51st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 62, Floor Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1430. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and guests to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Stephen Swanson, who is with the St. Paul Lutheran Church in Villa Park, Illinois. Reverend Swanson is the guest of Representative Conroy."
- Reverend Swanson: "It was a beautiful spring day. I put the top down on this old convertible my wife and I were driving. It's a nice road between Cairo and Metropolis. We were driving along, the hill goes down a bit and there's a bridge over a river. I had to come to a stop because there was a skunk that got his head into a chocolate can and now was running back and forth, this side of the bridge and that side of the bridge. I had to make a decision. We could have accelerated and hoped not to hit the skunk. We could have turned around and back-tracked or I could have gotten out of the car and gone up and tried to take that chocolate can off of the skunk's head. At the risk of being misunderstood, let us pray. Oh God, You have elected these

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

men and women to a very holy calling, to write laws that resist evil and to provide order for the common good for all the people of this state. May God bless each and every one of them with wisdom and courage to carry out their high calling, providing laws that recover sight to the blind, that bring liberty to the oppressed, good news to the poor, even at the risk of being misunderstood, Amen."

- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Conroy."
- Conroy 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 Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Dan Burke."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present and ready to do the work of the people, even maybe if we are misunderstood."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 117 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1637, Senate Bill 1831, Senate Bill 2362. Representative Monique

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2339. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1458; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 2350. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2136. Representative McAsey, Chairperson from the Committee on Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 850, Senate Bill 1704, Senate Bill 1925. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1667; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1829. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on May 07, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1826, Senate Bill 1869; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1908. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Bill 1931, is Senate Senate Bill 2178. Debate Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1226,

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Senate Bill 2314, Senate Bill 2353. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1005, Senate Bill 1044, Senate Bill 1399, Senate Bill 1565, Senate Bill 1598, Senate Bill 1606, Senate Bill 1768, Senate Bill 1843, Senate Bill 1844, Senate Bill 1851, Senate Bill 1852, Senate Bill Senate Bill 2186, Senate Bill 2231, Senate Bill 2304, Senate Bill 2306; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1210; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1599, Senate Bill 1609, Senate Bill 1842, Senate Bill 1862, Senate Bill 1923, Senate Bill 2270. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1216, Senate Bill 1310, Senate Bill 1479, Senate Bill Senate Bill 1757, Senate Bill 1764, Senate Bill 1849, Senate Bill 2356; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1817, Senate Bill 1828, Senate Bill 1929, Senate Bill 1940. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 70, Senate Bill 722, Senate Bill 723, Senate Bill 923, Senate Bill 1431, Senate Bill 1475, Senate Bill 1738; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1930, Senate Bill 2233; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 275, House Resolution 281 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1493. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

committee action taken on May 08, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1217, Senate Bill 1229, Senate Bill 1876, Senate Bill 2218; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1194. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 317, offered by Representative Turner and House Resolution 318, offered by Representative Willis are referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hays."

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Hays: "I would ask the Body to welcome, at the back of the chamber along the wall and along the wall to my left, the wonderful young men who came to Vermilion County from across this nation to attend de La Salette Academy. Please give a warm Springfield welcome to Father McMahon and the gentlemen from de La Salette Academy. Welcome."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Tryon, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Tryon: "Today, in the Comptroller's Office, the Diabetes Caucus is hosting a luncheon and that's on the second floor. In addition to that, you can get blood pressure and blood glucose testing on the first floor outside of 114 and they also have sandwiches there. So, I hope you'll join us for lunch. And then tonight at 4 at the American Diabetes Association's new offices, we're having a ribbon cutting and there'll be hors d'oeuvres and... and beverages tonight

