151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- 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 December 03, 2014: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 172."
- Speaker Turner: "Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Lee Crawford, the Pastor of Cathedral of Praise Christian Center in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, source of all wisdom in life, we pray today Your blessings to be upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this great House. We pray, God, as we come before Your great throne and humble ourselves before You, that we may reverence You. We pray and ask of Your gracious and loving God today to teach us in all things, seek first Your honor and Your glory. We pray that You would guide us to perceive what is right, grant to us both the courage to pursue it and the grace to accomplish it that we would perform that which is the good and that which is the perfect will of God. This we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

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

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. There are no excused Democrats to report to the House this morning."

Speaker Turner: "Congressman Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Durkin, Hays, and Poe are excused today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, on a count of 115 present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on December 03, 2014: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2047. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on December 03, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2774. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on December 03, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1342 and Senate Joint Resolution 79; Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1379, offered by Representative Acevedo, is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, on page 5 on the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, we have Senate Joint Resolution 67.

  Representative Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Joint Resolution 67 designates the Kaskaskia Trail as the… as

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

a scenic historic site. The Kaskaskia Trail was actually first mentioned by the French trappers in 1725 and is the oldest known road in the State of Illinois. I think it would be fitting for it to be designated as a scenic historic simble historic site. And I ask for your 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of SJR67. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', SJR67 is hereby adopted. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 4530. Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Sorry. Representative Hammond."
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 4530. It extends a TIF District for three communities in the State of Illinois. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #3 to House Bill 4530?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #3 to House Bill 4530 and this Bill is hereby declared passed. Representative Harms, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Harms: "Behind me today is my guest from my hometown of Watseka, are Gretchen Gran and Susan Windbenz, if we could give them a nice Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol. On page 4 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 4204. Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4204."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4204?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with the Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4204. Representative Harris, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Harris, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Chair?"
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Harris, D: "Was that final action on that Bill? On that Concurrence Motion?"
- Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir. We just took a vote."
- Harris, D: "I'd like to request that if there's a Concurrence Motion and its final action, that the Sponsor explain what the Bill or the Amendment does that we're concurring in."
- Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir. On page 4 of the Calendar, we have

  House Bill 1022 under the Order of Concurrence.

  Representative Walsh."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1022. And basically, what this Floor Amendment does is create a Task Force on Sustainable Transportation Funding. It will be responsible for reviewing the current trends between the infrastructure needs of Illinois and the revenue received from the federal and state gas tax. In researching and recommending possible alter... alternations and alternatives of how to modernize the State of Illinois's system of financing maintenance, improvement, and expansion of its public infrastructure systems. Basically, this is put together on a bipartisan level. Each leader gets appointments to this task force and they have to report by June 1 of 2013. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, comment, or debate...

Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm just looking at his Bill and I see...
you're asking us to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #3,
which creates a task force on sustainable transportation
funding?"

Walsh: "Yes."

Franks: "I'm looking at our analysis and it indicates that the Petroleum Marketers Association is opposed. Do you know why?"

Walsh: "Their opposition is from... basically, they feel that they're going to be left off this task force. I've talked to the Petroleum Marketers and asked them to reach out to the Leadership to see if they can get a seat at the table.

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Basically, this task force is created by appointments from the Legislative Leaders and from IDOT and the DOR and, basically, they would have to get that appointment from the Leadership."

Franks: "Is there..."

Walsh: "And I'd ask that... I would ask that they'd be a part of that."

Franks: "So would I."

Walsh: "I... we need to have all people that are in this discussion and all the players to be involved in it."

Franks: "I agree and I think they ought to be involved. And I could understand their opposition if they're not going to be included. Has there been any cost estimate to this... to this task force?"

Walsh: "There is going to be no compensation for it."

Franks: "So, just reimbursements for travel?"

Walsh: "I don't even think that's included in it, to tell you the truth."

Franks: "And when will the task force have to give a report as to their findings?"

Walsh: "The report findings are supposed to be submitted to the General Assembly by June 1 of 2015. Now, in discussion with this, there's some entities that would like to see that sooner. I am planning on running a trailer Bill to move that date up at least a month or two months. But that trailer Bill will be coming in the 99th General Assembly."

Franks: "Okay. I've done that before. I know somewhat... I'm short of times, especially with a new administration, you might

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

have trouble filling the... the task force membership right away."

Walsh: "Right."

Franks: "So I can understand why you'd want to move it. But I...

I'm... is the purpose of the task force to study an increase in

motor fuel tax? Or is it created for something else?"

"Well, they're looking at that. They're going to look at ... there's some ideas being floated around about a vehicle miles driven proposition that, I believe, it's a university professor that's come with. It's something that they've tested out in a pilot program in Oregon. But it ... it's looking at any and all methods to try to create a sustainable funding source so we're not using Capital Bills. Every time we pass a Capital Bill it's to do routine... routine road maintenance. And that's basically what's been happening over the last 10, 15, 20 years is we pass these Capital Bills and we're doing routine maintenance instead of capital projects. We need to find a... a viable source that we can have a dedicated road fund to go and do those... those routine maintenance... whether that's overlays, whether that's reconstructions of roadways, or bridge improvements, what not. We need to have that money available so we're not spending capital money on it and we can focus on schools and other things."

Franks: "Well, one thing we might want to look at is the pension issue when it comes to the transportation funding. 'Cause I know that a lot of"

Walsh: "That might..."

Franks: "One of the issues we ought to be looking at is the pension funding for IDOT, for instance, because maybe that

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

should be separated from the road funds, because that's a huge hit that they take in every budget that..."

Walsh: "And..."

Franks: "...doesn't go the roads."

Walsh: "...and I'm sure that's something that could be discussed in this task force."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I appreciate your answers.

Walsh: "Okay. Thanks, Jack."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Larry, I heard a little bit of the dialogue with Representative Franks about the composition of this task force. Can you elaborate a little bit on what your Bill requires but what you'd like to see done with respect to that composition?"

Walsh: "Well, right now. each... the way it's written is, each Leader gets to pick one Member from the House, one of us, one Member from the Senate on both sides, and then two Members from the public appointed by that Leadership. My consensus would be if... if I were choosing them, and which I'm not, I would like to see the road builders, the... the construction people, the... the general contractors, your labor unions, the Petroleum Marketers, the Petroleum Chemical Council. You know, all the players that basically make up how we fund our road systems right now to have a seat at this table and create a... a good strong bipartisan, bicameral task force that's going to try to give us an idea of where we need to go with the

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

funding that we need to have for our road systems throughout the State of Illinois."

Sandack: "So, while you and I, or anyone here, that's... to have no real power to make recommendations, we're at least laying the foundwor... the groundwork for putting people on this task force that can actually add value because they're the players."

Walsh: "Right."

Sandack: "They're the true stakeholders. And then I know there was some opposition about this just being a cover for an increase in taxes. It's a task force."

Walsh: "It's a task force."

Sandack: "They're making recommendations."

Walsh: "Yes."

Sandack: "And they're the folks that actually have the best knowledge of our infrastructure and transportation needs anyway."

Walsh: "Exactly. Exactly."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Walsh: "Thanks, Ron."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, I... I'm going to support your Bill today, but... and I'm assuming you're going to ask the Speaker to be on the task force as a... his appointee. I hope that you also talk about the expenditures. And over the last 10 or 15 years, yes, the... our buying power has been reduced because the motor fuel taxes haven't gone up and people are getting better gas mileage, but at the same time, we've seen this Legislative

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Body, and over in the Senate, pass Bills that divert road funds. we're spending it on Amtrak, we're spending it on RTA, we're spending it on work comp for other agencies. I hope we look at making sure that the dollars that are coming in for the motor fuel fund, or whatever source of revenue that this task force comes up with, actually go to pay for the roads. So..."

Walsh: "I... I don't"

Reis: "Like I said, I'm going to support your Bill and I hope you'll carry that water for us as you go forward."

Walsh: "Well... I... well, I thank you for your comments. And I'll do my best to see what we can get accomplished. And the main focus is to create a sustainable funding source for our infrastructure here in Illinois. And that's the bottom line, whether that's road, that's rail, that's waterways. We've got prime infrastructure in place now. We need to maintain it. We can't let it crumble, and we're to that point. So, this is... this is the whole focus of it."

Reis: "Agreed, but we can't keep filling the bucket from the top when the hole at the bottom gets... keeps getting bigger. Thank you."

