56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- 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 16, 2013: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1801, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2380."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Padget."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. The following is attributed to being found in the pocket of a dead confederate soldier at Gettysburg. This is his prayer. I ask God for the strength that I might achieve. I was made weak, that I might learn humbly to obey. I ask for health, that I might do greater things. I was given infirmity, that I might do better things. I asked for riches, that I might be happy. I was given poverty, that I might be wise. I asked for power, that I might have the praise of men. I was given weakness, that I feel the need of God. I asked for all things that I might enjoy life. I was given life that I might enjoy all things. I got nothing I asked for, but everything I hoped for. Almost to despite myself, my unspoken prayers were answered. I am, among all men, most richly blessed. Amen."

Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Mr. Sacia."

Sacia - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representatives Ford and Soto are excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Speaker. Let the record reflect Representative Tryon is excused on the Republican side of the aisle."

Speaker Lang: "Please record yourselves on the Attendance Roll Call, Members. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 115 Members present and the House does have a quorum. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Representative Hoffman, Clerk Hollman: Chairperson from the Committee on Labor and Commerce reports the following committee action on May 15, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1830. Representative from the Committee State Government Chairperson on Administration reports the following committee action on May 15, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1256. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 220 (sic-222), House Resolution 230, House Resolution 263, House Resolution 270, House Resolution 291; recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 221. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action on May 16, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1534. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

following committee action on May 16, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 626. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action on May 16, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 257, House Resolution 290. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action on May 16, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 33, House Resolution 271, House Resolution 296. Representative Thapedi, Chairperson from the Committee on International Trade & Commerce reports the following committee action on May 16, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 246. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 347, offered by Representative William Davis. House Resolution 350, offered by Representative Arroyo. And House Resolution 354, offered by Representative Flowers are referred to the Committee. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1912, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. First Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "I want to introduce Kyle Johnson. Kyle, will you step up? Kyle is in the fifth grade at Pierce Downer Elementary School in the wonderful Village of Downers Grove. He is a fantastic reader. His dad Chris is up in the gallery. I am hoping everyone will give them a nice Springfield welcome."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield, glad you're here.

Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Wheeler: "Thank you. I'd like to announce Elgin City Council member, Anna Bianca Moeller, who also brought her two beautiful daughters, Madeline and Eleanor here to be as Pages on the side over there, the Democratic side. Welcome. I wish everyone would give them a nice warm welcome today. I'd appreciate that."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Zalewski: "Final reminder. Tonight, 9 p.m., DH Brown's, White Sox Caucus. We're building a little bit of momentum as we head into the weekend versus the Angels. White Sox Caucus meeting tonight at 9 p.m."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski, I think you need to have a little more energy in... in that. You know, if you really care, Sir."

Zalewski: "I... should I sing the Go, Go, White Sox song? White Sox Caucus..."

Speaker Lang: "No, no, don't do that, Sir."

Zalewski: "...tonight at 9 p.m."

Speaker Lang: "Much better. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, appears House Bill 530, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 530, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "This is... now, this is exciting, Mr. Speaker. I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 30 which is an initiative of the Illinois Hearing Society. It differentiates between a hearing instrument device and a hearing enhancement device. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman... Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "So right... right now, the definition is which?"

Zalewski: "The... the current... I don't know what the current definition is, Mike. I know that there needs to be clarification that there's such a thing as a hearing instrument device, which is designed to amplify the sound and a hearing enhancement device, which, I think, is done to simply control the... the volume."

Bost: "Wasn't... wasn't always this just considered a hearing aid?"
Zalewski: "I think, you know, that's the common name for it, but
there is a difference between a hearing instrument and a
hearing enhancement. One of them allows you to just control
volume, one of them allows you to control amplification and...
and how the sound travels through the device."

Bost: "Okay. What is... what is the reason that that must be described in Illinois law rather than... because is... is there at a time where we are justifying that you use one and not the other or...?"

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Zalewski: "What I'm told is that when these devices are marketed, we... we want consumers to be aware of the difference, that there is a... there's a significant difference if you're... You can't market a hearing enhancement device as a hearing amplification device. You have to be clear about how you're marketing these devices."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the Order of House Bills-Third Reading appears House Bill 2562, Mr. Jones. Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar appears, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1226, Mr. D'Amico. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1226 is a Bill that was brought to us by a foundation back in my district, the Danny Did Foundation. And what it does, under this provision all autopsies in the state shall include an inquiry to determine whether the death was a direct result of a seizure or epilepsy. If the medical examiner or examining physician or the coroner findings are consistent with known suspected, sudden unexpected death in epilepsy, they then... they then shall indicate on the death certificate that SUDEP is the cause of the suspected cause of

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

death. And then forward the copy of the death certificate to the North American SUDEP Registry at Langone Medical Center in New York University within 30 days. This is a Bill that was worked on for quite some time with the coroners. I want to thank Brian Duffy that represents the coroners, the medical examiners. I have up in the... up in the gallery up here, I have Tom Stanton, he's the President of the Danny Did Foundation and he brought this Bill forward. I have his father, Mr. Stanton and the chairman from the Danny Did Foundation, Scott Very... Verhey up in the gallery. So I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Members, the chamber is very noisy. Mr. Reboletti's been up here complaining. Chair recognizes Mr. Brady."

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

Brady: "Representative, we've discussed the Bill and I believe I'm on the Bill as a cosponsor, am I not?"

D'Amico: "Yes, you are."

Brady: "Could you just walk through the process for me. It... the signs of... at the time of autopsies, no physical appearance that is noted of epilepsy being a cause, there's certain testing that has to be done. You really... it's a process of elimination to rule certain things out. But my question is this. If I understood in your comments, you are creating to the Bill a medical cause of death of epilepsy which would be reflected through the Department of Public Health for a cause of death actually to go on a medical death certificate as well as a coroner's death certificate in the State of Illinois?"

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

D'Amico: "Yes, you are correct."

Brady: "Okay. And do you have any idea through that process what we're talking about with the Department of Public Health, of what type of changes under the electronic filing of death certificates now in this state, what type of additional issues, charges, changes in computer systems, anything that would be technical in nature that would be involved with changing in a line as be a cause of death under the State Law?"

D'Amico: "I'm not... I'm not sure I understand your question. Could you..."

Brady: "The question is, we're creating a... the medical cause of death being epilepsy..."

D'Amico: "Yes."

Brady: "...as a medical cause. Under our filing of death certificates in the state, on electronic filing of death certificates, has the Department of Public Health indicated there'd be any additional burden to them in the department whether that be cost, whether that be changes in the electronic process, whether that be anything along the lines regarding the death certificate itself?"

D'Amico: "I have not heard of any opposition at all to the Bill."
Brady: "And in closing, we are simply allowing the cause of death to be epilepsy if it's found and determined by means of scientific study. We're not changing anything to do with the five manners of death through the State of Illinois that's recognized through the coroner certificate process. Is that correct?"