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

there. And that's at 4:00 and we hope you can make it. There'll be members from your community, from your area, and the Comptroller's Office that have come down to meet Legislators and talk to them about issues relating to diabetes. So, hope you make it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Willis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Willis: "I'd like to recognize the members of AFFI, our firefighters that are here on their lobby day today, if you guys will stand up. They are here to talk to us, and these are the men that are the men on the frontlines... men and women. So, I want to thank them for being here."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Brauer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Brauer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, up here on my right is Mrs. Radtke and Mrs. Jones third-grade class. They had a goal to raise money for the Mt. Pulaski Courthouse where Abraham Lincoln once practiced law. Their goal was to raise about \$200 for maintenance. In the end, they've raised over three... I'm sorry... \$13 thousand for maintenance of the courthouse. Please help me recognize the third-grade class from Mt. Pulaski."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Monique Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Davis, M.: "I rise for a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Davis, M.: "On my left, up in one of the orange shirts, are two great firefighters from Alsip, Illinois, Reka Bodoni and Bill Patterson. Give them a warm welcome, please. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Moffitt, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Moffitt: "Along the same line here on firefighters, first I'd like to make sure every... remind everybody the Associated Firefighters have a reception tonight, 6:30 to 8:30, at the Abraham Lincoln Presidential Museum. I hope you'll stop by there and talk to them. Second, tomorrow morning at 10:00 will be the Fallen Firefighter Memorial out here by the fire... Fallen Firefighter Memorial statue. Hope you'll join with that if... then award ceremony, Medal of Honor, over at the Prairie Capital Convention Center, take time for that. And then today, at 1:00, the firefighters are going... near the memorial are going to present... be presenting a car to Wounded Warrior, a program of theirs. So, I hope you can be there at 1:00 today out by the memorial. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Sims, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Sims: "On a per... point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Sims: "On the Democratic side in the gallery, I have members of Alpha Phi Alpha with me. Today, they're here in Springfield represent... representing the state's chapters throughout the State of Illinois, but also chapters throughout the Midwestern region, of which I have the pleasure of serving as vice president. I'd like for them to stand and be recognized."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if the Members could take their chairs, if the staff could retire to the rear of the chamber. We have a very distinguished guest today. Members in your seats, staff to the rear of the chamber. We're very privileged to have with us today a distinguished representative of the government of Japan. Consul General Yoshida is currently assigned to the Midwest Region headquartered in the City of Chicago. Previously, he enjoyed four postings in China over a period of nine years and he has been in Chicago for approximately three months. He comes to the House today with remarks and greetings from the government of Japan. And he will speak to the economic relationship between his country and the State of Illinois. It's my pleasure to give you Consul General Yoshida."

Consul General Yoshida: "Thank you very much. Speaker Madigan, distinguished gue... Members of the Illinois House and Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to stand before you today. And I wish to thank Speaker Madigan and distinguished Members of the Illinois House for this great opportunity. Japan and Illinois have long joined together in many ways for sunny days and a cloudy day. Just over two years ago, the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

struck Japan. We'll never forget those who lost their lives. We stand by the survivors as they now rebuild their lives. Immediately after that tragic thing and many people and all the relations across this state contributed huge funds. Illinois volunteered to Tohoku in battered areas to help. Governor Quinn legislated an Illinois initiative that provided 2 thousand personal radiation detectors, which were a tremendous help to those people in affected areas by the accident of the nuclear power plant. Your outpouring of support was spontaneous and there from the heart. We thank you deeply. We'll always remember your friendship. With your support and our efforts in Japan, I think Japan is back. We're ready to do more business. We're eager welcome more Illinois tourists. And our Illinois must generally, as Mr. Speaker introduced. Everywhere I go I've met people who are engaged with Japan. At your schools and universities, about 5 thousand Illinois students are now learning Japanese. In the last few years, the Japanese Government has brought more than 120 recent Illinois college graduates to Japan to teach English. Through them, we become even closer. Those who come together through business, our two economies need each other. We share the same key sectors such as more of equals, pharmaceuticals, electronics and rail train station. Across this state in cities, large and small, nearly 600 Japanese companies provide more than 38 thousand valid jobs for the people in Illinois. The largest employers are pharmaceutical makers, Astellas and Tacara, as well as Mitsubishi Motors, LT and Boa Ricoh and Komatsu, America.

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

In Japan, Illinois companies such as Boeing, Caterpillar, McDonald's and the United Airlines are household names. We buy your airplanes. We eat your Big Mac. Our companies have a spirited, friendly competition and they cooperate closely and we both benefit. Japanese companies are committed to this state. Last week, Nippon Sharyo, the passenger rail car maker, programmed for its second production plant in Rochelle. Its rail cars move thousands of people every day to and from Chicago and soon across the state. By moving people, it helps move the Illinois economy forward. The outlook for business partnership is bright. Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's new economic measures called Abenomics are already strengthening Japan's economy, which will also benefit Illinois business, I'm sure. The Transpacific Partnership, the free trade agreement, now being negotiated by 11 countries will boost trade. It will pave the way for Illinois companies to do even more business with Japan and all these lines, I think Japan and Illinois share something very special. We're the closest of partners and friends, yesterday, today and tomorrow. Last year, 10 Japanese cherry trees were planted at the Governor's Executive Mansion and soon 5 more will be planted. They commemorate the 100th anniversary of Japan's gift of cherry trees to Washington, D.C. Here in Springfield, the trees stand as a lasting symbol of our Japan-Illinois friendship. Each spring, everyone can delight in their spectacular blossoms. Ladies and Gentlemen, our already close partnership is destined to reach new heights. Let us achieve this together. Thank you very much."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "The Consul General will be in the well if any of you wish to greet him and take a picture, for a few minutes. Mr. Riley in the Chair."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a Resolution that I want to present. It's... the Resolution begins
 - WHEREAS, Illinois State Representative Monique Davis and the members of the Illinois House of Representatives recognize that Mother's Day is celebrated nationally on May 12, 2013; every mother wants her child to succeed; and
 - WHEREAS, A child's parents are the foremost authority in the needs of the child; and
 - WHEREAS, Every day, mothers, grandmothers stand up for the rights of their children and advocate for their needs; and
 - WHEREAS, Many of these parents and grandparents come to Springfield to advocate on behalf of legislation that supports their children's rights; therefore, Sir, be it
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we designate May 8, 2013 as "Moms on a Mission Day" in the State of Illinois to honor... to honor mothers, grandmothers, and their families who stand up for the rights of children; and be it further
 - RESOLVED, That we welcome the mothers and the grandmothers present at the Illinois State Capitol in orange. Welcome 'Moms on a Mission'."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Monique Davis moves 'do adopt'
 House Resolution 281. All those in favor vote 'aye'... all