Walsh: "I understand that."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Thank you for the questions. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1022?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1022. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1377, offered by Representative Lilly. House Resolution 1380, offered by Representative Stewart. House Resolution 1381, offered by Representative Stewart. House Resolution 1382, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth. And House Resolution 1383, offered by Representative Kosel."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves... Leader Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1, we have Senate Bill 2047. Representative McSweeney. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2047, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative McSweeney, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McSweeney: "I wasn't sure if we were doing the... We're not doing the Bill now? Okay."
- Speaker Turner: "Just moved it from Second to Third."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Members will please be in their chairs. We have a special guest today. And so, if the Members would take their seats. Staff please retire to the rear of the chamber. The Chair would like to welcome Representative DeLuca to today's deliberations. Mr. Moylan, you can take your seat. We're very pleased today to have with us the Consul General

from the Government of Canada to the Midwest of the United

States. Mr. Roy Norton is stationed in Chicago, but he

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

represents the Canadian Government, I believe in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, and Missouri. Missouri. Okay, just Illinois and Missouri. And Wisconsin. He can explain all of it when he gets up here. We all know that we enjoy a wonderful relationship with Canada, our neighbor to the north. I believe it's the largest trading partner that Illinois has. And there's a flow of goods and knowledge back and forth across the borders all of the time. And so, it's with great pleasure that I... I introduce to you the Consul General, Roy Norton." Consul General Norton: "I worked in the Canadian Parliament for 8 years after college and never got a standing ovation there. So, thank... thank you all very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your time this morning. I enjoyed meeting with you. I enjoyed meeting with Legislators. And this is a two-day visit, my first to the... to the Capitol, having become Consul General only last March, on St. Patrick's Day, in fact. I chose the day deliberately. It seemed to me that if one is coming to Chicago and starting a job, one would always remember having done so on St. Patrick's Day. And it's true, I'll never forget. You know this already. Canada and the United States are the closest friends and the best allies. It's a turbulent world; we've got one another's back in North America and abroad, as well. And I think that's a source of great comfort to both of our countries to know that we enjoy that kind of relationship. We're also, as the Speaker said, Illinois's best customer, and in fact, by far. You sell more to Canada than you do to your next four destinations, export

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

destinations... in the world. Those, by the way, are Mexico, China, Germany, and Australia, and between them, they've got 1.6 billion people. We have only 35 million. But our 35 million are really big and happy consumers of Illinois goods and services. Keep them coming. You make good quality products and we're glad to ... to consume them as Canadians. exceptional trade relationship that we enjoy means lots of good jobs in both places. We calculate, in fact, that something in the order of 345 thousand jobs in the State of Illinois depend on trade and investment with Canada. That's almost 5 percent of your workforce. In other words, we're talking here about a considerable proportion of Illinois society that's dependent on a relationship that, for the most part, just works, works smoothly and is largely below the radar screen. Trade-related jobs, as you know, generally are better paying jobs, they're good jobs. In other words, we've got a good thing going between our jurisdictions and our challenge is to grow it and not to jeopardize it. I believe that the economic relationship that Canada enjoys with Illinois is quite different from the one that you have with any of your other trading partners. In reality, we make things together: we're production partners far more than we are mere customers for one another. It's really hard to slap a label on things that are produced in my country and say, that's a product of Canada. And I raise that because a quarter of everything that we sell to the world actually consist of U.S. content in the first instance. We are very big consumers of U.S. goods and services, consistent with the stats I just cited in the case of Canada-Illinois trade, and we refashion

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

some of that and export it elsewhere in the world. This applies particularly in the automotive sector. statistics from Michigan's Center for Automotive Research suggest that 60 percent of the major content of cars or trucks coming off the assembly line in Canada actually is U.S. content in the first instance. And I'm thinking here of the power train, for example. This is a friendly occasion. I don't want it to get into specifics today of legislation that has sometimes come before this chamber, even past this chamber for that matter, but I would encourage you today, and going forward, when considering Bills that introduce a buy Illinois preference, to contemplate the impact on the integrated trade relationship that you enjoy with my country. And to think about whether such initiatives actually could counterproductive in the sense that they would discriminate against a U.S. firm that imports things from a Canadian subsidiary that's organized itself that way over the decades, or that could risk provoking retaliatory action or similar buy Canada policies, we don't have those at the moment, that would simply result in Illinois selling less to Canada. There is a federal protections law, this is not something of concern to this Legislative Body, that I, nonetheless, should mention because it's a bit of an irritant between my country and the United States at the moment; it's called Country of Origin Labeling in the agricultural sector. I've raised it with the State's Agricultural Director here, with the President of the Illinois Farm Bureau, and with most Members of the Illinois Congressional delegation in Washington. At least half of whom, actually, have signed a letter to Secretary Vilsack

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

saying that they don't want the United States any longer to pursue this policy because they're concerned, among other things, that \$240 million of Illinois agricultural sales to Canada could conceivably be at risk if this policy isn't changed. It's not about irritants, principally. In the energy sector, we have a spectacularly strong and mutually productive relationship. President Obama's first Ambassador to Canada, David Jacobson, a Chicagoan, often says that Illinois does more trade with the Canadian Providence of Alberta than it does with any other state in the Union, or, for that matter, with any other country. Last year, Illinois imported almost \$30 billion of Canadian energy. And it's imported raw, as it were, and it's refined, manufactured, as it were, here in the state creating jobs and adding value right in... in Illinois. Your major airports, Midway, O'Hare, principally derive their jet fuel from Canadian sourced product in the first instance. It's a good mutually beneficial relationship. Major U.S. companies have spent billions of dollars upgrading their Illinois refineries in order to be able to process Canadian energy, creating good jobs and reliability of energy supply right here in your state. I visited the Phillips 66 Cenovus Refinery in Wood River. It's just one example of value-added employment in Illinois from refining Canadian petroleum. The Canadian energy pipeline company, Enbridge, is currently embarked on a \$2 billion pipeline upgrade project in Illinois, creating about 3 thousand construction jobs in the 2013 to '15 period. And when that's done, they'll be paying more than \$4 million more in taxes to counties and localities, which go to fund schools

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

and the like. And I've visited in Morris, Aux Sable, a Canadian owned processor of natural gas that receives its natural gas from Canada, but also piggybacking on the same pipeline from the Bakken Field of North Dakota and Montana. In other words, the energy sector truly defines the integrated nature of the relationship. And we believe and hope that progrowth, pro-energy, and indeed, pro-environment policies will continue to be pursued at the state level and nationally in the United States so that oil will ideally move by pipeline, less so by train, which incites all sorts of apprehension in... in urban areas and actually is more consumptive of energy from the point of view of moving the energy around in the first instance. We have finally... finally for today anyway, I know my limitations in terms of trading on your time, an outstanding relationship in the environmental generally speaking. Environmental stewardship is something that both of our jurisdictions are committed to. We have many institutional arrangements in place, our two countries do, to govern the Great Lakes and the border. We're both committed, through the upgrade of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement in 2012, to ensure that this pristine resource that is so important for both of our jurisdictions remains accessible to generations well into the future. I'm available to meet with any and all of you anytime. Happy to come down here. Come to your districts. I'm getting around the state. Look forward to being in touch with you during my three-to four-year term as Consul General. And I'm very, very grateful to you for your attentiveness today on this, your almost last day, I guess,

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- of the legislative sitting before the holidays. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "For those that are interested, Mr. Norton will be down in the well to greet those who wish to greet him. And Representative Soto, as usual, is number one. Mr. Lang. Would Mr. Lang come to the Chair?"
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to recognize Nick Crisler, who's a Page today, and his parents, Cord and Susan are in the gallery. If we could give them a warm House welcome. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. On page 3 of the Calendar, Members, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there's appears Senate Bill 172. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 172, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. The Bill was read for second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we adopt the Amendment and then discuss the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "There being no objection, 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 have been filed, but several notes have been requested and have not been filed including

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

a Home Rule note, fiscal note, a state mandates note, as amended by House Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves that the notes be held inapplicable. As we did yesterday, we will take them one at a time. Mr. Clerk, the first note."

Clerk Bolin: "A Home Rule note has been requested on the Bill as amended by House Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves that the Home Rule note be held inapplicable. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A few questions of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "Thank you. Leader, explain why Home Rule... the Home Rule note is inapplicable in your..."

Currie: "It doesn't have any..."

Sandack: "...Perspective."

Currie: "There's no differential impact with respect to this Bill and the Home Rules communities verses any other kind. So, I think that this might be described, the filing of this note might be described as a stalling, harassing tactic rather than..."

Sandack: "Harassing?"

Currie: "...a real wish for good information."

Sandack: "Leader, the idea that anything that I... we have done on this side could be even rise to the level of harassing is your opinion. Preposterous."

Currie: "So, again, this doesn't have anything to do with the reasons for a Home Rule note. This doesn't expand Home Rule powers, take them away, has nothing to do with Home Rule."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Lang: "Those who support the Lady's Motion 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 record yourselves, Members. Sandack, Williams. Williams. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. The Lady's Motion carries and the Home Rule note is held inapplicable. The next note, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "A fiscal note has been requested."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the fiscal note be held inapplicable. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Dare I ask, Leader, if this could be deemed as harassing when we know for a fact there will be expenditures associated with the expanse laid out in your Bill? None-the-less, I'd like an explanation from your perspective as to why you believe a fiscal note should be deemed inapplicable."

Currie: "Again, I think this is not applicable. We've talked to the State Board of Elections. I think they're going to be able to manage the new responsibilities without incurring major new costs."