D'Amico: "That's correct."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also want to thank Senator Dan Kotowski for bringing this Bill forward. He worked very hard on this to make this Bill what it is today. And I want to thank all the people, especially the Danny Did Foundation. Tom Stanton, again, thank you for all your work. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday my light wasn't working and I'd like to be recorded a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 1404."
- Speaker Lang: "Your... the record will reflect your intentions.

 Senate Bill 1458, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1458, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1479, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1479, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1479 is an Amendment to the Illinois Vehicle Code and the Boat and Safety Act. This Bill arises out of Senator Morrison's nephew being

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

tragically killed over the summer in a boating accident. He was a 10-year-old boy. He was a... rafting with his parents, with his dad and his children, and while he was floating in the water with a red life vest on, a person who was high on cocaine and drunk..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Leader. As I was saying, this Bill arises out of the tragic death of Senator Morrison's nephew over the summer when a person who was high on cocaine and drunk ran over the 10-year-old boy in a boat and decapitated him and dismembered him. Our current boating laws don't provide for severe penalties for people who are driving boats intoxicated. This Bill takes care of that by applying the DUI laws that currently apply to drivers to boaters and taking away your driver's licenses. This Bill passed out of the Transportation Committee with unanimous vote. And I ask for your 'aye' for this very, very important piece of legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti, but before you proceed, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is very noisy in the chamber. Please, take your conversations to the back where, at great expense to the taxpayers, Mr. Mapes has built some nice rooms back there for you to sit in. Keep the noise down. Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, right now, if you get an OUI, operating a boat under the influence of alcohol, what are the

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- procedural suspensions that may occur in our current statute? What happens right now?"
- Drury: "My understanding is what happens is that you can get a warning from DNR and if you get two of those, they can prevent you from boating, but it doesn't affect your actual driver's license."
- Reboletti: "Because my... my understanding is, that there's like a... similar to a summary suspension on our public ways that you're suspended from operating a motorboat or any type of vessel on waterways of Illinois for a certain period of time. Am I... am I mistaken on that? Is that the current state of the statute?"
- Drury: "My understanding is, after the second violation that you could have some of your privileges suspended as to boating. The problem is that there's no license that is issued, no driver's license that is issued for driving a boat. I have a motorcycle license, it's attached to my driver's license. Boating doesn't have that."
 - Reboletti: "So, this would change... basically, there'd be implied consent. We have a driver's license. We all give consent to law enforcement that we'll give blood, breath or urine upon law enforcement's request. You're allowing this to occur on the waterways of Illinois, right?"
- Drury: "The implied consent you give when you get your driver's license would also affect your drive... your... what happens when you're on a boat, yes."
- Reboletti: "And so, it says here that you shall be deemed to have given consent to a breath test using a portable device. So a portable breath test in court is not evidence that could be

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

used at trial. It could be used for establishing probable cause at the summary suspension hearing for your driver's license. What would happen if this Bill were to pass with respect to what would happen on the waterways and what would the evidentiary value of a portable breath test be?"

Drury: "This would be a... what this does is, it basically takes the law that currently exists for DUIs, and you'd have the same evidentiary standards that you'd have in DUIs. So if you had the breathalyzer test, that would give you probable cause. You could then bring the person in, ask them for a blood test, have him do other... other things. But it's going to go to the summary suspension of the driver's license and the notice that the Secretary of State's going to issue to have your license suspended or taken away if you refuse to take the test."

Reboletti: "So, if you're arrested for OUI, your driver's license would also be suspended or would be suspended statutary... the summary suspension, the statutory summary suspension allows for a hearing within 46 days of the date of the arrest before your license would be suspended. Is that going to be the same thing? It's going to mirror the Illinois Vehicle Code?"

Drury: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?"

Reboletti: "It's loud in here again."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please, please, let's get some Bills passed today or not passed, but let's move through the Bills."

Reboletti: "Thank..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Reboletti: "thank you, Speaker. Representative, I guess... I guess the question is this, you're going to mirror all the Illinois Vehicle Code language because under the driver's license if you get arrested, your license is suspended. The summary suspension will start 46 days after the date of the arrest. This would not change, right?"
- Drury: "Well, what I... I want to make clear is, what triggers this...
 this whole procedure in the boating incident, is that if
 you're operating or controlling a motorboat, and you're
 involved in a personal injury or fatal boating accident, then
 these proceed... it's not just any one... it's not a OUI that
 someone's operating under the influence. The trigger for this
 is something similar to what happened to Senator Morrison's
 10-year-old nephew, is that there is a boating accident that
 deals with an injury and then it turns out that the person
 is... is above .08, you will then go into the summary suspension
 procedures that we're all familiar with in the driving laws."
- Reboletti: "So, this does not... if you get an OUI on a... on a public waterway and you're a first timer and there is nobody else involved but yourself, no... no Class A injury or death, this would be inapplicable. Is that..."

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

- Reboletti: "I know that there were concerns about what operating a boat was... meant. And I know, that Chairman D'Amico had some questions for you at the time, I remember I had a Bill after that. Did you resolve what that meaning was in language here or through legislative intent?"
- Drury: "Well, I... I spoke with Chairman D'Amico about this and we...
 we decided not to do an Amendment at this time. The language

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

makes clear that it's operating a motorboat. There was concern about, you know, possible other motors and everything, but we... the language is motorboat and that's where it stands at right now."

Reboletti: "And for... So, the Members of the Body understand, what is a Type A or Class A injury? What would that entail?"

Drury: "I don't have the specifics of a... a Class A injury, but the injury that triggered this was a boy who was... who was decapitated by a motorboat and the person at the time was drunk and had been drunk before. And we're just trying to prevent tragic injuries like that, Sir."

Reboletti: "But... but also, I guess my point is, is that a Class A injury could be... obviously, it may... it's not death, but there is a statute that says it. So, I... your... your ablebodied counsel I think just gave you a list."

Drury: "Yes. So, a type A injury is an injury that's not fatal, but it would prevent the injured person from walking, driving or otherwise performing his daily activities. It's a very serious injury."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Representative, I'm very familiar with this accident because it happened in my district, and I just want to have a couple questions answered as to what this covers. Does this specifically cover all waterways in the State of Illinois?"

Drury: "It does."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Osmond: "And have you been in contact with the Secretary of State on how this procedure would happen if, in fact, someone has lost their... I mean... I'm sorry... has committed this offense and should lose their license?"
- Drury: "We have worked on this Bill with DNR and the Secretary of State and so they would be applying the procedures very similar to what they're doing currently with DUIs."
- Osmond: "The only reason I ask that is because we tried to do a
 Bill like this several years ago and were unsuccessful because
 the Secretary of State said that the database did not allow
 this transfer to happen, and that's what one of my main
 concerns is that that has been worked out."
- Drury: "My understanding is, 'cause we've been working with the Secretary of State closely on this Bill, that any... any issue that happened two years ago which I don't know about is not an issue with them at this time."
- Osmond: "All right, thank you. And I do stand in strong support of this Bill. This was a very tragic, tragic accident that happened on the Chain O'Lakes and this was a very high powered boat that just had no notice whatsoever that... he was going so fast that he could not see this child in the water and it was a very tragic, tragic accident. And I do support this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sir, you ripped your sign off your microphone. The Gentleman yields."