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

those in favor state by saying 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 281 is hereby adopted. Members, we have a lot of business to take care of. We're going to start on page number 3... page number 3, Senate Bills on Third Reading. So, please be in your chairs, be attentive when your Bill is called. Senate Bill 1524. Senate Bill 1524, Representative David Harris. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to explain this Bill by asking you a question. If your constituent had a vehicle that was completely legal in every way, registered by the State of Illinois, titled in the State of Illinois, paid all of its fees in the State of Illinois, yet that vehicle, whether it's from Waukegan, or Arlington Heights or Schaumburg or downstate, if that vehicle drives into the City of Chicago, parks, that vehicle has the possibility of getting a \$250 ticket because its windows are tinted even though the tints match what the State of Illinois says is permissible. So, what this Bill does... First of all, do you think that's fair? I don't. What this Bill does is it removes the ability for the City of Chicago to impose a tinting standard on vehicle windows that is different from the State of Illinois. I think it's fair, equitable and I'd ask for your support."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Zalewski."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

- Zalewski: "Representative Harris, the City of Chicago, did they tes... I'm not a member of the committee that this Bill came out of. Did they testify in committee on the Bill?"
- Harris, D.: "You know, interestingly, Representative, this Bill passed the Senate on a unanimous 55 to 0 vote. The night before committee this... representatives of the City of Chicago came to me and said, you know, we really... we don't like this Bill and we're going to oppose it. And I said to them, you mean, not a single Senator from the City of Chicago bothered to call up and say, you have a problem with this Bill? And they sort of hemmed and hawed and well, you know. So, in committee, they put in a slip, but nobody testified against it and it came out of committee on a unanimous vote as well."
- Zalewski: "Well, the... the reason I ask, Representative, is my understanding about the tinted windows, while our ordinance in the City of Chicago is officers' safety, predominantly, I could be wrong about that, but the concern has always been, if the officer's conducting a traffic stop and they can't see into the backseat of the vehicle or through the back main part of the vehicle, that's concerning to them. So, I wonder if... if that was addressed during the committee."
- Harris, D.: "It was and let me ask... let me respond with two points. First of all, when we, the State of Illinois, went

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

to the tinting standard that we have now, that's... that's employed all over the state, the Illinois Department of State Police said yes, this is a safety standard or a tinting standard that, for safety reasons, we can live with. But the second thing, and this is where I think the Chicago ordinance falls of its own weight, is that the ordinance precludes any vehicle with... precludes vehicles, with any amount of tinted glass on specified areas of the vehicle, from parking or standing on any public way in Chicago. And I can give you the Chicago Municipal Code site. So, the point is, if you're parked, you're violating the ordinance. Once you're in the vehicle, which it, presumably, that's when a police officer is going..."

Zalewski: "Yeah."

Harris, D.: "...to make the stop, you're not in violation."

Zalewski: "Okay. Well, I appreciate you answering and... or answering my questions, Representative. I... I... I just, from whatever I've ever heard about a tinted window ordinances and I... and if... if our state statute mirrors the... the... if our state statute is good enough for the State Police, that's certainly persuasive, but from whatever I've ever heard about a tinted window ordinance in the City of Chicago, it's because officers have said they need to able to view the entire car, especially at nighttime, for... for officer safety reasons. So, I'll continue to listen to the debate, but I appreciate your... your indulgence on my questions."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sacia." Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."
- Sacia: "Representative Harris, I'm... I'm just having a little bit of a problem getting my arms around this. Is it fair to say that this is an issue where cars parked in Chicago are being tagged that do have a specific tint?"
- Harris, D.: "Oh, it's very fair to say that. As a matter of fact, any number of people have received \$250 tickets for violation of the ordinance and, indeed, which I think is completely unfair."
- Sacia: "And then, if they're in the car and traveling down the road, it's not a violation if that..."
- Harris, D.: "That is what... that is what the ordinance says. The ordinance pro... precludes any vehicle from parking or standing on any public way in Chicago, which is presumably the vehicle could be unoccupied. Once it's occupied and traveling down the road, is presumably when the traffic stop is going to be made and they're not in violation at that point."
- Sacia: "So, help me understand what you are trying to accomplish with this legislation. What... what will it do? It'll prevent Chicago from tagging that car. Is that right?"
- Harris, D.: "What I'm try... what I'm trying to do is make the standard that is applicable in the rest of Illinois, whether you're from downstate or the suburbs or any other area of Illinois, we have a tinting standard that has to be adhered to, which is fair, everybody recognizes it, everyone who has a vehicle that has tinted windows has to meet the state standard. Yet, if they go into the City of