Sandack: "Well, you... with all due respect, Leader, you talking to the State Board of Elections is all well and good, but have they been asked what the fiscal impact will be for your Bill?"

Currie: "They... the answer is they don't know. But they do believe that they can manage with the resources that are available to them."

Sandack: "To..."

Currie: "So, again, I renew my Motion."

Sandack: "And I renew that the entirety of the... of the argument that a fiscal note be deemed inapplicable is borderline

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

preposterous. No, let me check that. It is preposterous. There will be a fiscal consequence to passing this Bill. And if everyone here should deem a fiscal note be deemed inapplicable when there will be an expenditure, we ought not have fiscal notes. And please bear in mind, when you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this chamber, wish to really know the fiscal impact of what we're doing, just know that it doesn't really matter. That the Rules here don't matter. That I find offensive. And Mr. Speaker, I know that people want to leave real soon. This is kind of an important Bill, and maybe we could lower the volume a little bit."

Speaker Lang: "It worked, Sir. Have you completed your remarks?

Mr. Bost."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Lady's Motion. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know everybody's wanting to leave here. I know you're thinking we're going to get out and everything but ... but listen to what we're doing. We're looking at this Bill and... and the Motion is that the fiscal impact note that... that there no cost to this Bill that we're going to come up with. That we don't really need to find out what the cost is. Well, folks, I will quarantee you will there not only be a cost to the state, but there'll be a cost to every county in this state if this Bill moves forward. The reason why we have the notes on these Bills is not for harassment purposes, it's so that we can actually make our decision based on true information we can receive from our agencies. It is not in a way of harassment that we ask for this note. This will affect every one of your counties. It will affect this state. The cost is going to be very large. You need to know what that is

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

so you can make an informed decision. But that's okay, keep talking, pay no attention to what's going on, and pay no attention to the man behind the curtain because, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to get it again. This is going to happen again and again. And it is going to affect you, and once again, this is a case where Rules of this House are just being thrown by the wayside so that it... cause, so... because something of a political nature can it be advanced by the Leaders in this chamber. And they're going to affect every member of your district, and you're allowing it to happen. Once again, like a bunch of lemmings."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "She certainly does."

Reboletti: "Leader, I wasn't in the chamber, unfortunately, to hear your comment about harassment, so could you please explain to me what a Member who represents 108 thousand people, follows the Rules, that is a second vote that we take after the for vote Speaker. How is it harassment when somebody demands some fiscal accountability that it's harassment?"

Currie: "Maybe..."

Reboletti: "Because it doesn't serve your purpose."

Currie: "Maybe, I used the wrong... Representative, perhaps I used the wrong word. Perhaps, the right word would be persnickety."

Reboletti: "A while... that may be true."

Currie: "Do you..."

Reboletti: "Leader, with all due respect, the fact that you may call whatever you may, which is part of the Rules, and I'm sure there is some 1995 references, Speaker Daniels, what

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

happened 20 years ago when I was in law school, we're still going to abide by, but the fact of the matter is, the Gentlemen brought something in appropriate fashion that should be vetted by the appropriate agency so that everybody in the chamber can understand the fiscal impact before the taxpayer in Illinois bears the burden. Be it their state tax that they have to pay, from their property taxes, from a sales tax. God forbid we have transparency and accountability. Why can't we have this vetted, Leader?"

- Currie: "Representative, I think I explained already that the state board has not yet been able to calculate total cost, but they assure us that the costs are not insurmountable. And as you know, a fiscal note does not tell us what the costs to local government would be of a particular legislative measure."
- Reboletti: "Well, what I've learned here again, today, is that Rules only apply when the Majority tries to keep down the Minority's voice. And I can... and that, Mr. Speaker, is harassment. But I... I will continue to speak louder, Mr. Speaker, or I won't speak at all until the Body will come to order."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, you're exactly right. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a pretty important piece of legislation. Let's get through it. There's going to be debate. People aren't going to be happy, but let's keep the noise down so we can get through this debate. It's important that we do that. But I would also ask those who are speaking, to remember that we're on a note Motion, not on the Bill. Please proceed."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Reboletti: "Right. And... Mr. Speaker, to the note, to the Motion, here we go again. Happy birthday, Illinois. While we try to ram legislation down your throat very quickly, and God forbid somebody stand up and ask a question, it's harassment. I don't thinks it's harassment that I need to know that the people in DuPage and Cook County that I represent have some general idea of how much this may cost them because when it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions of dollars, too bad, got to get this done. Hurry up, because, oh my God, the Republicans won an election. So screw the Rules, you'll just take your medicine, this is your punishment, sit down and shut up. And I'm not going to do it, not on any of these notes, or the underlying Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The Clerk advises that the fiscal note has been received and filed. Leader Currie withdraws her Motion. What is the next note, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "A state mandates note has been requested."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves that the state mandates note be held inapplicable. There being no debate, those in favor of the Lady's Motion say 'yes'... vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Turner. Turner. Please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion carries. And the mandates note is held inapplicable. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "There are no further note request. The Motion has been filed by Representative Sandack to discharge Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 172."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Lang: "Under Rule 18(g), this move... this Motion requires unanimous consent. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I object to the Motion."

Speaker Lang: "The Motion fails. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request a Roll Call vote on my Motion pursuant to the rights granted in the House Rules and the Illinois Constitution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, since the Rules require unanimous consent, no Roll Call is necessary. Leader Currie stands in opposition to your Motion. Your Motion fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Motions have been filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 172, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This has been a long time in the making, a long time in the coming. What this measure will do will make our experiment of November 4, 2014, when people were allowed to register and vote on Election Day, that will make that a permanent part of Illinois law. And in fact, people will be able to register and vote in their own precincts on Election Days yet to come. I was talking with a woman who, 30 years ago, worked on legislation for the League of Women Voters. I believe she'd said that the measure was sponsored by then President Phil Rock and House Speaker Mike Madigan. It included same-day registration and voting. It didn't happen 30 years ago. But finally, Illinois is willing and able to join the 12 other states that offer their citizens a chance to have a fail-safe when it comes to

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

participating in our democracy. This Bill makes many other changes. For example, some of them are... are not perhaps quite as major as this, but it will allow people to... have ballots postmarked on Election Day still be counted. We are expanding early voting opportunities, even to and including the day before Election Day, all the way through Monday. We're expanding campus opportunities for registration and vote, so that they will cover all of the state universities in Cook County, not just those universities that are out of ... out of the populous part of Illinois. We are going to participate in the Electronic Registration Information Center. That's called ERIC and that will make it easier for us to track people who have moved away from Illinois or into Illinois and help make sure they have an opportunity to register and vote. And we're going to require the State Board of Election, biannually, to check the national change of address database, again, giving us the opportunity to make sure people who want to be registered are easily able to do so. So, we will give ... yeah, one of my favorite items here actually is that if the election authority hands out 'I voted' stickers, they have to give them to everyone. So, I would be happy to answer your questions, and I would appreciate your support for what, I think, is a major improvement in Illinois election laws starting in... in 2015."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Enough. Ladies and Gentlemen, this week has been overwhelming, overwhelming the destruction we have done to the State of Illinois. This

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

just caps it off. We just went through election where people wanted bipartisan solutions. This is not it. What in the world are we thinking about passing a Bill on election reform when we certify the ballot two days ago ... three days ago? We haven't even seen the results of what happened; what went right, what went wrong. It's called analysis. Let's wait for the analysis, but that's not going to happen today. Your Party is going to vote for this and it's not time. It's not time for the vote for this. They've asked us, the electorate has asked all of us, please be bipartisan, come with solutions to make things right in Illinois and this Bill isn't it. This Bill is opposite of what took place in the election. And it's an elections Bill. Come on, people, we're better than this. We're better than ramrodding through something before the next administration has a chance to even weigh in on what's going on. We're better than this. But I don't think that's what's going to happen. So, in my 12 years down here, going to be 13, 'cause I actually won an election on an election' Bill, we haven't had this opportunity. We have not had this opportunity to work together in a bipartisan manner to do real reform, real good things for the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, please, think this through. This is not a victory lap. It's time to do real reform. Let's push this Bill aside. Let's relook at it in February, March and let's do real reform, not this. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Turner in the Chair. Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Brady: "Leader, I've got a couple of questions and I'm going be brief. I don't want to beat a dead horse and I don't want to talk about something that your side's going to do their way and we're going to do our way. But I would like to know a couple of things if I could. Since the election, what type of data has come back from the election authorities in the State of Illinois supporting that this is a good idea?"

Currie: "In fact, the Clerk's Association supports this Bill.
So..."

Brady: "Do you..."

Currie: "...we've heard..."

Brady: "Do you know then..."

Currie: "Originally, we heard from David Orr. He's a supporter of the Bill. But then... and in committee on Monday, we did learn that the clerks are for this Bill... across the state they're for this Bill."

