that the... and the lawyers who actually were involved in that

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

were... felt that our Bill specifically addressed the situation raised in the Seventh Circuit case."

Zalewski: "Okay. Did... The second question I had was that your Bill may con... contradict federal wiretapping laws with regard to saying that in order to record a conversation under federal eavesdropping laws one party has to be aware that they're a part of the conversation and that it's being recorded, similar to what the previous speaker said about one party consent. I just want to know if you can touch on whether there's a concern by... by yourself that what we're proposing today is contravening Federal Law."

Nekritz: "And Representative, I... I, you know, again, I don't pretend to be an expert on federal wiretapping laws, but it would seem to me that one party consent simply means that one party knows they're recording. So the person holding the recording device knows that they're recording. Under Federal Law and under... and under other State Laws that is... that is sufficient. That is the one party consent that the one party knows that they're recording, so I don't know why this would certainly be the case and... and... in the situation in this Bill, we also have, I believe, it's, you know, this would be exception 'Q' to the eavesdropping law, so I would assume that exceptions 'A' through, you know, whatever is before 'Q', would also have implications for federal wire tapping law if that were a problem."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I really wish that we would rewrite the eavesdropping statute in its entirety because we did a Bill before the break that offered law enforcement some assistance and that may have

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

been opposed by some of the groups that are concerned about overreaching prosecutorial laws and now we're doing a Bill after the break that deals with some concerns that law enforcement has about a... recording officers. That being said, I think that when a Federal Court asks us to act and says that a Bill... a statute that we have before our power to change, that we should change it. It's our duty to change the Bill and that's why I... I stand in support of the Bill today. I... I know that the Sponsor has the best of intentions; I'll continue to work with her on this. I think down the road we should reconsider the whole Bill and the whole statute... or the whole statute in its entirety, but for the time being, given the circumstances that is before the Body, I think an 'aye' vote is the appropriate vote in this instance. And I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Thank you. As... as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the previous speaker, this is... this is a Bill whose time has come. As we all... I think many of us watched the, you know, the goings on in downtown Chicago over the weekend with the NATO summit and you could see the crowds, the police lines, and you could see kids and people with their cell phones held up recording what was going on. And I would agree with some of the previous speakers that to... to... that no one would think that that's really a felony. It's time we modernize our laws, make it consistent with, you know, what people expect from society today. I'd urge your 'aye' vote."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "After a thorough discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1808 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? Connelly, Crespo, Farnham, Lang. Leader Lang. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 71 Members voting 'yes', 45 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rich Brauer, on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 2494. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2494, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman from Menard, Representative Rich Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gold Star plate that we have in the state today is for a... a father or mother of a service person that has given the ultimate sacrifice for their country and this Bill just basically allows other family members to have that plate. Instead of one, it will be multiple Gold Star plates per person that died in the line of duty. I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield? Did I..."

 Speaker Lyons: "Spon... sp..."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- Davis, W.: "...did I hear you correctly, Representative, that this Bill will allow members of that individual's family to have the special plate."
- Brauer: "Right now there's just one special plate per service person that died in the line of duty. This will allow more than one. So, it would be a mother, father, or sibling."
- Davis, W.: "Of the individual that died in the line of duty."

Brauer: "Yes."

- Davis, W.: "How many additional plates then?"
- Brauer: "Well, that would depend on how many siblings they have."
- Davis, W.: "So, the parents and siblings of that individual will be allowed to display this particular plate."
- Brauer: "They... they would be allowed to apply for the Gold Star plate, yes."
- Davis, W.: "To apply for the Gold Star plate."
- Brauer: "It would not be the same plate. It would be a different plate, but it would still have that Gold Star insignia."
- Davis, W.: "So, what about the… I guess… I guess… I'm going to assume that the spouse, if there is one, of that individual will be able to apply as well."

Brauer: "Yes."

- Davis, W.: "But their additional family members will have that opportunity also."
- Brauer: "Yes. And it's limited to immediate family. It's not extended family; it's just that immediate family."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Does that include step? Chi... not children or brothers, you know..."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Brauer: "It's just..."

Davis, W.: "I mean, when you say immediate family, you know, that definition's probably a little skewed. I'm just asking."