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Chicago, conceivably, they're in violation of that ordinance even though in every other way they meet state requirements."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Reboletti, did I buy you enough time?"

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Speaker, does the Representative yield?"

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Hernandez: "Representative, what... what does it... what happens when the individual has a health condition? Is that being addressed at any level?"

Harris, D.: "I'm not sure I un... when you say they have a health condition, what does that mean?"

Hernandez: "So, there is... and I've come across this where there is a nec... a necessity to have tinted wheels (sic-windows) because of a health condition that the driver or the owner of the car is, in their case. So, has that been addressed, and so are they opt out of, you know, being harmed of..."

Harris, D.: "Thank you for the clarification. I understand your question now. There is a provision currently in State Law that if you need tinting which is greater than what the state allows and you have a physician's statement to... to authorize that, then you can have more heavily tinted windows than what the state allows, but you have to have a signed document from your physician."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reboletti." Reboletti: "Inquire of the Chair."

Speaker Riley: "State your inquiry."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, if you could ask the parliamentarian, since this, I would assume, preempts Home Rule, how many votes this would need to sustain a Constitutional Majority?"

Speaker Riley: "I will do so. The Chair recognizes Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I want to make sure I understand the Bill. And so, this would create, basically, a statewide standard for tinted windows. Is that correct?"

Harris, D.: "A statewide standard already exists. It's in place, has been in place, since July of 2010. Chicago imposes a standard which is different from the rest of the state and..."

Lang: "So, is this just about..."

Harris, D.: "...and this..."

Lang: "...is this just about Chicago?"

Harris, D.: "It is, Sir."

Lang: "And is that the only municipality that's Home Rule that has adopted a separate ordinance?"

Harris, D.: "Yes, Sir. The on... the only one that I'm aware of, but I believe that is the case."

Lang: "Now, have people driven into Chicago from downstate and been ticketed for not meeting the city's standard?"

Harris, D.: "An emphatic yes."

Lang: "Well, how... how does happen? Is there some... is... Can you have a primary traffic stop for tinted windows?"

51st Legislative Day

- Harris, D.: "Sir, the ordinance specifies parked... let me... let me be specific when I tell you... The... the ordinance specifies parking or standing on any public way in Chicago."
- Lang: "And so, how did this happen? Do police officers come apa... across parked cars and they think it's too dark and they just stick a ticket in the window?"
- Harris, D.: "That's how it happens and it's a nice revenue generator."
- Lang: "And do you think that's what it's for, Sir?"
- Harris, D.: "I would not impugn the motives of the Chicago Police Department."
- Lang: "So, you don't think there's some public safety aspect to it?"
- Harris, D.: "Well, we've addressed the public safety aspect and the Illinois... again, the Illinois State Police have said the standard that we use across the state is... is we feel a standard that can be... that is safe to use for tinting."
- Lang: "So, wouldn't this Bill be better if you limited it to...

 Well, let me rephrase the question. Is... I don't know if

 I can rephrase the question. So, the only opponent to this
 is the City of Chicago?"
- Harris, D.: "I'll say yes, but I have to tell you, I'm not so sure how strongly they were opposed. Again, it came out of the Senate 55 to 0. There was no Chicago Senator who voted against it. In committee, they put in a slip that said we're opposed. Nobody showed up to testify against it. So, I'm not sure how strong their opposition really is."

51st Legislative Day

- Lang: "One additional question. Wouldn't it be easier to simply pass a Bill that prohibits auto dealers from selling vehicles where the… the tinting is higher rather than creating a statewide standard?"
- Harris, D.: "The state… it may be. The… the tinting standard which we have established statewide is the maximum level of tinting, so someone could have tinting standards that are less. And you bring up an interesting point. If… if the tinting is done by an OEM, an original equipment manufacturer, that tint is not applied to the window but rather is imbedded in the window. So, it's… you have to replace all of your windows in order to conform to the Chicago ordinance."
- Lang: "So... so, I guess my point is, though, that rather than preempting Home Rule and telling the City of Chicago or other Home Rule units what they can or can't do, why don't we just prohibit the sale of... of windows or after market applications that violate the state standard rather than dealing with the issue of Home Rule at all?"
- Harris, D.: "Well, they're not sup... if it violates the state standard, they shouldn't be putting it on to begin with. Remember, the Chicago standard is tougher than the state standard. The state standard is at a level which is considered to be safe by the Illinois State Police."
- Lang: "Right. But it seems to me and then I'll stop belaboring the point, but it just seems to me that this Bill would be better if instead of fiddling around with Home Rule and telling municipalities what they can and can't do, you just

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

made sure that the product that you don't want sold in Illinois is not sold in Illinois."