Brady: "In what... what county would David Orr be the election authority of?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Brady: "What county would David Orr be the election authority of?"

Currie: "He is the Cook County Clerk."

Brady: "And that's..."

Currie: "But we... and we also had asked all the clerks for their input when the Bill was being drafted. So, if they had suggestions for us, we took the suggestions seriously.

Brady: "Okay."

Currie: "For example, while we're requiring in-precinct opportunities to register and vote on Election Day, for those

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

jurisdictions of a hundred thousand or fewer people that do not have electronic poll books, they will not have to require it in every precinct until they begin to catch up with the 21st century. So, that came from a clerk... from the clerk themselves who were concerned about being required to offer in-precinct registration and vote opportunities on Election Day itself."

Brady: "That's all nice. And that's nice fluff. But I'm concerned about my election authorities and the people in my district that I represent and the fairness of elections throughout the State of Illinois. Quite frankly, I don't think this Bill speaks to that. But I just want to go on the record, Leader, knowing that my election authority, the McLean County Clerk and the Bloomington Election Commission Authorities, they oppose this Bill. And so, I don't know how the Clerks Association speaks for all the clerks across the State of Illinois when they have individual election authorities and clerks that oppose the Bill. So, I just want to go on the record saying that. And I think it's important to note, as some of my colleagues have spoken to earlier, the need to do this right now, quite frankly, leaves me scratching my head with what little hair I have left."

Currie: "Well, our understanding was that your clerk does support the Bill. Let me just say, for the record, that we invited all the clerks to give us data about how Election Day had worked. Some 40 of them responded to our request for information. And again, we tried to base our drafting on what we heard from the people who are most involved in the establishment and the administration of the election system."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Brady: "That's... that's very nice. But for the record, both my election authorities have both contacted me, both oppose this Bill. So, the façade that you're putting out there, that this is some type of unanimous support across the state, it's really not factual, Leader."

Currie: "Well, their association is definitely on board."

Brady: "Well, I think associations sometimes are associations. It doesn't necessarily mean that they speak for every clerk or every election authority across the State of Illinois. And the concerns brought to me are something I just want to be made of the record. And furthermore, and what's, I think, extremely important, is the fact that I don't know anywhere in the most recent election where we have got data that supports that things in this Bill are so needed, so right, and so important that it be done right now. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Leader Currie, my colleague, Representative Brady, asked you about data and you went into a conversation about who supports the Bill. I'd like to focus on data. Because I did get the fiscal report when we were debating the supposed inapplicability of a fiscal note, and there's significant fiscal impact. But to the data that you have when you filed the Bill. What experience, what metrics support these changes that you're pro... that you're advancing in this Bill?"

Currie: "Well I simply... again, we did invite all of the clerks, statewide, to give us information, to give us data about how

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Election Day worked for them. And we are delighted that the idea of expanding in-person Election Day precinct registration and voting is one that the clerks are comfortable with. I think this is a major seat change and a very important change to make Illinois a more... a more voter friendly state than it has been in the past."

Sandack: "Leader, I have no doubt about the propriety of the rationale that supports your Bill. What I have significant doubts about are other than anecdotal evidence. You have two clerks association that support your Bill, but you have no data."

Currie: "But we do. We..."

Sandack: "We, just as Representatives Sullivan said..."

Currie: "That's a..."

Sandack: "...we just had, excuse me, we just had the results certified days ago. So, there is no data showing us what good things happen versus some of the things that were struggles and may be challenges."

Currie: "As I say, we got lots of data from the clerks, from the 40 who responded to our request. And we feel quite comfortable, and so do they, with the draft that is part of Senate Bill 172."

Sandack: "Well, I can assure you that DuPage County elected...
electoral officials do not share in your approval of the data
and in support of your Motion... or your Bill. Excuse me."

Currie: "Yeah. Well, our staff tells that me they've had frequent and lengthy conversations with that authority and we believe that they are not opposed to this Bill."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Sandack: "Well, I can assure you they have not slipped in support; they have not taken a position in support of this Bill. And while you may have conversations, which is wonderful, you should, since you're proposing some radical changes to the way they conduct their business. I can assure you, Leader, they are not in support of the Bill, as drafted, in its current form. There may be portions of the Bill it support, as do I. Let's move on. I'm looking at the report on Senate Bill 172 from the State Board of Elections. Do you have that in front of you, Leader?"

Currie: "Are you talking about the fiscal note, Mr. Sandack?"

Sandack: "I am, yes."

Currie: "Yeah. Yeah."

Sandack: "This is the same fiscal note we were debating minutes ago where you said there was no impact or the note..."

Currie: "No... yeah, I said"

Sandack: "...request that we filed was inapplicable, I think you used."

Currie: "I didn't say none. I said not so significate that we thought it would be awkward or difficult for the state board to meet the requirements of the Bill."

Sandack: "Well, the first paragraph of the State Board of Elections' statement says, the key impact of this fiscal note is a complete and extensive restructuring of the statewide IVRS system will be required to comply with the mandates of this legislation."

Currie: "Yes."

Sandack: "This restructuring will require extensive IT consulting resources to rewrite its system. Now, you may not think that's

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

a big deal, but it looks like the State Board of Elections disagrees with you."

Currie: "I... I think that given what value we will get from these technological 21st century changes, I think the cost is not enormous, is not staggering, and it is well worth the cost to expand opportunities for our citizens to participate in our democracy."

Sandack: "You may well be right. Of course, we really haven't had a chance to vet that because there's been no data from any of the electoral boards. There's been absolutely nothing but anecdotal evidence and you're expanding what we just did as an experiment a month ago."

Currie: "Yeah. And the reason we're doing it now is because the experiment was a success."

Sandack: "Says who, Leader?"

Currie: "The experiment worked."

Sandack: "Says who?"

Currie: "And we think it's important for the clerks to begin planning now knowing what the... what the scene is going to look like for the next election. I don't want them coming back to us and saying, gee, we had no idea we were going to have to give people the opportunity to have early voting expanded hours or the opportunity..."

Sandack: "Leader, I have no complaints about..."

Currie: "I think it's great."

Sandack: "...some of the things you want to do."

Currie: "I think giving them notice..."

Sandack: "But we're not doing it in the right."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Currie: "...giving them notice is a very important part of our job as lawmakers. And I think that the idea we're giving them this long a time to get themselves up and running is only a plus."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I know some folks want to leave and I know many people think just pushing the green button is a perfunctory act. What we are being asked to do in truncated time period is fundamentally different than, frankly, what we just experienced over a month ago. And if the changes sought by the Leader were genuine and if process and bipartisanship mannered... mattered, we'd be having the discussion about some of the good things this Bill does next month, rather than having it jammed down our throats after yesterday's debacle. Folks, this is bad process. It embarrasses our state. There are many things in this Bill folks on our side would be happy to support, but we're not given the opportunity to engage in legitimate Bill making process. So let me be clear, I'm voting 'no' and I'm suggesting you vote 'no' for a variety of reasons. Most of which is because this is Chicago politics at its worst. Let me be clear, folks. The people of Illinois just spoke and they spoke clearly. They want bipartisan change, they don't want Chicago-style ramrodding occurring, and make no mistake, that's exactly what this Bill does. This allows Chicago ward bosses to... the ability to bundle absentee ballots. That's really a bad thing given Chicago ward bosses reputations, all deservedly earned. This allow processing of votes before Election Day. That should cause some pause. Excuse me, Mr. Franks, you can talk when it's your turn. This puts rural

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

voters at a disadvantage, Mr. Franks. Something that should cause you some semblance of pause. It places additional mandates on state and local governments. And there's a corresponding cost. Something that most fiscal conservatives, like the aforementioned Mr. Franks, likes to popularly pound their chest and say they are, but when real costs are put forward and real expense is said to cause some pause, let's just go push the green button. Folks, this is a really bad Bill. And those who vote 'yes' really should think through the consequences of that perfunctory act. Stop being lemmings, Ladies and Gentlemen. Start thinking. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Please bring the noise down in the chamber. Thank you. Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I know everybody's kind of tired and we're about to hear some breathless and Academy Award winning speeches from the other side, but let's talk... and before anyone jumps up, think about the disrespect that's just been lobbed toward the Leader, in terms of things being fluffy and everything else. So, let's talk, just for second, about what this Bill actually does, 'cause I actually agree with some folks who stood up said and that this Bill isn't well timed because, this Bill is overdue. This Bill should've happened a long time ago. We have seen the results of what happens when we implement early voting and same-day registration, not just here, but in other states. There are people who are concerned about cost. Well, we implemented same-day registration in Iowa in 99 counties in advance to the 2008 election. It cost them a grand total of \$40 thousand. We are not talking about something that breaks

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

the bank, but what we are talking about is initiatives that allow young people, people of color, people who've recently moved for school or for work to have access to their fundamental democratic right, which is the ability to vote. And to those who are standing in opposition to this, I have a very simple question for you. What are you afraid of? What are you afraid of? We just had a situa.... You just won the Governor's mansion for the first time in 12 years, so it's clear that voters in Illinois are capable of making independent decisions. What are you afraid of if more people come to the polls and vote? I have the Martin Luther King Center in my district on Election Day and people sit in line for 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 hours just to have a chance to cast a ballot on Election Day. They waited, even though they had other things to do and they did it because they wanted to exercise their right to vote. We ought to make it so these folks can vote in their own precinct, so that no one is turned away from the polling place because they had to wait too long. This is a good commonsense Bill. We have seen it work in the State of Illinois. We've seen it work in surrounding states, like Minnesota, that have identical demographics. People are putting up straw men and they are being dishonest. This is a good solid piece of legislation and everyone in this chamber ought to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Before I go into asking some questions, my question to the previous speaker, what are you afraid of? Why can't we do

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

this next year? Why can't we vet this through the proper committees and the get the proper information from the elections, the proper... the recommendations from our county clerks? What are you afraid of?"