Brauer: "Well, and... and that's the way it's listed in the legislation."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brauer moves for the passage of Senate Bill 2494. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the... All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Durkin, David Leitch. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Turning to page 6 of the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, page 6 of the Calendar. Michelle Mussman, under Concurrences, Michelle, you have Senate Bill 2545. Read the Bill... On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, I'm sorry. Third Readings. Michelle Mussman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2545, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the committee. Senate Bill 2545 is essentially identical to the Internet Dating Safety Act that passed out of this committee recently. Pardon. Oh sorry, thank you. It passed out of the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

- House. The Amendment is the agreed upon language that represents the satisfaction that removes all opposition from the parties involved. I'm happy to answer questions and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2545 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? Monique Davis, Representative Dwight Kay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Connie Howard, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 2559. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2559, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Connie Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues, Senate Bill 2559 accomplishes two things. One, it designates 14 days as the time period by which treatment providers must transport to a county jail facility prisoners who have initially been deemed to be mentally incompetent and are now considered to be fit to stand trial. The goal of the reduction of the amount of time that the defendant is in need of the services for... from the Department of Mental Health is what we're talking about here. It also requires that the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Illinois Sheriffs' Association and the Illinois Department of Human Services issue reports to the… let's see, to issues reports to the Governor regarding the efficiency of transferring criminal defendants from these mental health facilities to the courts for a fitness hearing. I ask for 'ave' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what were the objections from the Illinois Sheriffs' Association? I know that they testified twice in front of our committee. I know that they had... it was soft opposition but opposition nonetheless. Do you recall what that was?"

Howard: "As I recall, it had to do with financial reasons. Just as we're trying to, on the state level, deal with economics they are as well. So that the Department of Human Services is saying that they would like this to happen because it will save money for the state."

Reboletti: "And how would it save money for the state? Because they would be out of our facilities then..."

Howard: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...in less time."

Howard: "Yes. At this time, it's costing the state significant amounts of money to be able to keep these individuals in beds that have been designated for these types of patients. If they were not in these beds, we could then provide the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

services that are necessary to those prisoners who need the services more. So, we would like to be able to have these individuals who are no longer considered to be mentally incompetent to be transferred in a much more timely fashion."

Reboletti: "Will this pilot program or pilot study... will this also review the cost upon the county sheriffs and provide recommendations to the Governor's Office."

Howard: "I think that that is the case. Yes, in fact, I'm being told that it is the case that, in fact, that this report would include that kind of information."

Reboletti: "And when is the final report supposed to be submitted to the Governor's Office and the General Assembly?"

Howard: "Prior to January 1, 2014."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Howard, we discussed this at length in committee. Would you be kind enough to enlighten the Body a little more as to who was involved in the pilot study and specifically what it will entail?"

Howard: "The... the three entities, I'm understanding, would be the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, the Department of Human Services, and the Governor's Office. And they're going to look at this whole matter of why the department believes

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

that it is necessary to make these transfers in a much more timely manner."

Sacia: "So, it... it's fair to say then it's not like taking two or three counties as test counties. It's more sitting down the Sheriffs' Association, Department of Human Services, the Governor's Office, some Members of the General Assembly and attempting to come up with a... with a logical concurrence. Would that be a fair statement?"

Howard: "The... the report would talk about admissions, cost, and all those things that are necessary for this kind of program to exist."

Sacia: "So the bottom line is this... this program may never come to full fruition if the study determines that it really doesn't make sense."

Howard: "Yes. That would be a good conclusion to draw."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader David Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much. I strongly support the underlying Bill as well as the Amendment of this measure. For many, many, many years, until quite recently, the sheriffs were required to transport mentally ill patients. I think it's very unfortunate that they are not required to do so these days as well, and especially since we have such a challenge getting money into the budgets for Human Services to make these critical... critical transportation services available.

So, I would strongly support the Lady's Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Connie Howard to close."

Howard: "Yes. I think that I have been clear as to why this is necessary and I appreciate 'aye' votes."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2559 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? Skip, Michael McAuliffe, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Karen May, on page 6 of the Calendar, Karen, you have Senate Bill 2885. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2885, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Karen May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2885 amends the Health Care Purchasing Group Act dealing only with purchasing co-ops. Amends it in a couple ways to help the small businesses and all businesses in our state provide affordable health care coverage for their employees; specifically, it changes from 500 up to 2500 employees. It is supported by many... many business interests... Excuse me. It's supported by the Illinois Chamber, the Chicagoland Chamber, NFIB, the Academy of Family Physicians, and HUMANA. All insurance groups are either in favor or neutral on the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady awaits your questions, Sir."

Reboletti: "Representative May, this would allow businesses to come together to add for their purchasing power in numbers to save money for their businesses."

May: "Yes. Only purchasing co-ops."

Reboletti: "This has nothing to do with Obamacare."

May: "It has nothing to do with the Affordable Care Act."

Reboletti: "I'm sorry. That's correct; it is the Affordable Care Act."