Durkin: "You're very observant. I think... I'm looking at the analysis and I want to make it very clear that the issue of

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

consent, if you refuse to participant in any blood analysis or breathalyzer, it's similar to what you do... similar to what we have in the automobiles, that you were there summarily suspended, correct?"

Drury: "Correct."

Durkin: "That's what we deemed that they've... they've deemed consent. The other issue I want to just make very clear, and this is a matter that has come before this Body in the past, that if an individual does refuse to take the breathalyzer or refuses to, you know, allow blood to be drawn, this Bill is not going to allow any law enforcement official the authority to involuntarily draw blood from an individual, correct?"

Drury: "I don't believe so. I believe what's going to happen,

Representative, is that his license will be summarily suspended."

Durkin: "Right. But this is not giving any type of extra authority to law enforcement to involuntarily draw blood from an individual who refuses to either take the breathalyzer or submit to a... any kind type of chemical or blood test, correct?"

Drury: "Correct, I don't believe that's true."

Durkin: "Okay. Lastly, the appropriate venue, if someone is going to contest the suspension, is it the Circuit Court or would be with the Secretary of State's administrative law judge?"

Drury: "I believe with the summary suspension it's going to start, it's going to be a Secretary of State procedure on the first instance."

Durkin: "Great. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

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

Harris, D.: "Representative, is our... I think you may have said this earlier, but for clarification, this only applies in the event of a serious or fatal injury. Is that correct?"

Drury: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Correct. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the testimony in committee concerning the young boy that was killed because of this impaired boat operator, quite frankly, was gruesome. What happened to him should not happen to anyone and because of this person who was operating this... this boat under both the influence of alcohol and cocaine, that individual deserved to lose his license, both to drive as well as to operate a boat. And because of that, I would strongly support this Bill. And hopefully you'll give it a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury to close."

Drury: "Thank you, Members, for... for the dialogue on this. This is... this is a very important Bill. It'll give families and boaters a chance to take our lakes back and be able go out on the weekends, enjoy the lakes with our children. I ask for your 'aye' vote on this very important Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Halbrook."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Halbrook: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen in the House, I'd like to take a moment to recognize behind me in the gallery, Blake Leitch. Blake has served our country for seven years with time stationed in Illinois, California, and a year's tour of duty in Iraq. Today he serves as a student volunteer coordinator, veteran coordinator, at Lakeland College. Let's give him a warm House welcome and welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Sir. We're honored to have you here.

Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You're looking mighty fine today. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Do people not say that to you? You look shocked."

Speaker Lang: "Not often, but keep going."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I just want to have everybody come up and give a congratulations to my seatmate. He is 55 today. He looks good, doesn't he? Fred Crespo. Not Jack, he's 50. But he's 55."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday, Representative. Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Leitch: "I, too, would like to congratulate the veteran, Blake Leitch. He came to my office earlier and I was grateful that he did and he has promised to find out if we are related. He could be my funny cousin Blake that we've all been searching for. Blake, welcome to the floor."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Harris, D.: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D.: "Could we put the Ladies' opinion of how you look today to a vote?"
- Speaker Lang: "Sure, but we won't. Senate Bill 1493, Mr. Sullivan.

 Ready to proceed, Sir? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1550,

 Mr. Sandack. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1568, Mr. Hoffman.

 Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1585,

 Representative Gabel. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1585, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this Bill creates a new Article in the Township Code which allows for the discontinuanat... discontinuance of Evanston Township. It just applies to that township alone. It is a coterminous township and the... the Bill is very specifically... and it just describes Evanston."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I really couldn't hear the Lady's explanation. I do have some questions if she'll yield and just explain a little bit more again, because it's very loud around us here."
- Gabel: "Sure."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields. Please proceed. Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Thank you. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Sure. The Bill allows for the discontinuance of Evanston Township. What it says is that there are two ways that they can discontinue the township. One way is by an ordinance

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

adopted by the city council of the township or upon petition of at least 10 percent of the township's registered voters. Evanston has already passed an advisory referendum which 66 percent of the voters voted to discontinue the township."

Bost: "So... so, even though they've done an advisory referendum this will circumvent the ability to do a referendum specifically to get rid of the township. Is that correct?"

Gabel: "No, no, no. No, no. There has to be a referendum."

Bost: "And it is a front-door referendum?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Bost: "Okay. That's what I need to know. Thank you very much."

Gabel: "Yes. There will be a referendum."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "This Bill is a good government Bill. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there 70 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1637, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1637, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation addresses the Open Space Land and Acquisition Development grants, the OSLAD grants. Under current law, the park district or the local

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

unit of government that is awarded the grant has to front 100 percent of the cost of that in order then to be reimbursed at the... at the end of the project by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. This is a... this... and that makes these grants really unattainable and unaffordable for some... for some park districts. What this Bill will do is to allow for 50 percent of that award to be granted upfront at the time of the award and then, as the project proceeds there'll be reimbursements on a quarterly basis. And I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hate repeating myself, but I can't hear. Maybe it's an age thing with me anymore, but I can't... I didn't hear the Lady's explanation. I..."

Speaker Lang: "Can you listen harder? Is that possible?"

Bost: "I'm... I'm trying. I was sitting here looking at her and trying to..."

Speaker Lang: "So, Representative Nekritz..."

Bost: "If she could explain it one more time."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz, if you could please repeat the explanation of the Bill for Mr. Bost, we would all be grateful."

Bost: "Thank you."

Nekritz: "I don't know that we'll all be grateful, Speaker, but Representative Bost will be grateful."

Bost: "I will be."

Nekritz: "So this has to do with the OSLAD grants."

Bost: "Okay."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Nekritz: "Right now, under current law, there's no reimbursement under the OSLAD grants until the project is completed. So the park district, forest preserve district, has to front 100 percent of the cost of that and then be reimbursed. That makes it unaffordable for some districts. So, what this would do is to make 50 percent of the grant awarded at the time of the award, so they actually get the cash upfront and then the other 50 percent is awarded quarterly as the project proceeds."

Bost: "Okay. So..."

Nekritz: "So we... it's a... 50 percent is a reimbursement."

Bost: "So, basically, it... it is a start-up money placed in and then... and then the rest of the grant is fed through later on."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Bost: "Correct? Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, as I look at this on our analysis, it indicates that there may be a potential loss of millions of federal dollars from the LWCF, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I was hoping you could maybe speak to that issue."

Nekritz: "That issue was... that question came up in committee and I believe that there was some confusion with regard to that, and that would... that would not be the case."