Currie: "I'm not afraid of a thing. In fact, we asked..."

Reis: "I was making a..."

Currie: "...the county clerks."

Reis: "...statement. I was making a sta..."

Currie: "That's what this Bill is all about. It's what the clerks told us works and works for the voters."

Reis: "I have nine county clerks that are all against this. We didn't ask them. They told me all fall what a disaster this was. I was making a statement to the proper... the previous speaker."

Currie: "Oh, I'm sorry, I thought it was a question."

Reis: "No, it was not a question to you..."

Currie: "I apologize, Representative."

Reis: "...and it was not a... statement directed towards you. But I can ask the same thing. What are you afraid of? We passed..."

Currie: "Was that a question?

Reis: "...a major, major..."

Currie: "Now, was that a question or was that a statement?"

Reis: "A rhetorical question to the previous speaker. We passed a major election Bill in May. You didn't seem to mind that they didn't have only a couple months to implement those changes. So, surely we could do something next year for the next election. Now my questions to you, Leader. We are making permanent a change that was made this year eliminating the requirement for voter ID in early voting. Is that correct?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Currie: "We did adopt, in the state, a Constitutional Amendment that would seem to guarantee people the right to vote free from instances of discrimination based upon factors such as race or ethnicity, and so forth. So, I think that it is appropriate to say, yes, you don't have to show ID, your name is on the polling books, here you are signing your own name when you... when you cast your ballot. I think that's good enough."
- Reis: "Well, we differ on that issue. But I really differ on it, in that on Election Day, which is what legislation that I have introduced in the past, you had both the judges there. And I know things are a little different, but... down home than they are in Chicago, but you had Republican judges in the polling place, you had Democratic judges. That pretty well offered a little bit of comfort to those of... to those of us who want photo ID. But when you're voting early, only the County Clerk and his or her staff are present. There are no judges from the opposing party there that day."

Currie: "In fact..."

- Reis: "How do you know that that's that person when they walk in?"
- Currie: "Many... many of the election jurisdictions do appoint judges for the day when there is early voting. And again, I think we have a constitutional right in this state to vote without having to show identification."
- Reis: "It list a dozen things that you have to show an ID for, but not to... not to vote. This also includes a change that says you can early vote up until the day before the election.

  Does that incl..."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Currie: "Well, no... it... through the day before the election. That extends early voting to the Monday before elections."

Reis: "Does that include Sunday?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Reis: "Does that include Sunday?"

Currie: "Yes. It does include Sunday, which we've done... which we've done."

Reis: "But is it... a re..."

Currie: "The hours on Sunday are shorter than they are on the other weekdays. But extending it to the day before elections would mean the same hours on the Monday before the election as now would work for other weekdays in the early voting activity."

Reis: "Is it a requirement to have voter's precincts open on Sunday?"

Currie: "If they have... Yeah, if they have a permanent polling place then that would be open. Yes."

Reis: "But it's a requirement, they can't opt out."

Currie: "The counties... Yeah, right."

Reis: "So, it's a requirement that..."

Currie: "It was a requirement this year and that doesn't change with this legislation except we make it permanent."

Reis: "Okay."

Currie: "And again, the in precinct on Election Day does... in the precinct doesn't apply for the counties that are under a hundred thousand and do not have electronic polling books."

Reis: "Okay. It was mentioned by the Speaker that the fiscal note had been filed. What... what did that fiscal note say?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Currie: "It's says that it's going to cost the State Board around \$1 million to begin bringing its equipment into the 21st century. So... so, information technology changes will cost a little something, but, I would say giving people the opportunity fully to participate in the electoral system is worth every penny."

Reis: "And what about the cost to the counties? I know the fiscal note that doesn't cover that, but..."

Currie: "No, the fiscal..."

Reis: "...what's your expectations?"

Currie: "...our fiscal notes do not cover local costs never have..."

Reis: "But here..."

Currie: "...never will."

Reis: "...here are some things. We're are going to have cost to hear new objections from single county races, cost to join ERIC, cost to develop mobile apps, cost to develop interface with agency registration, cost for cross-referencing national change of address databases."

Currie: "Right. And those are State Board of Elections costs and you can see from the fiscal note what they're target... what their general sense is of the costs to them. Now, it's possible we will get some help from private sources to pay for initial ERIC work. And I would say that the value of both the participation in ERIC and the national change of address database will be to have cleaner election rolls, will help the clerks bleed out people who shouldn't be in the system, and make sure people have the opportunity to register to vote."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Reis: "Okay. There are also costs to local election authorities. Extended hours, extra manpower. I have counties that have less than 10 thousand people in them. And we just keep doing this top-down thing where the whole state has to do it, but there are a lot of counties that just... they can't justify all these extra costs and all these extra days and all this extra manpower to drag on an election that may only have 2 thousand people in the whole county vote."
- Currie: "Well, again, we worked with the clerks and small counties do not have to provide in-precinct registration and votes on Election Day if they don't... if they're under a hundred thousand in population and they do not have electronic voting records. So, we were responsive to the clerks including, I hope, your own."
- Reis: "Well, they don't feel that way, Leader Currie. To the Bill.

  I go back to my original statement. We've been asked what we are afraid of. What are you afraid of? We're doing this in a last minute of Veto Session. We really haven't gotten true data back from the election. We, for sure, haven't heard from all the counties. There's some other things we need to change.

  I know universities measure 100 feet from the front of the room that they're polling in. They're handing out flyers in university buildings. There's letters that got sent out with absentee ballots missing from them. There's a whole host of other things that we could address in an election reform Bill that we're not being given the opportunity to do. This is something that we should do next year after the new people have sworn in. Based on the election from this fall I would encourage a 'no' vote."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was ... my name was used in Franks: debate. And I... I was listening to the debate closely, and it seems like my friends on the other side of the aisle simply want to delay this. And they want to go home without doing their jobs. And I think this... this is an important Bill. Let me tell you what happened on election night in Lake County. We did the provisional voting for the first time. And how they set it up was in such a way as to disenfranchise people. They followed the letter of the law but not the spirit of the law. So what they had is they sent people to a central area and said, go wait in line for hours and hours and we will have two people there to check you out and then maybe we'll let you vote after about a 12 minute delay on each person. So, I go over there to watch what's happening. And there's hundreds of people in line, young people, people who had never voted before, who really wanted to be part of the process. But they were being disenfranchised, because the way this was set up was to make it so hard that people would give up. And I was watching people standing in line and then just say, you know what, after an hour and half, forget it. I... young... and it was so heartbreaking to me because these kids, these young people really wanted to be part of it and they could not be part of it. This Bill fixes a lot of those problems. We've had an antiquated system and we have to pretend we're going to be out of town for absentee voting and make up something why we can't be there. This gets rid of that nonsense. This allows more people to vote. So, it's really simple, folks. If you're for voter suppression, vote 'no'. If you... if you are

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

happy with 17 percent voter turnout in the primary, then vote 'no'. If you're happy with 46 percent statewide turnout in non-Presidential elections, then vote 'no'. But if you want more people involved in our democracy, if you want more people voting, if you want more people engaged, if we want to have new leaders, if we want to make sure that our democracy continues, then vote 'yes'. There is nothing to be afraid of when more people are involved. What I'm hearing is, you know what I don't really like the type of people who might be voting because they might not be voting for me. I am totally serious. Because that's what's it about. Because if you want more people voting, you will vote for this Bill. If you want less people voting, you will vote 'no'. That's what it... that's what it boils down to; that is the issue. So, if you want more people voting, vote 'yes'. If you want to keep it down so protected insiders are able to protect their fiefdoms, vote 'no'. But I am not happy with the system, and we need more people involved, and we need change. This is a way to effectuate change. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, just a reminder. Everyone will have a chance to speak. There is no need to shout over the Speaker or the Member who has the mic. So, please be respectful of all Mem... Members as we continue with the debate. Thank you very much. Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is probably one of the most cynical Bills that we have seen on the House Floor. This Bill started out as an election law going through the normal process in the spring. Well... this... the origination of this Bill, which was HB 105, passed on May 30. It started