Harris, D.: "Well, I would... if you put in that Bill, I will consider it and rather than fiddle around with Home Rule. It seems to me there's only one municipality in the entire State of Illinois that chooses to do this. To me, that's unfair."

Lang: "You know, that's exactly the same answer I would have given, Representative."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Ford: "Representative, General Harris, I passed a Bill, I think three years ago, to do exactly what the previous speaker said and that was to say that dealers could no longer apply window tint to cars that... when it's illegal. So, it's..."

Harris, D.: "So, that's already law."

Ford: "Yep."

Harris, D.: "Great."

Ford: "Yep. So, I did pass that Bill. It's signed by the Governor, so if a... after market, if you take your car to a tinting place, a tinting company cannot, by law, apply window tint to a car if it's illegal. So..."

Harris, D.: "Excellent."

Ford: "Thank you."

Harris, D.: "Thank you for letting me know that."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Mr. Harris to close."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

- Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe this Bill is one that creates a standard that... that is fair and equitable.

 And I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

 Excuse me, Mr. Reboletti. I wasn't here when you made that inquiry. Mr. Reboletti, the parliamentarian informs me that this Bill requires 60 votes. Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Is that because it's not a gun Bill, Mr. Speaker?" Speaker Lang: "That may be the reason, Sir."

Reboletti: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "So, those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Switches are right in front of you, Members. Have all voted who wish? Berrios, Durkin, Feigenholtz, Mell. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 99 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is harebear... hereby declared passed. House Bill 15... Sorry. Senate Bill 1538, Mr. Halbrook. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All we're doing here is just adding slingshot bow to the Code for taking certain types of fish, just adding. Looking for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Did you say slingshot load to the Code? Those in favor..."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Halbrook: "No, I did not."

Speaker Lang: "...of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Yes, Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Lang: "Please proceed."

Hernandez: "I just want to ask the Members if they can give a warm welcome to my staff members from back in the district who are here today with me. That's Liz Garcia, Griselda and Christian Lopez. I just felt that it was necessary for them to come and see the dynamic of what is going on in Springfield, so they have a better understanding. Give them a warm welcome will you, please."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 1550, Mr. Sandack. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1620, Representative Hammond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1620, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1620 basically amends the Wildlife Code to make it illegal to wantonly waste or destroy usable meat from game animals or birds. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Franks, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1623, Representative Golar. Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1623, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1623 is protecting Illinois babies from Pertussis. It requires that the neo natal intensive unit personnel should discuss the health risks of Pertussis with parents and caretakers of hospitalized infants and provide information on where to obtain the vaccine. As you know, Pertussis, more commonly known as whooping cough, is a highly contagious vaccine preventable bacterial disease that is potentially fatal to infants. Illinois is one of the 20 states that has seen more cases than the national average. Up to 80 percent of the babies are infected by parents and caretakers. This vaccine immunity from Pertussis is not lifelong following infection or vaccination. The Center for Disease Control recommends a booster dose for adults and caregivers that have routine contact with infants. I'll be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, just for a point of clarification, does this Bill mandate anything?"

Golar: "I don't see it in there as a 'shall', but we are asking because of the incidents of... that are happening to babies that the neo natal in most hospitals would advise the parents and the people that are close to these babies to have that vaccine."

Flowers: "So, it is my understanding with Amendment #1, it goes from 'it shall be offered', and with Amendment #1 it says now that the information shall be offered... the parents shall be offered an opportunity to receive the vaccine."

Golar: "So, it's more of informational. We're informing these individuals..."

Flowers: "So, it's information..."

Golar: "That is correct."

Flowers: "...shall be given, but not vaccine that shall be given."

Golar: "That is correct."

Flowers: "That's my point. Thank you very much for the clarification."