Reboletti: "So, there won't be any loss of federal funds if this were to pass and become law. And..."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Nekritz: "Yeah. The... we were... that... couldn't figure out where that question came from because it just didn't... it didn't connect at all with the OSLAD grants. It had nothing to do with OSLAD grants, so we just... I mean, there was... the two were not connected at all."
- Reboletti: "And by requiring 50 percent of an OSLAD grant, what is the common procedure now? You just kind of get it whenever or..."
- Nekritz: "No. The procedure now is that you don't start… you don't get reimbursed until the project is fully complete. So you… so the local district has to front the entire cost of the project before they can be reimbursed at the end."
- Reboletti: "This sounds like some commonsense legislation, Representative."
- Nekritz: "We think it... we've been trying for years to get DNR to do this."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Ask for your support."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Nekritz, are you voting 'present' on your Bill? Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1667, Representative Berrios. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1768, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1768, Mr. Zalewski. Mr. Zalewski. Out of

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Representative Golar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1801, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor and read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Please withdraw Amendment 1."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. A technical Amendment to the Bill including incorporating a change with the Department of Revenue and one from our own staff. I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1817, Representative Tracy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1828, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the record. Chair... the Chair recognizes the vociferous Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "You haven't seen anything yet, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. And pursuant to House Rules, I move for the discharge of the following House Bills,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

107, 108, 109, 111, 112 and 113 from the House Rules Committee. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge, and under Rule 49 in Article 4, Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be a recorded vote whenever five Representatives shall so request. There are as least five Members on my side that wish for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge 107, 108, 109, 111, 112 and 113 from the House Rules Committee. And I bet Leader Currie's already standing and has her light flashing."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. As everybody in this chamber knows, it takes an unanimous consent to discharge a measure from the House Rules Committee, and his Motion does not have unanimous consent. Speaker, I object."

Speaker Lang: "Lady objects to a Motion that requires unanimous consent; therefore, the Motion fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In January of this very year, I introduced a significant workers' compensation reform package, talked about it several times in this chamber, but it was to help improve Illinois job climate by curbing the misuse of workers' compensation system as we know it in Illinois today. The workers' compensation reform package consisted of eight pieces of legislation. The high cost of workers' compensation insurance for employers compared to our border states is stifling job growth and killing business. The cost of insurance and the perceived unfairness in our

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

workers' compensation system is causing job creators to think twice before they expand their business or even stay in the State of Illinois. The reform package I've introduced is intended to improve the fairness of our workers' comp system for both the employee and the employer, providing Illinois employers the chance to be equally competitive with our border states. Said another way, let's stop being discompetitive. According to the National Council on Compensation Insurance, the Heartland Institute Illinois is home to the most active private market for workers' compensation insurance in the United States, and the third highest workers' compensation rates of any state in the nation. The eight pieces of workers' compensation reform package included three Bills focusing on reforming the state employees' workers' compensation system. I listened to wit, House Bills 107, 108, 109, 111, 112 and 113. Of course, these dealt with the very things that we need to do in this state to make us competitive with our neighbors. In my region, the Metro East, the average unemployment rate as we speak today is 9.3 percent. The national average is 7.6 percent. The Legislative Body has an opportunity today to be a part of the solution, not the problem, by supporting eight commonsense workers' compensation Bills in a package. It's time we work together and pass legislation that will help improve our job climate, grow this economy by creating opportunities for people to go back to work in every county in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to piggyback briefly on what was said by the Gentleman there and I, you

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

know, I take some ... some personal concern with this. Obviously, Illinois's unemployment rate, it was announced recently, at 9.3 percent, which is two points above the national average. But even more importantly to me, of course, with northern Illinois, out in my area, we're looking at an unemployment rate in Winnebago County of eleven and a half percent, City Rockford 13 percent, Boone County, the unemployment rate in the entire state at 13 percent, and we just have to ask why? And it's not just, you know, my area, it's across the state. Marion's unemployment rate in March was 11.7, Rock Island 8.1, Cook County at 9.7 percent. And we don't have to look too far for some really good examples of what other states are doing. And we haven't seen improvement in the last couple of years and we just have to keep asking ourself why? Is it taxes, our competitive nature, workmans' compensation? I just really urge this Body, on a bipartisan basis, to let's work together to really try to figure out what we can do to pass good legislation that's going to grow jobs in this state. And let's do it, again, across Party lines, let's work together and let's get families back working together. 'Cause I know one thing we're definitely seeing, with this unemployment rate, people are not looking for jobs anymore, so the number even looks better than it actually is. So, again, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the indulgence. I just urge all of us to continue to keep that perspective."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Representative Sosnowski, from the Rockford area, pinpointed the problem. I know... could we have some order here? I mean, we're talking about a serious subject. We're talking about jobs in the State of Illinois and leaving. That... that is a serious subject, folks. It doesn't... it's not a Democratic issue, it's not a Republican issue, it's a crisis here in Illinois and the chamber should listen. The unemployment figures were out today, 9.3 percent, nearly two percentage points higher than the national average. Unfortunately, in the State of Illinois, what should be up is down and what should be down is up. Our debt's high, our jobs are fleeing, but let's put it into perspective. Let's put it into perspective how it... how it addresses a community and we are all here to represent our folks back home. Just three... within the last three to four weeks, Caterpillar announced a layoff of 760 jobs in Decatur, Decatur, Illinois, 76 thousand people, 76 thousand people. One percent of the population just lost their job within the last four weeks. Now, that might not seem a lot, 760 jobs to people in Cook County, but let's put it in perspective. That equivalence would be 27 thousand jobs would have been lost in Cook County in the last four weeks. That's what we experienced this... the magnitude of the crisis in Macon County, 760 jobs, 760 good paying jobs have just been lost. People that made 15 bucks an hour just lost their jobs. It would be 27 thousand jobs in the City of Chicago. If that happened, I bet you we would have a Committee of the Whole. We would address this problem, we would have Special Sessions. If 27 thousand jobs left the

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

City of Chicago in the last 30 days, oh my God, the Speaker would be here, the President of the Senate, the Governor. It would be a crisis and you would be listening. But because it happens to a middle-class, blue-collar community in central Illinois, it gets a deaf ear from the Chicago Democrats that have run this state into the ground for the last decade. It's a sad, sad day."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. We're going to come back to Mr. Reboletti by popular demand. Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you. I rise to point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ives: "I think we don't understand how bad it is in Illinois, but everybody outside of Illinois completely understands. In a recent survey of 736 chief executives, they ranked Illinois 48th, 48th in places to do business. And our neighbors, Indiana, number five; Wisconsin, 17; Iowa, 23rd; Kentucky, Kentucky of all places, 29th; and Missouri 31st. All better places to do businesses by major CEOs across America than Illinois, ranked 48th. And as one CEO remarked in the report, a good state is one that understands the private sector pays for the public sector and makes it easy for the private sector to conduct business and grow. But that's not what we have in the State of Illinois. And if anybody here has coached a team and you look at the kid who's got all the attributes of being a great athlete and just doesn't just seem to have the desire, that's what I see in Illinois. We have all the attributes of being the ... a world-class leader, one of the best in this area, and here we are done in by failed policies. Failed policies that have been the result of a decade of one Party rule,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Democrat rule in Illinois. You all know the facts and the figures. We're in the bottom five of every single leading economic indicator. And instead, we spend almost two hours on a lion meat discussion. E-mails came into my office saying, what are you talking about? Lion meat, seriously? This is not what the people want us to be talking about. It's about the failed policies that have led us to having the highest debt of all states, exceeding \$21 thousand for every man, woman and child in our state. It includes, over the last four years, major credit and agencies downgrading us 11 times. You know the list. You've heard the results. And yet, we continue to do nothing about creating growth in Illinois. And just today, Larry Kudlow, remarking about the federal deficit, said he would not have a concern about federal debt if we had economic growth. And isn't that the same in Illinois? could grow our way out of our problems if you would just allow us to do it with the legislation that we have on file. Instead, we get more taxes, more spending, more debt, and we know the result, it's fewer jobs. So let's get some real work done today, and let's get Dwight Kay's Bills out of Rules and on to the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer."

Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Demmer: "I'd just like to add another perspective to this conversation. I'm one of the younger Member's of this Body, if you hadn't noticed. And I'm really concerned about the lack of job opportunities for young people today and what that means for the State of Illinois in the future. You know,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

I grew up in Dixon and I can't tell you how many friends of mine went away to school and stayed away because there weren't available jobs in the State of Illinois for people who had been educated. A lot of times we talk about the greatest resource in the State of Illinois being our people, yet we educate and export these people all the time because we don't have the opportunities here in Illinois for them to take good, qualified, high paying jobs. Now, this week in a column, Scott Reeder cited numbers from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics that show that in 2011 only 75 percent of Illinoisans between the ages of 16 and 24 had a job. That's the lowest number in 42 years. Job availability for young people is at an all-time low and we're just trying to build the future of the State of Illinois in a strong way. We need to do better, we can do better. These Bills will put us on the right track and I'd support bringing them out of the Rules Committee, too. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Zalewski: "So, here we are again, another day, another instance where we're separating the City of Chicago and Cook County from the State of Illinois. And the problems in downstate Illinois are different than the problems in Chicago and Cook County for some reason to some of us. There is not one person in this Body who is unconcerned about the jobless rate in Illinois. There's not one person in this Body who doesn't see the significant amount of fiscal challenges that this state faces. And there are many of us who put our votes on the line

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

to go about fixing those challenges, many of us, and many of us who haven't. So, I respect a lot of the… what's been said today about the focus on jobs, but it's… it's been the case on conceal carry, it's been the case on a lot of other Bills and now it's the case on jobs where some of us feel the need to separate the state and divide. There are many of us here who are willing to work to do what's right to fix this state, but let's stop the discussion of what's good for one and not good for the other and let's work together instead of continuing to separate regions in the State of Illinois. It's not healthy, and it's not worthy of this Body."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Scherer: "The 4-H Great Debate Team from Sangamon County is here with their coach, Eric Austin, and I'd like everybody to give them a big round of applause for all their hard work."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Welcome to the Capitol.

Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Reis: "I can hardly contain my excitement after the former speaker there. I want to bring a little bit of... in perspective here. I know we've... we've talked about releasing Bills from Rules here, but yesterday, the Small Business Empowerment Committee & Workforce Development had a much anticipated and highly advertised committee of the subject matter on what we can do in Illinois for small businesses. Within minutes after

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

convening the committee and bringing people down from Chicago and inviting business people in, the chairman leaves, turns it over to the vice- Chairman and gives five or six people two minutes to talk. Two minutes. DCEO, Chicago Jobs Council, business... the small business advisory groups, Federation of Women Contractors. Please, don't tell me we're all concerned about jobs here when people come down here to talk about the issues that are really important to making small businesses thrive, be created, and create more jobs in Illinois. The chairman left, everybody else got a couple minutes, they convened... recessed. How insulting for all those people that came down here. And with regards to we're all working together, what are you afraid of ... of debating these Bills? What are you afraid of? If you want to vote them down, vote them down. This is the only chance we get to talk about our Bills. If you're really bipartisan over there, let's call the Bills, let's debate them, and vote them up or down. We have heard for years and years some things that we can do to fix the business climate here. Let's just vote on them. What are you afraid of? We heard a couple speakers talk about bipartisanship and we're wanting to divide. Let's call the Bills, let's debate them, let's vote on them."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, when someone gets up and says they're for and they're going to support, but yet, time and time again we try to move forward with legislation that we're more than willing to work with you on, but yet it is trapped. It is not allowed out of Rules. I told you this at the very beginning of the year. Don't say you're for jobs but

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

then lock this stuff down or allow your leadership to lock it down. Wake up. Don't stand up and play to the crowd. Whenever you're... the fact is, you're keeping these Bills locked up, those Bills that could actually put this state back on a situ... back in the place where they need to be. We're one of the greatest states in the nation and should be. But we're strangled because we continue to allow our rules, our regulations, our lack of working on these issues to allow the jobs to expand, to allow our people to work. You want to cure the budget problem? Create more jobs. You want to fix our problems in social services and be able to have enough money to provide for the needs of the most needy? Let's put people to work. Don't just talk about it over there. Join with us. We've asked, but you set there 'cause you're scared of them. Set there. You're scared."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Rise for a personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Ford: "As the Chairman of the Small Business Empowerment Committee, I called the committee to order, and because there was a caucus called, we were unable to continue to hold the length of the meeting that we had planned. And the people that came down from Chicago had an opportunity to speak. And the stakeholders from the Illinois Department of Economic Development and all of the other stakeholders in Illinois had an opportunity to speak. But before that meeting took place, one of the previous speakers spoke about working together. And the Small Business Empowerment Committee had a work group and you didn't show up as the vice-chair of the, or the...

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Minority Spokesperson. You didn't show up for that meeting. So, I don't understand what you're talking about. And also, I even invited one of the other speakers that has many Bills that's locked in committee to be a part of a work group and he didn't show up. And I also invited him to ask to be added to the Small Business Empowerment Workforce Committee so that he can get his input in, so that we can get a package together, so that we can have a bipartisan Bill that I could take to my Leader, the Speaker of the House, that does such a great job keeping control. So, I got to tell you, it's amazing when people say things like that when I know that I invited the Republicans to come and be a part of the meeting, and we've had work groups and the Minority Spokesperson didn't show up. And I'm very happy to say that people came from Chicago, and as Democrats and Republicans, the Small Business Empowerment Committee will continue to work together. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Moving down the Calendar, Senate Bill 1831, Representative Hammond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 3 becomes the Bill and it makes it... it's very simple, it has three components to it. It makes it unlawful to take or attempt to take the species of wildlife on the land of another, and it also makes it unlawful to knowingly shoot a gun, a bow, or an arrow on to the property of another, and the final point is that it defines the owner's designee as the one that can

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

provide authorization to hunt on the land of another. And I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm not sure I understand the distinction between the current law and the proposed law. Because right now, isn't it illegal to go hunt on somebody's private property without permission?"