May: "Thank you so much for recognizing that."

Reboletti: "When would this be implemented? Is this... is this a January 1 of '13?"

May: "Oh... Let me check. You know what, I don't see it right here. If you could hold, we're checking..."

Reboletti: "Sure."

May: "...on that. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Who's waiting to answer the question. Dennis, did you ask it or..."

Reboletti: "I asked a..."

Speaker Lyons: "...are we waiting for the re..."

May: "We're waiting for information. The original Bill was effective immediately. That's my... I believe it's effective immediately."

Reboletti: "If the Affordable Care Act is sustained by the U.S. Supreme Court, how would... how would this Bill be impacted or would it be impacted?"

May: "It really will not be affected. You may remember there were some other Bills that I have worked on in a pooling of business insurance or a Bill that was very favorably passed

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

in other years to get money, but we found out by working closely with the Federal Government by making a slight change in our current State Law we can help the businesses in this state and not linking it to any Federal Law."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May to close."

May: "Yes, thank you. This will help the businesses and the employees of the businesses in our state get affordable health insurance. It's a Bill and an idea that is very important for us to help our businesses. Again, the insurance community is neutral or supportive of the Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2885 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Nekritz, I see you're busy in the back of the chamber, Elaine, but you have Senate Bill 2950 on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Readings. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz." Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2950 mirrors an

agreement that has been put into place with the... by the chemical companies with regard to phasing out bisphenol A,

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

BPA, in products for toddlers and it is... it al... and in response to some of the concerns that were raised in committee because the Bill does prohibit wholesalers and... and retailers from selling these products, there was a concern raised in committee that how would a retailer know whether or not their... that these chemicals are in a product so we added a knowing standard to... to that prohibition and... So, again, I think this... this... there's been a lot of work done across the country and federally to... to get these chemicals out of these products. This is reflective of the status of the... no chemical manufacturers are including these products in the... including the chemicals in these products anyway and so we'd just like for the Illinois law to mirror the existing situation."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion. The Chair recognizes Representative Dave Winters."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Winters: "I had a hard time understanding your... or hearing your voice on this, but if you could reiterate, this does not allow for the sale of children's food and beverage containers that contain BPA..."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Winters: "...is that not the current status that the industry has withdrawn those products already from the market."

Nekritz: "Industry has."

Winters: "So, this really has no affect. They are not manufacturing anymore, have no intent to manufacture

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

anymore. What exactly does this... would this Bill effect in Illinois if... it seems like you're addressing a nonexistent problem."

- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, you know, this is something that's been under consideration in a lot of states and nationally and so while it wouldn't affect industry in any sort of negative way, it gives consumers comfort that these products will not come back."
- Winters: "Well, you did mention and nationally there's a movement in this direction, but could you tell us what the U.S. EPA's approach to BPA is. What did they find in their... in their best scientific knowledge? My understanding is that they found no danger that BPA was a health problem."
- Nekritz: "Representative, I don't have those documents in front of me right now, but my recollection is that while they... at the levels at which they were able to test currently, they did not find a problem. They did acknowledge that at lower doses, which is what happens when these chemicals leach out of these types of plastics, at those lower doses they still felt they needed to do more testing."
- Winters: "They felt they needed to do more testing, but they did not find a problem. In fact, I have very fortunately for me anyway, I found an article the FDA affirms bisphenol A is safe in food packaging. That's the headline. 'The Food and Drug Administration assessment is that the scientific evidence at this time does not suggest that the very low levels of human exposure to BPA through the diet are unsafe.' That was March 30 of this spring..."

Nekritz: "But it..."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Winters: "...from the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. I think this is a Bill that is trying to address a problem that is nonexistent. Not only is there no scientific evidence it is a problem, but there is no market. Nobody is building... or is manufacturing these products. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Fortner."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, as I understand this Bill, it is really primarily seen as a measure to carry us over in the period between now and when we anticipate the Federal Government will be acting. That was what I recall. And there's language in the Bill to make sure that should that happen this would then sunset upon action by the Federal Government. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "No. I don't think that's quite accurate. The industry has already phased this out, so I don't believe that the Federal Government is intending on taking further action on this. There is a repealer in here if the FDA prohibits... prohibits them, but I don't think that... I don't think it's intended to be a bridge."

Fortner: "Right. There is... there is repeal language in here..."

Nekritz: "Right."

Fortner: "...so that... because as I understood it this is still being reviewed by the Federal Government. Some people anticipate there may be a for... more formal statement coming..."