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

out in the norm... the normal process. It then morphed in to a Bill that, 36 hours prior to ending Session in May, became an omnibus election Bill, the mother of all election Bills. And at that time, the Sponsor said, 'oh, we're just going... this is just a trial Bill. We're just going to see how it works and then we're going to study it, and then we're going to make sure that the processes was good. Well, what could be further from the truth than passing a Bill now, three days after certification, without any study, any analysis, only antidotal evidence and nothing? But in May, when you passed this five month... a temporary voting Bill, all that was promised to us was, we're just going to see how this works for this election cycle. That's what was promised to us. And now... and now, barely after the election, we're going to go ahead and make it all permanent without any analysis. And if you are in DuPage County and you represent part of the DuPage Legislator, I'll let you know that I have actually been in contact with our election... one of our election commissioners, and he has e-mailed me and he or texted me and has says, look this is going to cost thousands of dollars. It's a significant increase in needed manpower and paperwork. Also, keep in mind, same-day registration is for people who so poorly manage their time that they've passed up every opportunity to register in advance. No real studies on the actual demand for this service has been seen. There's a rush to pass legislation that hasn't been vetted. So, we need to take a deep breath and study what just occurred. And he's absolutely right. And that's what you promised. Talk about cynicism. You promised in May that this would be temporary,

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

we would see how it worked, and then we'd move on from there. And now, we're back in Session... barely back in Session, this has not been vetted, it's not gone through a normal committee process, and you're going to make permanent all these changes. Additionally, the worst thing about this Bill is you're actually engaging additional state agencies in registration processee... process when it is not their primary duty. Where there's no oversight that that registration is being taken properly, as if they are a qualified and certified registrar. And you can do it online, additionally. Well, we know how that's worked in the Medicaid program. We know that we've had outer... out-of-staters who have participated in our Medicaid program for years with no oversight. So now, are we going to have Indianans coming over and voting in Illinois? Well, maybe, we'll get a better result. Who knows? But it's very cynical for the other side to sit there and promise one thing at May, that we would look at the results of this and study it before making it permanent, and then come back three days after certification of the ballots in November and decide to make it permanent without any further study. If you're a DuPage Legislator, you should vote 'no'. If you care about voter integrity, you should vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the… actually, to the Bill. When we… when we put this in place in May, we gave the counties only a few months to put this in place. My counties, right now, as is, already have a hard time finding enough election judges to cover the current responsibilities. So what happened was, in the… in the Clerk's Office, phones were

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

going unanswered. So, people calling to probably find their polling places or doing something like that, their phones were going unanswered because they... they didn't have enough time. They don't have the manpower to put this in place in smaller counties. I represent nine counties. Nine counties. I have an e-mail here from one of my county clerks, who just happens to be a Democrat, and he says, I know the thought behind a lot of these election Bills is to increase voter turnout, but, we had 600 less voters this year than we did in 2010, while still having the same registered voters. Somewhere along the line, people need to be responsible for their actions. Currently, we give them about six weeks to vote and correct their registration. When is enough, enough? I'm asking this Body, when is enough, enough? Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker. Before I begin, what I will attempt to have an Academy Award winning performance, I'm going to ask for a verification of this vote, should it pass."

Speaker Turner: "Verification has been requested, Representative."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I would ask questions of the Majority Leader, but I don't want to get that, nobody reached out to me, because, oddly enough, the County Board Chairman of DuPage reached out to me. He's opposed to it because he has no idea how much it will cost, and what it will cost the taxpayers in the county, how he could implement it as quickly as he could. The DuPage Board of Election approached me immediately. I got an e-mail 4:20 in the morning about the Bill, the concerns with the Bill. Do you think you could work in a bipartisan

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

way with the Sponsor? And for eight years, I've tried to do that. Sure, we can reach across the aisle only when it works on one side. So, the gentleman from McHenry tried to take ... I'm going to only use me to task that what am I afraid of? Well, first, I'm not afraid of what the voters say one way or the other. I've won elections, and I've lost elections. Number two, what were you afraid of when we actually filed notes and that was harassment? What was anybody afraid of? And if the system is so antiquated, why isn't anybody who's been here more than a couple days do something about it? You've been here for 10 years or 16 years, you say, oh, my god, you guys are trying to keep people's voting rights away from them. Nonsense. Nobody's trying to keep anybody away from the polls. In Chicago, when there's nine hours of waiting, that's keeping people away from the polls. Why is that? Because when you passed a Leave No Democrat behind Bill in the end of Session, you kn... you thought that that was going to be the magic bullet that would provide another term of one-Party rule. But the people who participated said differently. They wanted divided government. Damn them for participating because I don't like the result from your side of the aisle. And so, now, we'll punish those who have participated by saying you know what, your vote doesn't matter because other people didn't matter. It's kind of like when the President said, Oh, only 33 percent participated in the midterm elections, but, I hear the other two-thirds. What does that mean? Elections are what matter. The people who go to the polls matter. You expanded every opportunity for people to cast their ballot. We passed a Constitutional Amendment to make sure that it happened

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

unfettered. There is a major concern, on my part, for fraud. Damn that. God forbid somebody'd check an ID to make sure that when the ward boss or committee men is delivering ballots or taking ballots that it's actually the person that is voting. That they're actually taking that ballot and recording it appropriately. So, here's the rush. We don't want to work in a bipartisan manner because we have to hurry up and flush everything down the drain as quickly as possible before bipartisanship starts in a matter of a few weeks. So, instead of being afraid, why don't we all embrace the opportunity to work in a bipartisan manner? But no, we can't do that here because, unfortunately, minds of many on that side of the aisle are Republican one. Not one office, but two offices. And so, in one election, your Bill probably worked. So, now, we can't have this continued experiment of divided government for four more years because we'll get through that, we'll tolerate it, but then we can rush to judgment here when, as the previous speaker said, why won't we simply go to the county clerks, the Board of Elections from throughout the state, ask them what worked, what didn't work, ask them for their expertise? And I know why they didn't call here, Mr. Speaker, because it's so loud... they sure... nobody would hear their phone ringing."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we all... take all conversations to the rear of the chamber? It's becoming increasingly difficult to hear the debate. Can we keep the noise down? Thank you very much."

Reboletti: "You know, when... when people get up and pontificate about not wanting people to vote, you know, I sat here watched

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

remapping and redistricting that had nothing to do with anything about helping people participate that alienated people. That's okay 'cause it worked in your favor. And I'm not here to win an Academy Award, as one of the ... a previous speaker suggested. I'm not here to try to suppress anyone's vote, 'cause I voted for the referendum, here on the House Floor and in my precinct in Elmhurst, 'cause I want everybody to vote. Our men and women in the military sacrifice their lives, and their limbs, and their opportunities so that we have that precious right. So, I don't think one of us here on this floor is trying to suppress anybody's vote. I wish more people participated in voting. I encourage my students at Triton College to vote. Not to vote for a particular candidate, but to exercise their right and they should speak. I think it's a loss when people don't vote. This isn't the solution. This is a punishment. This isn't bipartisan. This is a partisan Bill meant to make sure that the next time we have a four-year election cycle, the next time we can choose Republican verses Democrats statewide, that the de... the deck is stacked. So what that, Mr. Speaker, I do ask for the verification. And I respectfully ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, again, a verification has been requested by Representative Reboletti. Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, this is embarrassing. It's embarrassing to hear some of the conversation coming from proponents of this Bill. It's been very misleading. And if anybody... if anybody in this chamber wonders or questions why there isn't any trust coming from Springfield, let this be exhibit A. Now, I just got off the

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

phone with two of my county clerks who both happen to be Democrats. And there was conversation at the very beginning of this Bill from the Sponsor who suggested that everyone... that everyone had an opportunity to pipe in and to opine on this Bill. Well, both of them just found out about it. One of them found out about it yesterday and has not had a chance to reach out or to comment and the other one just found out about it two days ago. Both of them, again, both Democrats, could not be any more opposed to this Bill. They have said it is awful, 'horrible'. And now, I know that there's a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have spoken many, many times about how unfunded mandates are hurting our local taxing bodies. Now, Mr. Speaker, there isn't... maybe there's not a bigger unfunded mandate than this Bill. Both of the clerks that I just got off the phone with said that it will cripple them, because of the unfunded mandates, because of the cost. This is going to have a huge fiscal impact on our local taxing bodies. So, for those of you who are against unfunded mandates, I would think that you would be opposed to this. Again, Mr. Speaker, the comments that have been made about this Bill and some of the discussion on this House Floor are embarrassing and it's why people don't have any trust coming from Springfield. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, B.: "Good morning, Madam Leader. I have a question for you. Just... what was the participation rate in this 2014? Did it go up or down? And we had same-day registration."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Currie: "Yeah."

Mitchell, B.: "Let's just compare it to 2010."