Hammond: "It... it is, Representative. But currently, it only states to trap or hunt on the land of another. And this one... this particular Amendment includes hunting with a bow or an arrow or shooting a gun on to the property of another landowner."

Franks: "Okay. But I would think that would be covered until the present law because..."

Hammond: "You would think that it would be, but it is not clearly defined."

Franks: "Okay. So, you're just really codifying what the… which… what was probably be the present practice, but you want to make sure you have it in law to help the police to go forward."

Hammond: "It is... it is the present intention, but it is not included. And in addition to that, there has been some problems in the courts concerning a designee who could speak on the owner's behalf and this clears that up as well."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Hammond: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Question of the Sponsor."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Mautino: "Would there be any change to the law or current practice that you know, for example, if I'm hunting on my property and let's say I'm bow hunting, shoot a deer, the deer crosses over on to another person's property. If I don't specifically have the permission of that person, I can get a hold of the Conservation Police officer who would then allow me to go on the property and retrieve the game as well as the arrow?"

Hammond: "It's my understanding, Representative, that you would have to have the permission of the landowner."

Mautino: "For... for just accessing without it, but I mean, currently, the law does provide, since you can't leave a wounded animal, you can contact the..."

Hammond: "You can contact..."

Mautino: "There'll be... you're not changing that Section of the law, are you?"

Hammond: "Absolutely not."

Mautino: "Okay. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond to close."

Hammond: "I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1842, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1847, Mr. Schmitz. Please read the Bill."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1847, a Bill for an Act concerning workers. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1847, we're amending the Workers' Compensation Act and it removes paramedics and EMTs who are not involved in firefighting activities through their contracts from the rebuttable presumption clause in the Act. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1849, Mr. Reboletti. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1849, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. This Body already saw this Bill in the form of a House Bill which did not move in the Senate. This is the Senate version, same language. Says that if you violate the DUI statutes or have a DUI that's reduced to a reckless driving, that you can be required to reimburse the medical professional for a DUI blood draw. I'll take any questions and ask for your support."

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

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1851, Mr. Reboletti. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1851, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Members of the Body. This Bill would remove the statute of limitations from unlawful video recording offenses and usually that's a three-year statute of limitations. This would allow for a prosecution of unauthorized video recording who can be commenced within one year of the discovery of the offense. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer, Jakobsson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1853, Mr. Sacia. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1853, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1853 simply allows law enforcement agencies to

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

charge a reasonable fee to take your fingerprints if you need them for a job or another important reason. Be happy to take your questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what does it cost now? I know they actually do it electronically for the most part. It's a lot different than it used to be. Do you know what... it generically would cost local law enforcement to do that?"

Sacia: "The Sheriff's Association tells me anywhere from 10 to 20 dollars. I imagine it would be a little cheaper in Pecatonica than it would be in your high cost of living area, Representative."

Reboletti: "Well, we'll see about that. Maybe I can make an Amendment here, Representative. But... so reasonable fee would be somewhere in that range? Would that be set by the county or the DNR?"

Sacia: "Yes. The individual county would make the determination, the individual agency, but the reference is to a reasonable fee and I guess that's loosely interpreted, but obviously, I think it would be in \$25 or less range."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1859, Mr. Jefferson. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1859, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1859 amends the County Code. It provides that Winnebago County would consider municipalities representing 67 percent of the county's population may impose an additional two percent tax on people involved in the business of renting, leasing, or letting rooms in a hotel. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Cabello: "Mr... or Leader... Representative Jefferson, does this Bill give the local governments the ability to impose the hotel tax?"

Jefferson: "It does."

Cabello: "Thank you. So this Bill does not mandate the local government to do this?"

Jefferson: "No. In order for them to do this in Winnebago County, they would have to go ask for an ordinance before they were allowed to do this."

Cabello: "Thank you. Our community is hurting. Will this create much needed jobs?"

Jefferson: "I'm sorry."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Cabello: "Our community is hurting. Will this create much needed jobs?"

Jefferson: "Yes."

Cabello: "Good paying jobs?"

Jefferson: "Absolutely."

Cabello: "Will it prevent further loss of economic benefits?"

Jefferson: "It will increase economic benefits. It would increase jobs."

Cabello: "Thank you. And does this help the entire region?"

Jefferson: "Yes."

Cabello: "Thank you."

Jefferson: "All the regions have agreed to... to be part of this."

Cabello: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please help Rockford. Rockford and the surrounding region has been hurting for quite some time. Representative Sosnowski earlier gave you the unemployment rates. Leader Jefferson, thank you very much for bringing this Bill forward. I requestfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1862, Mr. Brown. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1862, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1862 reroutes funding for the Metropolitan Enforcement Groups through the Criminal Justice Information Projects Fund rather than through the Drug Traffic Prevention Fund. I am happy to answer any questions."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, this is not a new fee. This is already a preexisting fee that's already on our schedules for the... for drug cases?"

Brown: "That's correct. The reasoning behind the change here is the Illinois State Police currently operate the Criminal Justice Information Projects Fund, and they also have participation in the Metropolitan Enforcement Groups. Therefore, to remove some of that overlap to provide for some accountability and transparency here in the process, we're plugging in the Drug Traffic Prevention Fund so there's an independent body that makes this... this decision."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Roth."

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

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Roth: "I would like to recognize my seatmate today, Wayne Rosenthal's birthday. So, happy birthday to Wayne."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Are you as old as Mr. Crespo? No? Okay. Senate Bill 1869, Mr. Fortner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1869, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Unlike a much more complicated storm water Bill that we considered that I carried a while back in the Session, this is a much simpler storm water Bill. This simply provides for some clarification of two parts within the Municipal Code. In one place it basically further specifies some of the specific types of drainage implementation that a municipality can use, adding things like storm sewers, detention bases and many other common projects that are already presumably part of what you would need to do for drainage. The second thing it does is it clarifies language as it affects the types of revenue streams one can use. Current law says that you can either use a special assessment or general taxation or both. That language or both is sometimes not very clear, so to make it clear with the intent, is it simply changes the word 'both' to mean a combination and makes that explicit. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hammond and Sacia. Please

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

take the record. On this question, there are 79 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1872, Mr. Zalewski. Please read... Out of the record. Senate Bill 1876, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1876, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1876 is a technical Bill that deals with the Illinois Clinical Laboratory. It's a regulatory Act that removes the definition of 'therapeutic optometrist' or replaces it with the definition of 'optometrist'. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, can you give me the definition of a 'therapeutic optometrist'?"

Zalewski: "What's in the... what's in the... in the statute as it exists, Representative?"

Sullivan: "And where would that statute be found?"

Zalewski: "No, I'm asking you, Ed. Are you asking me what the statute currently is or what we purpose to change it with?"

Sullivan: "Yes, what it currently is."