Golar: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received

51st Legislative Day

- the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 922. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 922, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Today, I'm presenting House Bill 922. This Bill extends current requirements for contractors subject to the Prevailing Wage Act to keep payroll records for 10 years. And also contractors who violate any Section of the Act twice in the last 10 years instead of 5 (sic-3) years will be published on a list provided by the Department of Labor. I appreciate your comments or questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, can you explain the genesis of why you want to extend this from 3 years to 10 years?"
- Hurley: "This was brought to me by labor organizations. There have been incidences where they have investigated claims against the Wage Prevailing Act and the records were not available. So, they want to extend the records from 3 to 10."
- Sullivan: "How does this coincide with federal legislation?"
- Hurley: "Federal, I am not sure, but I do have the e-list of case statutes from Illinois that... Illinois that would be also 10 years, which would be consistent with this proposed Bill."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Sullivan: "It's my understanding that Federal Law requires 7 years worth of data to be compiled."

Hurley: "Was that a question?"

Sullivan: "Yes. Is that your understanding? It's my understanding that the Federal Law requires 7 years, so the point then being, why would we have something that is longer than Federal Law?"

Hurley: "Because it is consistent with Illinois case... Illinois statutes and court case interpretations in the State of Illinois."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'll follow up with Representative Sullivan's questions. If... I'm trying to figure out why you would need 10 years. And I'm... and I'm... you said there might be case law that would be relevant. And I was wondering if you had the name of those cases because I'm... I'm looking at our analysis and we don't have any Illinois cases that were cited that say that we need to try to... we have to move this to 10 years. Are... are you aware of what those... those cases are?"

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "What's the case name?"

Hurley: "Chicago District Council of Carpenters Pension Fund v.

Cotter. Other examples are Cesca Finance Corp. v. Brown,

Ponce de Leon v. Optner, Prosner v. Salsman and Country

Preferred Insurance v. Whitehead."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Reboletti: "And... and what do those cases hold?"

Hurley: "They all are mentioned 10-year statute of limitations in there."

Reboletti: "They say we have to have a 10-year statute of limitations?"

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "Are those Supreme Court cases or First District cases?"

Hurley: "I am unaware of which district."

Reboletti: "Has there been an issue that labor has not... that they couldn't do it in 5 years or 7 years, which is consistent with Federal Law? Why would Illinois need 3 more years longer than the Federal Government to hold these records?"

Hurley: "I don't know the examples of 5 or 7 years, but there has been examples, with the 3-year record keeping, that records have been destroyed when they're investigating a case."

Reboletti: "Are you aware of what the objections are? I mean, there's numerous opponents: the Illinois Chamber, General Contractors, NFIB..."

Hurley: "I..."

Reboletti: "...the Road and Transportation Builders, DuPage
Mayors and Managers, Metro Counties. The construction
industry, what is their objection?"

Hurley: "I talked to the original Illinois Chamber of Commerce and NFIB. They were a little concerned, but we walked out of the room friendly. The additional opponents, I have not spoken to. I was given a sheet yesterday with their

51st Legislative Day

- opposition, I think it was record keeping, but I haven't spoken to them."
- Reboletti: "Is part of it have to do with cost?"
- Hurley: "There was a bunch of notes filed on this Bill and there was no associated cost."
- Reboletti: "Who... who is filing these... these cases? The Trades
 Unions are filing these cases?"
- Hurley: "One of the cases was Carpenters Pension Fund, so that is a trade, yes. The other one's..."
- Reboletti: "And it... As far as you're aware, in these types of cases, how far back have you seen them go? Do you mean if somebody said, oh my God, you know, if we had a 5-year statute of limitations, we would have been able to sue and... and make this situation right or I mean, is it that somebody goes, oh, we saw 7 years ago we wish we had 7 years or 10 years? I mean, it seems like a long time to not realize that there was something wrong."
- Hurley: "And... and I cannot really speak to that. Maybe they did realize something is wrong, so they're trying to amend it with this Bill."
- Reboletti: "I mean, I'm just trying to figure out why the Department of Labor would need 10 years to investigate if there were any issues regarding this and... and I think, you know, in felony prosecutions you have a 3-year statute of limitations. I think that's... that's a lot when you're talking about peoples' liberty and... and major cases. And now for this, we're looking at federal... the Davis-Bacon is 3 years, but now we're going to go to 10 years. It's not even a... we're not even doubling or we're not even tripling

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

it. I mean, we're going bigger than that. I mean, is that really necessary, Representative? Can we… can we… can we agree with some of the opponents and we can maybe meet in the middle, maybe 5 years or 6 years will be sufficient."

Hurley: "The organizations, Department of Labor have agreed to 10 years, so they'd like to stick with 10 years."

Reboletti: "Well, I can imagine why they agreed to 10 years. I get that part. I'm trying to figure out isn't there some kind of middle ground between 3 and 10?"

Hurley: "There is numbers between 3 and 10, but they... they would like the 10-year statute."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Representative Hurley, did the Department of Labor indicate to you that they had a specific instance in... in mind that they thought that there had been a business that had breached or would be prosecuted if you would allow the statute of limitations to be expanded to 10 years?"