Currie: "Yeah. As you know, every election is different and people vote depending not just on how they can vote, how easy it is to register and vote, but they also vote depending on how interesting or vital they find the candidates who stand. My understanding was that in Cook Country, participation was down compared to 2012. But I don't think that it was significantly different from what it had been in 2010."

Mitchell, B.: "I think it was down from the last off-year election. My point is, way back in 1990, and I wasn't here then, we had motor voter. And now, we have early voting. And the voter participation rates don't go up. I think you alluded to a better point, in terms of voter participation rate, is how this Body operates, how this government works. In the last 12 years, under all Democrat rule, it's been lousy. So, people are going to be disenchanted when your government is constantly broke. You're constantly spending money you don't have, and that's why they... we're discouraging. Hopefully, we have a new Governor on too, things will change. To the Bill. If we really want to reform the voters system, it would seem to me that we would just do the fair map. I know of... 71 Members on the other side are so eager for voter participation, for every vote to count. Why don't we just do the fair map, send it to the voters of the peop..."

Currie: "Could you confine your remarks to the Bill?"

Mitchell, B.: "...of the State of Illinois and see what they... that would be..."

Currie: "Confine your remarks to the Bill."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Mitchell, B. "...a giant, giant reform. And this Bill's going to pass, but I would humbly request that this Bill be called exactly what it is, the Voter Fraud Act of 2014."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I'm a Legislator from DuPage County, as well. I often hear, from the other side of the aisle, opinions that are from DuPage County. There are a couple things about DuPage County we very rarely hear about. Number one, we have poverty in DuPage County. Number two, we have schools that struggle in DuPage County. I will be taking a vote of 'yes' for this for all the people in DuPage County that want everyone to participate in our democratic process."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates that she will."

Kay: "Thank you. Leader Currie, how many days this past year, the
 most current election, could people vote?"

Currie: "If you... if you, by that, you'll want to include mail-in ballots, 40 days."

Kay: "Okay. Forty days..."

Currie: "The mail-in started earlier than..."

Kay: "Right. Exactly..."

Currie: "...the in-person early."

Kay: "About October 20, would you say?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Kay: "October 20, maybe? Early voting."

Currie: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay."

Currie: "That was the early voting beginning."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Kay: "And, I heard a previous speaker on your side of the aisle say that he was concerned about voter turnout being 17 percent. Is that correct? Did you hear that?"
- Currie: "I believe someone did reference the fact that we do not value the right to vote, perhaps, as many people in other western democracies do."
- Kay: "Well, I think the... the context was that the more time, the more voters. And what we see this year is that we've had much more time and more opportunity and less voters. And I think, although I don't remember the Representative... Representative who said it, they hit the nail right on the head. People have lost confidence. They've lost hope. And they think this state is probably some place that's lost. Would you agree with that, Leader?"

Currie: "No. I do not agree with that, Representative."

Kay: "Well, okay."

Currie: "And our job... our job is to offer people opportunities to participate. That's what this Bill does. And I'm proud when we offer people more opportunities to participate..."

Kay: "Well, why don't we just let them call in?"

Currie: "...not fewer."

Kay: "Why don't we just let them call in? Lou Lang's shaking his head. He loves it. Why don't we just let them call in?"

Currie: "Perhaps you'll introduce that legislation in the coming spring Session."

Kay: "I'm sure you... I... Well, I fully expect that to be the very next thing. Because what this does, this Bill takes another piece of democracy, it doesn't add to it, it takes it away, because it's the double voter Bill. And let me tell you why.

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Let me tell you exactly why. You can't tell me how many people voted in Missouri and voted in Illinois, can you?"

Currie: "I hope you have that information."

Kay: "Well, as a matter of fact, I do."

Currie: "Good."

Kay: "Alright. Because you don't like measurables. You don't like metrics. You told one of our Representatives that. You don't go by data. Fiscal notes, they're worthless. They're worthless. So, the next question I'd have is, how many people do you think voted in a precinct and then walked across the block to a state university and voted? Do you know that?"

Currie: "I don't have that specific number."

Kay: "Well, why are we doing..."

Currie: "There are a variety of universities in the state."

Kay: "Do you think that that's a possibility?"

Currie: "What? You mean that somebody would vote twice in an election?"

Kay: "Yeah. Yes."

Currie: "I'd think the election authorities have pretty good ways to... to make sure that doesn't happen."

Kay: "You really... Ma'am, you really don't know."

Currie: "Well, Rep..."

Kay: "You really don't know whether someone voted in Illinois and
Missouri. You really don't know whether someone voted in
Wisconsin and Illinois."

Currie: "But do know what... when we pass this Bill, we're going to have so much better information available..."

Kay: "Well, we don't have any today."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Currie: "...about who is registered and where. The ERIC system in the National Change of Address database will give our election authorities even more tools to prevent fraud in the ballot box. National studies show that the incidents of voter fraud is, in fact, minuscule across the country. And I'm sure that same finding..."

Kay: "Well, tell me... Tell me about..."

Currie: "...applies to Illinois."

Kay: "...tell me about the data. If you know data, with respect to some group or research center, I'd like to know how many people this last election from the Metro East voted in Missouri and Illinois. Can you tell me that?"

Currie: "I do not have that information. And my guess would be that the answer is zero."

Kay: "Well, you're wrong. How many people in the Metro East voted in a precinct that they were supposedly to vote in and then skipped over... skipped over to a state university and voted again?"

Currie: "I think the answer has to be zero. And if it isn't zero, then I would encourage your state's attorney to do a better job of ferry... ferreting out criminal misbehavior."

Kay: "I see. Well, okay. You mentioned 21st century technology and I think the quote was, we need 21st century changes used with respect to voting. My question to you is, were those 21st century changes you referred to also used when we redistricted Illinois?"

Currie: "I don't understand the meaning of that question."

Kav: "Well..."

Currie: "In the context of Senate Bill 172."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Kay: "Did you use..."

Currie: "We're discussing Senate Bill 172, Representative."

Kay: "Yeah. Well, I was just curious... I'm just curious about this 21 century technology that we've just developed. We're moving forward. And if we were moving forward today, did we move forward in the same fashion when we redistricted this state so your side of the aisle couldn't lose? Never mind. I know that's..."

Currie: "Thank you."

Kay: "Let me... let me just say this. Every time we do something like this, we lose something. And it's the confidence of the people of the State of Illinois because they see right through this. This is about as transparent a Bill as there could be. And it's so wrong... it is so wrong that people see right through it. There has been no good answers today. In fact, there's been very few answers provided with respect to data, research, history. In fact, it's all guess work. It's all guesswork. Let me just say this. We have spent the last two days diminishing this House and today is the final nail in the coffin. This is horrific. It's horrible. We should be embarrassed. We should be ashamed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Look how quiet it got. So, Mr. Speaker, I've been listening to this debate and I don't understand what all the hysteria is about, frankly. We've had conversation from the other side of the aisle. Obviously, they don't like the Bill, but I haven't heard one person give us a list of what's wrong with the Bill. Has anyone on my side of the aisle heard anything wrong with

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

the Bill yet? I didn't think so. You don't like the Bill because you apparently don't want an election's Bill. It's too big. It's too long. It's too complicated. Your clerk doesn't like it. You don't like it. Your Aunt Sally doesn't like it. Somebody doesn't like it. So, you have to be opposed because it's proposed by the Majority Leader of the Illinois House of Representatives and of course, it's an election Bill so there must be something wrong with it. But not one person on the Minority side of the aisle has given a concrete problem with the Bill. Not one person on the Minority side of the aisle who has spoken has given us anything about the Bill that they would change, if they had the opportunity to do so. What in this Bill is pro-Democratic or anti-Republican? What? What? Throw the list over here. We'll read it. I don't understand what all the noise is about. I don't understand why a Bill that fixes the problems in different counties around the state, that I'm going to give you some examples of some problems, or enables college students to vote. By the way, some of those college students are actually Republicans, I've heard. I don't know why a Bill that allows people to vote and to register to vote and to complete the experiment we started this November of same-day voter registration, I don't know what's wrong with any of that. So, if you're afraid of people voting, just stand up and say so. If you're not afraid of people voting, then... then tell us what's wrong with the Bill. I have been a Sponsor of same-day voter registration for a very long time. And during many of those years, it was not a favored item, even among Democratic Leaders. Because as the Republicans would point out, there were many years that

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

there were allegations that all Democratic County Chairmen or Democratic Leaders or Democratic Committeemen wanted to do was only get their people out to vote. And if we have sameday voter registration, we would have an uncontrollable, unfiltered group of people coming to vote. And Democratic Leaders wouldn't like that either. But in the passage of time, we have all decided, and I assume Republicans, as well as Democrats, decided that helping people with the opportunity to vote, to come to the polls and cast their vote for the candidates of their choice, is a good thing. Now, clearly, voter participation is down but it's not down because we haven't made an effort to open the process up to voters. It's down because we haven't done our jobs in a number of ways but it's not the election laws and it's not this Bill that will keep voter turnout down. It's the fact that voters haven't keyed in to the fact that they should take an interest in who runs their government; in Washington, in Springfield, in their villages, and their townships, and their park districts, and their schools. Same-day voter registration's a pretty good idea. I didn't hear anyone on that side of the aisle say... say that same-day voter registration wasn't a good idea. I didn't hear anyone on that side of the aisle say... encouraging college kids to vote wasn't a good idea. So, I haven't heard anything about what's wrong with the Bill. But let's go through a few items that this Bill will correct. Aside from making sure that we have a consistent and workable notion of same-day voter's registration, and grace-period voting, and the use of terms like absentee ballot, etcetera, etcetera, let's go through some of the issues on Election Day