Zalewski: "What it currently is, is it means a person who is licensed in Illinois to practice optometry and is therapeutically certified. And then we're striking

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- 'diagnostic and therapeutic purposes' and I think we're replacing those with the standard definition of 'optometrist'."
- Sullivan: "So, is it just standard definition of 'optometrist' but a 'licensed optometrist'... or were these 'therapeutic optometrists' not licensed before?"
- Zalewski: "We're asking for consistency in the statute and I, for whatever reason, I think the department's feeling is that it's better to have consistency with the word 'optometrist' and then remove the 'therapeutic' adjective from the statute."
- Sullivan: "What other definitions are you changing to 'licensed optometrist' instead of a 'therapeutic optometrist'? There seems to be some other ones that you're striking."
- Zalewski: "We're striking... the Illinois... the Illinois Clinical Laboratory and Blood Bank Act, and the... we're dealing with the act of examinations of specimens. Its... we're saying that we're taking a 'therapeutic optometrist' out of there and putting in a 'licensed optometrist'."
- Sullivan: "Well, why do we strike language in regard to therapeutic ocular phar... pharmaceutical agents? Can you explain why we're striking that adds from this Act?"
- Zalewski: "Pharmaceutical agents?"
- Sullivan: "So, on page 1 line 19 of your Bill, there's two words, plus agents, therapeutic ocular pharmaceutical agents. Why we striking that?"
- Zalewski: "Again, I think the preference is from the Ill...

 Optometric Association and the department, that for

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- consistency of the statute, it's better to have there be a standard definition of 'optometrist'."
- Sullivan: "Are we doing a standard definition because we're adding multiple things in here, or just standard way to describe them as 'licensed optometrists'?"
- Zalewski: "I think what we're doing is, is using a term that's
 more appropriate in the opinion of the department, which is
 'optometrist'."
- Sullivan: "So, to make it more appropriate to call them a licensed instead of all these other words that we're using, and that... that is the reason for the Bill."

Zalewski: "To the best of my knowledge, Representative, yes."

Sullivan: "To the best of your knowledge? Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brauer. Representative Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1900, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1900, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1900 authorizes
Illinois public universities... or requires that they shall
establish an Open Access to Research Task Force. The task
force at each university will review policies and design

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

proposals regarding open public access to research articles produced at the universities by university professors and employees. Voting task force members will be university librarians, faculty, and administration. A representative of the Scholarly Journal Publishers will be a nonvoting member. The Bill is an initiative of our former colleague Senator Dan Biss. It passed the Senate unanimously. I ask for an 'aye' vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, is... so, what is the task force information that they're actually looking for?"

Burke, K.: "So the task force will design policies or recommend policies for that particular university in regard with... to figuring out ways to provide public open access to research that professors and other employees do that then gets published into Scholarly Journals. These Scholarly Journals are subscription- or fee-based and are generally costly, so a member of the general public doesn't have access to these Scholarly Journals, but this is research and work done on to the taxpayer dime."

Bost: "Okay. Does it do anything... and let me tell you, that when research is done, and this is always a conflict in higher ed, who does the research? You know, there... quite often that research is done on campus and during their time at work, but yet the benefits of that quite often are rewarded to the professor who did the research. Has it got anything to do

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

with... with trying to deal with that issue and where that goes?"

Burke, K.: "No. It's simply the work product of that research, so a paper or some presentation that is made in a scholarly journal. It's just to ensure that that information is open..."

Bost: "Open and accessible for the fut..."

Burke, K.: "...gets open to the public. Exactly."

Bost: "...for the future students as well as the general public."

Burke, K.: "Yes. And other states have done this and Senator Biss was modeling his idea on what those states have done."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "So, following up on the previous speaker, this is already a public record. It's not something that would be proprietary, you would not be requiring the submission of private or proprietary or trademarked articles necessarily being used for pecuniary gain, but this would be something that's already been published?"

Burke, K.: "Yes. And in general, from what I understand from Senator Biss, most times the faculty is not paid for these submissions. They do it in furtherance of the… the study in their field."

Franks: "May I ask why the opponents were opposed? I see that there was the Illinois Chapter of American Association of University Professors."

Burke, K.: "So, it's my understanding that this was one group at the University of Illinois and their objection was actually

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- taken care of by the Amendment that was passed in the Senate, but they hadn't quite caught up with the Amendment. I don't want to speak for them, but that's my understanding."
- Franks: "It's just seems, in this day and age, with the Internet you can get so much stuff anyway. I'd be surprised anyone would be opposed to this."
- Burke, K.: "Well... the journals are a subscription-based and fee-based so they don't publish them on the Internet and it's... it's... they're holding on to it. And the argument is that taxpayer money is being used to... for this research and the time to write it, so the public should have access."
- Franks: "Who gets the proceeds from those... let's assume they've got it in some publication that's fee-based. Would that be something that the university would receive money on? I guess... my question is, is there a fiscal impact to the University of Illinois, for instance, if we required them to give this for free, where before they were charging those who were getting that?"
- Burke, K.: "Well, the Bill does not speak to requiring anything for free or addressing whatever the fee arrangements were. It's simply to establish a task force to set up policies about how we can go about opening access to this research to the public."
- Franks: "Okay. So, it's just more for a study at this point, and then we can come back and determine if we're going to do anything legislatively?"
- Burke, K.: "The... the..."

Franks: "Beyond... beyond the task force."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

Burke, K.: "The task force, yes. The task force will report to the boards of... the Board of Trustees of the universities in order to come with a policy."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, why are we having each university create a task force rather than having one task force that sets a statewide policy? It would seem more efficient to do it once rather than 10 or 11 times."

- Burke, K.: "I think that might be the end game, Representative, but at this point, I think each university, because they all have different interests and different... different groups and different administrations, they felt more comfortable having each one come up with what they felt was... would work for their particular university. And I think the... the intention is to then look at what all the universities come up with and see if it's possible to put together a statewide policy."
- Pritchard: "Are there situations where we are taking away the propriety rights of an individual by having this kind of open access? It's preventing them from selling perhaps, or patenting the results of their research?"
- Burke, K.: "No. These would go into the… this is in for… this is research that is going into the Scholarly Journals, and that's why there is the nonvoting member of the… who is a representative of the journal industry, so to speak, so that they can weigh in on… on how to balance those interests of getting things out there to the academic and professional

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

community and also ensuring the open access. So, that's something they'll work through on the task forces."

Pritchard: "Our analysis shows that at least a couple of universities have already set this kind of policy. How is it working at those universities?"