Hurley: "There was an example of record keeping that they were not able to obtain the records because of the 3-year requirement. I don't know if it was the laborers or DOL that told me of that situation."

Tracy: "So, they didn't know of any specific situation which a 10-year limitation would have been required?"

Hurley: "I do not know. They may have known."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

- Tracy: "And is there a reason that you picked 10 years. We were... we're currently at 3 years, and why did it seem like a good idea to expand it a whole nother 7 years?"
- Hurley: "It was the request and 10 years, again, is consistent with Illinois state statutes and cases... case interpretation, so the 10 years."
- Tracy: "But... but the federal IRS... I mean, we're in agreement.

 The federal IRS, which is one of the main examples of going after someone on... of tax records, is 7 years."

Hurley: "Yes."

Tracy: "And you think it's better that we be 10 years rather than 7 years or 3 years or 5 years?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Tracy: "Well, to the Bill. Can you imagine how many businesses in this state are going to get letters if we keep passing Bills that pound on more regulation, more requirements? Even if you are a pristine record keeper and you are totally above the law, every business in Illinois is going to get a letter from the Department of Labor saying, oh, we are so appreciate you doing business in Illinois and by the way, we think we should make a statute of limitation change so that now, if you're doing any work that involves prevailing wage, you have to keep records in excess of the prior 3 years. But no, we'd like you to keep them 10 years because we appreciate you doing business so much in the State of Illinois. I just wish we would really recognize what it's like to be a business owner in this state: small, medium, large, mainly the small guy that gets another letter from the State of Illinois wishing him well and

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

saying, oh, we want you to keep your records and... for 10 years and that's what the statute of limitations is going to be. It is a very bad idea. And so, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

"Representative Hurley, I, coincidently, was Sacia: committee when the Gentleman, who's in the Chair today, initially presented this Bill, and many of the questions were asked then that are being asked now. And... and the Lady that just spoke, made a very, very interesting point, but to expand on that... the point, this is absolutely a jobkilling Bill in a state that is struggling so hard to bring business. To ask а company to keep records... coincidently, yesterday I was speaking with a gentleman who made reference to the fact that they literally will have to create a warehouse to keep these additional records, and this is an attack at nonunion business, period. And it's exactly why all of the business groups are in opposition and why Department of Labor is in favor and this Bill is going to go out of here. Your side of the aisle is going to vote for it, my side of the aisle is going to vote against it and all of us are going to say, wow, Illinois still can't bring in new jobs. We are upside down financially and this is an unbelievably highly invasive Bill. To... to get it up to... I mean, is there any other state in the nation that asks for 10 years?"

Hurley: "I'm unaware."

51st Legislative Day

- Sacia: "Well, if you're unaware then why would we do it?"
- Hurley: "Because it's consistent with Illinois case statute and case interpretation."
- Sacia: "Give me one example, one example only. What... what case?"
- Hurley: "I have... I read five: Chicago District Council of Carpenters Pension Fund v. Cotter."
- Sacia: "And they all went back beyond 3, 5, 7 years. They had to go 10 years in order to get the information?"
- Hurley: "Ten years is what was mentioned in the cases, yes."
- Sacia: "Well, in other words, did they subpoena records going back 10 years and then did they ding them because they didn't have them going back that far?"
- Hurley: "I'm not sure of the procedure, but it's again, the 10 years is consistent with state statutes. It is."
- 10 years isn't consistent with anything, Sacia: "No, Representative. This is a highly invasive, antibusiness Bill. You know I hold you in the highest esteem, but I have to tell you, this piece of legislation just reeks of job killing in a state that so desperately needs jobs, needs workers. How do you incentivize a business when you tell them that you have to keep... oh, by the way, we need to have you keep a bunch more records. Again, Representative Tracy said it so well. Now, we're going to have to have all of these additional records, all of this additional effort, labor is going to have to... the Department of Labor is going to have to send out all of this information stating this will be required hereafter. I really think, with all due respect, Representative, that this is a very invasive, bad

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

piece of legislation. And Mr. Speaker, should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I would ask for verification. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "That request is acknowledged. Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, what is your background as... in regard to job experience? Have you run a company, large or small?"

Hurley: "No, Sir. I run my house but not a... not a company."

Kay: "Okay. Good. And if you did though, would you want all
workers to be unionized?"

Hurley: "I would want to pay my workers all on the prevailing wage, pay them fairly so..."

Kay: "No. Just yes or no... yes or no is fine. Just yes or no."

Hurley: "Repeat the question, please."

Kay: "Would you like all... all labor in Illinois to be unionized?"

Hurley: "I would like to get... have them have a fair wage and have the opportunity to be unionized, if they wish, yes."

Kay: "That's a yes. That's a yes, then. Okay."

Hurley: "Opportunity."