Nekritz: "Right."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Fortner: "...and then should that happen and should the most likely circumstance be for the Federal Government to recognize what the industry has already largely voluntarily done..."

Nekritz: "Yes."

Fortner: "...then that would... we would no longer need this Bill so that's why there's a sunset. I guess that's why perhaps I characterized that as perhaps providing a bridge."

Nekritz: "Okay. I guess when you put it that way I wouldn't argue that."

Fortner: "Okay. And... Speaker, to the Bill. I don't disagree with some of the comments from the previous questioner that there are aspects of the science that certainly I would like to see better fleshed out, but in this particular limited set of products, industry has already taken action on their own dealing with normal market pressures to deal with this. In some ways this simply recognizes what's already going on in the workplace and I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady awaits your questions, Sir."

Reboletti: "Representative, are there any... does the industry still use BPA anywhere in the United States to make these bottles?"

Nekritz: "It's my understanding that they do not for the kinds of products that are defined in the Bill."

Reboletti: "Then I'm just trying to figure out why this is necessary if nobody else is making it anymore. Is there... is

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

it coming in from China or and that's where you're looking to ban then?"

Nekritz: "Representative, I think this is just simply to... to make sure that it doesn't happen in Illinois."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2950 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? Acevedo, Dugan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 88 Members voting 'yes', 30 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared pass. Representative Williams, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Williams: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

Williams: "We just brought up the NATO Summit and I just wanted to take a moment to commend the men and women of the Chicago Police Department, the Illinois State Police, and other law enforcement..."

Speaker Lyons: "Wait a minute, Ann. Shhhh... I think... Let's give a little more attention on the House Floor for this. This is a very worthy announcement. Please proceed, Ann."

Williams: "I just wanted to take a moment to commend the men and women of the Chicago Police Department, Illinois State Police, and law enforcement throughout Illinois as well as our superintendent... Superintendent McCarthy for the job

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

they did at this weekend's NATO Summit. I, like many of you, watched the live coverage and it was pretty unbelievable what they went through and I know now that I could never be a police officer, but that's their job to serve and protect us. And I just wanted to, once again, say publically how appreciative I was as a citizen of Illinois for the professionalism they showed under an extreme high-pressure situation. So, thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jerry Mitchell, what purpose do you seek recognition, Jerry?"
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, up above me in the gallery on the Republican side of the aisle is a great group of individuals from Sterling-Rock Falls area. They've been in my district for 18 years and I've been proud to serve as their State Representative. It's the folks from the Northern Illinois Center for Independent Living. We call affectionately NICIL. They're a great group. They're here with their association President Kathy Fischer. They're down here on a legislative training day. Please give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Cap... Capitol, proud to have you here for the day, enjoy. Leader Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to add on to what Representative Williams had said. You know, folks, a lot of times the police department is taken for granted. A lot of times when they do anything wrong, they're on the front page, but when they do something right to help the community it's always in the middle of the page or the back of the pag... paper. So, you know, the only thing that they

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

have on the front page is when a policeman had to use a little force. Myself, being a police officer was very, very impressed the way they handled themself, professionalism that... that they handled themselves. know, sometimes, like I said, we're taken for granted as police officers protecting the streets and I think the media has done nothing but make the Chicago Police Department like we're all a bunch of corrupt policemen and women, and I think that's totally false and I think that the professionalism that they handle themselves with during the NATO Summit just goes to prove what a fine, fine group of brave men and women we have on the Chicago Police Department and also the Chicago Fire Department. I'd also like to mention that Dena's husband, Representative Carli, was on the front lines during the NATO Summit as well, but thank you to the Chicago Police Department and the Chicago Fire Department."

Speaker Lyons: "On page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Chapin Rose, you have Senate Bill 2999. Out of the record. Representative Will Davis, for the purpose of an announcement."

Davis W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, very briefly.

Tomorrow the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus will host its annual End of Session event. Whether the end of Session is the 31 or sometime into the summer, we don't know. We don't know, but we're going to have our annual event tomorrow at our foundation office which is the Black Caucus House as we call it at 614 S. College. Which is just south of... south of the Capitol right here literally on the corner

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

there across from the Automobile Dealers Association. And then secondly, tonight, if you are not busy, I would like to invite you out to an event where we are celebrating the life and legacy of Alexander Lane who in 1876 became the first African-American male to enroll at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He used that opportunity to rise from slavery and pre-Civil War Mississippi to become an educator, a physician, and a State Legislator from Chicago. Come hear his amazing story and learn how we will honor his legacy through a new opportunity for SIU students. The host committee includes from this chamber: Representative Dan Brady, John Cavaletto, Jerry Costello, Will Davis, Paul Evans, Chad Hays, Jil Tracy, and Art Turner. The event is tonight with a reception beginning at 5:30 and program at 6:30 at the SIU School of Medicine. The Pearson Museum which is located at 801 N. Rutledge in Springfield. We hope to see you there this evening and look forward to seeing you tomorrow. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Will. Mr. Clerk, on page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Cassidy has Senate Bill 3261 on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status on that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3261, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cassidy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cassidy. We'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative DeLuca, on the

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Order of Senate Bills-Second Readings, you have Senate Bill 3318. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca on the Bill."