Burke, K.: "I'm not sure."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "To the Bill, please. I... in a former life was a librarian at an academic institution. This is something that is extremely needed. Open access really goes and helps promote additional research by the academic community, and unfortunately, some of these journals are not readily available and is very difficult to track down the research, keeping track of what institution the professors are at at the time. They often times change. And it is still protecting their interest and that's one of the most important things about this. So, we're looking at how to open up the field of research but still protecting the proprietary rights of these academia. So, I would strongly urge those people to certainly take this first step to go for the open access research task force. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, there's... many of my colleagues have already brought this up, but on your statements and findings, number four on page two, you openly talk about a substantial portion of the research currently is not freely available,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

and the reason is, the faculty have entered into publication agreements with terms that restrict the public access to the fruits of unclassified research. How does your intent, after reading your findings number four, jive with what you just said and that, you know, we have people that have entered in their agreements but your task force is, in essence, going to look how to get the research absent those agreements. So, I'm trying to understand this."

Burke, K.: "So... I believe that is where the role of the scholarly journal industry as a nonvoting member comes in to discuss how you can balance the rights of the taxpayers of this state having access to this with the propriety... with the interest of the journals in keeping people within that field abreast of the... of the developments in whatever field it is that they're on. So, I don't know that the Bill speaks to how that is going to happen..."

Sullivan: "Right."

Burke, K.: "...and I think that's something the task forces will work on and that's the reason for having the journal folks as part of the task force."

Sullivan: "So, are you... and I guess we're kind of jumping ahead of what the task force is going to do, but in anticipation of that, you have so many instances, and you know, my wife worked in a hospital and publicly funded and she did research and they published, all that was not under what we're talking about. But what if she had and, you know, there's people that she would write a chapter for. And they would, she would enter in an agreement with them, and they would sell the books for profit. How would this task force tackle something like that

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- where, you know, my wife may work for the university but contracted outside with somebody. Is it because she's being supported by public funds? Is that an issue here?"
- Burke, K.: "I think you're talking about two different subjects.

 One is writing textbooks for a profit versus doing research and publishing papers that are advancing something in the field. I think those are two different instances and I don't think we're speaking to the text publishing right now."
- Sullivan: "But we are in a way, because when you enter in a publication agreement, you have subscriptions to that publications, and so there is somewhat a profit, and I'm fearful that maybe we're trying to walk down the path, through a task force, to see how we can undo those publications. That's my fear and that's where the line of questioning."
- Burke, K.: "So I appreciate that, and again, that's why the... a member of the task force is a representative of the publications. Other states have done this, so they do have some models to look at, and again, each school, each university or college is going to look at their own particular circumstances and... and make a report to their Board of Trustees. So we are not dictating in this law how or things are going to work. It's setting up a task force to look at how we can make this more accessible for our public."
- Sullivan: "So, last question. Of the states that have adopted this type of model, have there been problems, and maybe that was asked by a previous legisla... Representative, have there been problems where maybe they got sued or there was court cases or some type of adjudication of a problem where they

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

said, hey, you shouldn't get access to that but they did?
This is my proprietary information."

Burke, K.: "I'm not aware of it. I can't say it hasn't happened.

I'm not aware of it though."

Sullivan: "Sure. Okay. I don't know which way this is going to go, but I think one of the things that your task force maybe should be looking at is how this has happened, 'cause I think that's a distinct fear within the, you know, university community. But thank you for your comments."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'm sure that many of you have at one time or another tried to research something, maybe some issue that we're dealing with down here in the House. And many of you may be familiar with organizations like JSTOR or maybe Elsevier or maybe Xerox Microfilms. And you'll go looking for your article and all of a sudden the pop up menu will come up and say, you can't get that article. We'll only give you an excerpt of it. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know that many of you have run into that, and that is part of the problem, especially if you're trying to look for something that was scholarly research done at a state supported university that should be in the public domain. And I think that this Bill just gives you access to what essentially is yours, because those of us who have taught or who are associated with... with colleges and universities know that essentially, anything you do for that college or university belongs to the college or the university, not you. Now, if you publish a book, a statistics book or something like that, and you enter into your own contract for that book,

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

that's a different story. There's a big difference between a book that you're writing, you cutting your own deal with the publisher, and a piece of scholarly research, that essentially belongs to the institution. This is a really good Bill. It just makes what folks do in those colleges and universities available to you. Easy for you to access. It's as simple as that. This is good Bill and I hope you all support it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a first step. It's a task force that will look at all the different ways that we can... and try... see to get us started on a path where we can have some open access to the research that is done at our publicly funded universities. It is a first step; it's not definitive. The universities will spend, I'm sure, quite a deal... a great deal of time figuring out the best way to do this. They will look at other states, they will consider the fiscal ramifications of what they're doing, and come up with a policy that hopefully will provide open access to all this publicly funded research for the average person instead of merely through very, very expensive journals and databases. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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? Mr. Meier. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 349, offered by Representative Cloonen. House Resolution 351, offered by Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 352, offered by Representative Bradley. And House Resolution 353, offered by Representative Wheeler."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks 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. Ladies and Gentlemen, please pay attention. Upon adjournment, there will be a immediate Democratic Caucus in Room 114. So those of you who are applauding, I'm sorry. Immediate Democratic Caucus in Room 114. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost. Mr. Bost passes, but Mr. Reboletti's light is on. Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, at the end of business yesterday, I had asked the Chair to overturn the Chair's ruling regarding a particular Bill, and we adjourned. And it's my understanding from the House Rules that if there is a inquiry of the Chair, Motion pending, that the Body cannot adjourn. So, I'm still waiting for a ruling from the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "You're suggesting we actually didn't adjourn yesterday?"
- Reboletti: "No. I'm suggesting we didn't rule on my Motion that we should have not adjourned and that a violation of House Rules... a breach of House Rules occurred."
- Speaker Lang: "Would you like to restate what your motion was yesterday, Sir?"
- Reboletti: "I had moved to overrule the Chair. Leader Turner, I thought, made an error with respect to House Rules after consulting with the parliamentarian. I moved to overrule the

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

- Chair; that Motion was pending. I was the second to last speaker yesterday and then the Body adjourned."
- Speaker Lang: "So the reason that there was no vote on your Motion was that the Gentleman took the Bill out of the record and therefore, the Motion was moot. Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."
- Franks: "As a follow-up to my friend Mr. Reboletti's question, I was just wondering if it be... I was reading the Rule book, would it be improper for me to call an immediate Republican Caucus right now?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "I think we should probably ask the Members of the Democratic Caucus if... what they thought about that."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, we'll all be in Room 114 in a few minutes.

 Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "If he would like to switch over this side of the aisle and claim a title of Republican, he could make that Motion. And we'd be glad to have... over."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair has no comment. And now, allowing perfunctory time... excuse me. The Chair recognizes the producer of the COWL show, Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to stand and thank each and every one of you, particularly the cast and the behind the scene team. Michelle, Patti, Stephanie, Ann, Sandy, Kay, you all did a fantastic job. The cast was fantastic. Can we give the cast a round of applause please? Just want to thank everybody. We did a fantastic job in raising money for scholarship. Thank you all. See you in two years."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. And now, leaving the perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Nekritz moves that the

56th Legislative Day

5/16/2013

House stand adjourned until Friday, May 17 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 17 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. Please go, Democrats, to the immediate Democratic Caucus."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 628, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This is referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."