Kay: "Let me... let me ask a separate question. Over the time period that you cited these cases, these violations, was it between 1 and 3 years, 3 to 5 years, 5 to 10 years? What period of time, those 6 cases that you mentioned to Representative Reboletti, span?"

Hurley: "I... I do believe they were after 3 years."

Kay: "You know that for sure?"

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Hurley: "I do not, no."

Kay: "No?"

Hurley: "No."

Kay: "Okay. Are you aware... I'm sure you're aware because you've been here most days, you've got a very good attendance record, are you aware of the number of prevailing wage Bills that we have passed in this General Assembly?"

Hurley: "I... I know there was a few this year, yes."

Kay: "There has been more than a few. Are you aware of the number of Bills that we have passed to encourage business or make the environment better in the State of Illinois to encourage jobs to remain here or businesses to come here?"

Hurley: "I... I do not know the number."

Kay: "I'll give you that answer. It's zero, zero. Does that
 concern you?"

Hurley: "Any time the State of Illinois loses business, yes, that would concern me."

Kay: "Okay. Well, that's, I think, the point that a lot of us have been trying to make here today is that we seem to have a penchant here to protect one class of individual, one class of worker to the disadvantage of everybody else. And for that very reason, I'm going to vote against this Bill and I'm going to ask everyone else to do the same because what we're doing is stifling business in the State of Illinois. And this is... many of us have said is just one more step, one more nail, one more effort to make it tougher and tougher and tougher for us to keep businesses in this state. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

Moylan: "To the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "To the Bill."

Moylan: "Miss Hurley, was this presented as a union or nonunion Bill? It's my understanding that this is not a union or nonunion Bill."

Hurley: "What... what's the question?"

Moylan: "As reading the Bill, it's my understanding that this Bill is at the contractors that destroy records after a certain amount of time. These contractors bid on prevailing wage and then when there is a claim, their records disappear."

Hurley: "Correct."

Moylan: "Is it true that there's been cases that have been filed and the records had been destroyed?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Moylan: "And you have those records with you today?"

Hurley: "No."

Moylan: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I, myself, had pursued violations of the prevailing wage and it's true that when contractors are confronted they use every effort they can to delay the outcome and then after a certain time period the records are destroyed. This will ensure that this... that bad contractors will indeed be penalized. This has nothing to do with keeping business in or out of the State of Illinois. This is all contractors that bid on prevailing wage, union and nonunion, and will make them do the job that they're... that they contract to do. And I urge an 'aye' vote. And I'm on this side of... and I will be voting for the Bill."

51st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, I believe your name was used in debate, Sir."
- Reboletti: "It was, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question." Speaker Lang: "There's only one more speaker. Will..."
- Reboletti: "That's fine. I still move to the previous question,
 Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti moves the previous question. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no'. And the previous question is put. Representative Hurley to close."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I understand your concerns, but contractors who play by the rules on Public Work construction contracts will have absolutely nothing to worry about if this Bill passes. As far as record keeping, there is numerous ways to keep records. There's flash drives; there's files. We're not trying to encourage hoarding here with this Bill, just accurate record keeping. And again, if you're playing by the rules, there should be no problems. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Sacia has requested a verification. Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Cabello, DeLuca, Leitch, Sente, Smith, Thapedi. Please record yourselves. Mr.

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

DeLuca, Mr. Leitch. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And Mr. Sacia, do you persist, Sir?"

Sacia: "Give me one moment, Mr. Speaker. Yes, if you would, have the Clerk read them, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative vote."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.

Acevedo; Representative Representative Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Bradley; Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis; Representative DeLuca; Repre..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, would you suspend for a moment. Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "I... I'm satisfied, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Drury."

Drury: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Drury: "I'd like to welcome Aaron Bach. He's our Page for a day. He's down in the well. He's a fourth grader from Lincoln School, which is a elementary school in my district

51st Legislative Day

- and he's here today with his dad, Phil Bach, who is a constituent and a good friend of mine. If... give him a warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Happy to have you with us. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 286, offered by Representative Brauer. And House Resolution 321, offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

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

 Mr. Clerk, committee announcements, please. Members, please listen to the committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "There are two committees that have been rescheduled that were previously recessed. The Cities & Villages Committee is meeting in Room 413 at 2:00 and the Health Care Licenses Committee is meeting in Room 114... 115 at 4:00. The following is the complete committee schedule for this afternoon. At 2:00, the Business Occupational Licenses Committee is meeting in Room 115, Labor & Commerce in D-1, State Government Administration in 114 and Cities & Villages in Room 413. Meeting at 4:00 is Higher Education in C-1, Revenue in 114 and Health Care Licenses in Room 115."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, May 9 at the hour of 3 p.m., 3 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the

51st Legislative Day

5/8/2013

House does stand adjourned until Thursday, May 9 at the hour of 3 p.m."