DeLuca: "Yes. Before moving it to Third, there was a commitment that I made in committee that I would hold it on Second Reading until an issue, which was being worked on, regarding the farmstead split was worked out. I distributed a letter to all the Members of the committee last week showing that the issue has been resolved, so I'm prepared to move it to Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative... Representative du Buclet on the Motion. Seeing no objection, all those in favor... Mr. Clerk, move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading. Hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Representative du Buclet, did you have a..."

du Buclet: "Point of pers..."

Speaker Lyons: "...purpose of an announcement?"

du Buclet: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed."

du Buclet: "I'd like to recognize a group of school children that are visiting from Chicago Skinner School. They're up in the gallery. Welcome them... welcome them to Springfield."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, enjoy the day.

Representative Jakobsson, you have House Resolution 777.

Representative Jakobsson."

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 777 congratulates the University of Illinois women's volleyball team on its very impressive season. The team advanced to the NCAA national semifinals for the first time in 23 years and reached the NCAA National Championship match for the first time in school history. Illinois finished the year with a 32-5 record and finished second in the Big Ten with a 16-4 mark and then, in addition, it earned the number 3 seed for the NCAA tournament. And for people who had followed this or maybe didn't follow, an S... ESPN audience witnessed one of the epic points in the history of the sport. It came at match point of the national semifinal between Illinois and USC, 55 touches, 18 over the net volleys and 68 seconds of electronic... of electric play. The Illini completed a five-set win over the nation's top ranked team and earned a spot in the National Championship match. The first weekend at number 1, a sellout crowd of 4,261 saw a battle of the last two unbeaten teams in Illinois and Purdue. For the first time ever, Illinois swept the season series winning matches at home and on the road. With us today we have our volleyball coach, the head coach Kevin Hambly. And with him also, today... and they're standing... I hope they're standing in back of me... assistant volleyball coach Jen Flynn and assistant volleyball coach David Kniffin. Let's give them a big round of applause."

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, U of I volleyball. We're proud of you as we always are and Representative Jakobsson and Representative Rose move for the adoption of... of House Resolution 777. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 777 is unanimously adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1070, offered by Representative Bill... Bill Mitchell."

Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor... 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. And now, seeing no further come the to before Illinois Representatives, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourn 'til the hour of 11 a.m. on Wednesday, May 23. All those in favor of adjournment signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourn to the hour of 11 a.m. on Wednesday, May 23. Have an enjoyable evening, everyone."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3397; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2840, Senate Bill 3514; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1531. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 4193, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 4202, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 4239, offered Government. House Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning House Bill 4246, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 4251, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4264, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 4276, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4277, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4278, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 4328, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4329, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4330, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4331, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4332, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 4741, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 5457, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 5657, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 5926, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning workers' compensation. These Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

281, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 538, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 548, offered Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 555, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 968, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1351, offered by Representative Greg Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2194, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 2537, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, which may be referred to as Caylee's law. Senate Bill 2561, offered by Representative McAsey... Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 2706, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 2822, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Senate Bill 2837, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Senate Bill 2840, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 2867, offered by Representative Winters, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3216, offered by Representative safety. Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3259, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3277,

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3338, offered by an Act concerning Representative Currie, a Bill for elections. Senate Bill 3373, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3397, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3415, offered by Representative William Davis, a Bill for concerning education. Senate Bill 3433, offered Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3442, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3458, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3514, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3572, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3597, offered by Representative Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Represent... Senate Bill 3626, offered by Representative Carli, a Bill for an Act in relation to civil law. Senate Bill 3669, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 3722, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 3743, offered by Representative Gordon, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 3780, offered... offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3794, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government.

140th Legislative Day

5/22/2012

Senate Bill 3810, offered by Representative Lyons, a Bill for an Act concerning rent assignments. Senate Bill 3823, offered by Representative Howard, a Bill for an Act concerning child visitation, which may be referred to as the Steven Watkins Memorial Act. These Senate Bills will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."