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

that this Bill will resolve. First, in Lake County, voters are required to cast provisional ballots. When the voter brought their vote-by-mail ballot to the polling place... they actually had the ballot, they never mailed it in. They wanted to vote in person. And in Lake County, they were forced to vote provisionally. This is a legal, registered voter coming to the polling place on Election Day, but were required to vote provisional ballots. Why? Why were they required to vote provisional ballots? No one knows. It was at the whim of the Clerk of Lake County. Our election laws should not be left to the whim of a clerk. In fact, the Attorney General and private citizen had to file a lawsuit on Election Day to prevent that clerk from disenfranchising voters. A judge ordered her to follow the law, but she chose to ignore the court order. The Lake County Clerk chose to ignore the court order which ordered her to allow people to vote. Ultimately, these private attorneys, representing citizens and the Attorney General, had to go into court on three different occasions on Election Day... three different occasions on Election Day. And still, the Clerk of Lake County refused to abide by the court's order. Some clerks put their early voting places in large cities immediately across the street from each other in areas where they had limited parking and limited availability for voters to get into the polls. Lake County was supposed to have two early voting places in Waukegan. Rather than place a polling location at the Clerk's Office and in, perhaps, the heavily populated African-American and Hispanic areas of the city, the clerk ordered the second polling place to be located directly across the street from her office. Two polling

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

places, no parking, directly across the street from each other. Why? The whim of the Clerk of Lake County. Our election laws should not be run by the whim of a clerk but by the passage of a law in Springfield to correct these wrongs. Additionally, Lake County, again, there's a lot of good stories from Lake County, Ladies and Gentlemen. But this isn't the only county. But let's talk about this one. In Lake County, the clerk reduced the hours for Election Day registration sites to be less than the regular hours for voting; in direct violation of the election law of the State of Illinois. Election Day registration was supposed to be from 6 a.m. until 7 p.m. just like the polling places, the law of the State of Illinois. The law of the State of Illinois. But people attempting to register or change their addresses on Election Day, as allowed by our own state's election law, were turned away at the whim of the Clerk of Lake County. Our election laws should not be run by the whim of a clerk, but by the law of the State of Illinois. Again, the Attorney General and private citizens were forced to go into a courtroom on Election Day and file a lawsuit and of course, the judge ordered that the Lake County Clerk, acting on her whim, was wrong and ordered registration as required by the law of the State of Illinois. Some clerks, including the Lake of ... the Clerk of Lake County, you'll be not surprised to learn, limited early-voting and grace-period registration sites to only certain townships or municipalities favorable to one political Party. I'll let you guess which political Party that was in Lake County. In Lake County, the clerk placed early voting locations in heavily Republican districts

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

and precincts, and limited early voting to only those precincts. Elections laws of the State of Illinois should not be decided by the whim of a clerk, but by the laws of the State of Illinois. In some counties, photo ID was asked for, sometimes two forms, where no photo ID was required by the law of the State of Illinois. That's something that's been tried in a lot of southern states to suppress votes of minorities, but yet, we had clerks in the State of Illinois who required their election judges to take photo ID in opposition to the laws of our own state election law. Election law should be determined by State Law, not the whim of a clerk. Some clerks, including the Clerk of Lake County, you'll be surprised to learn, refused to let voters who did not receive their vote-by-mail ballots vote a full ballot. So, these are voters who have applied for a vote-by-mail opportunity, never got it. And, they came into vote on Election Day and were refused. In Lake County, you'll be surprised to learn, the clerk advised election judges to tell voters that certain political Parties were fraudulently requiring that they vote-by-mail, or requesting a vote-bymail ballot in the voter's name. Well, the Clerk of Lake County was well aware that the law allowed people to vote a regular ballot if they signed an affidavit attesting to the fact that they did not receive the ballot in the mail. The clerk directed election judges, under these circumstances, to force individuals to vote a provisional ballot, a provisional ballot. This was also the subject of a successful lawsuit in Lake County, you'll be surprised to learn. Ladies and Gentlemen, the election laws of the State of Illinois should

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

be determined by our laws, not the whim of the Lake County Clerk, the Kankakee County Clerk, or any of the Clerks that handle elections in the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, there is nothing in this Bill that is pro-Democratic or anti-Republican. This is a Bill designed to fix some problems. This is a Bill designed to open the process. This is a Bill designed to provide transparency. This is a Bill designed to try to ensure that the clerks abide by the law. This is a Bill designed to try to alleviate six-hour lines at the polling places, six-hour lines at the polling places. Now, we can either decide to run this state by law or we can decide to allow 102 county clerks to do whatever the hell they want with the election laws of the State of Illinois. This Bill is well crafted. This Bill deals directly with problems we saw on November 4. This Bill will improve Illinois's election laws and take it out of the hands of people who are doing guesswork rather than following the laws of our state. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Assistant Majority Leader just offered a challenge. He said, stand up and give me one thing that's wrong with this Bill. I'll tell you one thing that's wrong with this Bill. If Mr. Joe Jones is registered at 424 Main Street... if Mr. Joe Jones is registered there, but Mr. Tom Smith goes in to vote early and we don't ask for an ID, that's voter fraud. That's what it is, voter fraud. Don't we have a bad enough reputation in Illinois about voter fraud? I want to make sure that the election process is fair. I want

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

people to vote. But he asked me to give him one instance of what's wrong with this Bill. That's one instance of what's wrong with this Bill. I want to make sure the person who's registered to vote is actually the person who's casting the vote. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I think the previous statements don't really have anything to do with this Bill. If there is voter fraud, the state's attorneys ought to be out there prosecuting it. But the studies show us that it is not a major issue in this country. Voter fraud is way down from what it might have been in the '70s, the '60s, and the '50s. This is a data-driven Bill. This Bill comes from real stories from the clerks, real information we asked for, and they gave us. This Bill is being promoted now so that the clerks have time, time they requested, to get themselves up and running for the next election. This opens opportunities to participate by registration improvements and by voting opportunities for all of our citizens. I think democracy is a good thing. I think you can't have too much of it. I hope you will join me in voting 'yes' on Senate Bill 172."

Speaker Turner: "Members, a verification has been requested by Representative Reboletti. Please be at your seat to vote your own switch. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 172 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 70 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', and 0 voting

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

'present'. Representative Reboletti, would you like to proceed with your verification? Mr. Clerk, please read the names of the Members voting in the affirmative."

"A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Clerk Hollman: Acevedo, Representative Representative Representative Arroyo, Representative Beiser, Representative Berrios, Representative Bradley, Representative Daniel Burke, Representative Kelly Burke, Representative Cassidy, Representative Chapa LaVia, Representative Cloonen, Representative Conroy, Representative Costello, Representative Crespo, Representative Currie, Representative D'Amico, Representative Monique Davis, Representative William Davis, Representative Drury, Representative Representative Evans, Representative Feigenholtz, Representative Fine, Representative Flowers, Representative Representative Franks, Representative Representative Golar, Representative Gordon-Booth, Representative Greg Harris, Representative Hernandez, Representative Hoffman, Representative Hurley, Representative Jackson, Representative Jakobsson, Representative Jones, Representative Kifowit, Representative Representative Lilly, Representative Lang, Manley, Martwick, Representative Representative Mautino, Representative Mayfield, Representative McAsey, Representative Christian Mitchell, Representative Moeller, Representative Moylan, Representative Mussman, Nekritz, Representative Representative Phelps, Representative Riley, Representative Rita, Representative Scherer, Representative Sente, Representative

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Representative Smiddy, Representative Smith, Representative Soto, Representative Tabares, Representative Thapedi, Representative Turner, Representative Verschoore, Representative Wallace, Representative Walsh, Representative Welch, Representative Williams, Representative Willis, Representative Yingling, Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Representative Christian Mitchell. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Your request has been withdrawn. On a count of 70 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 172, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1378. Order in the chambers. Doorman, please remove the people in the gallery. Can we have all staff retire to the rear of the chamber? Mr. Clerk, we have House Resolution 1378. The Members, stand, please."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 1378, offered by Speaker Madigan.

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives have learned of the death of an Illinois resident who holds the distinction of being the person elected to serve as the mayor of the largest American city to be governed by a woman; and

WHEREAS, Jane M. Byrne highlighted a lengthy career of public service and civic involvement by serving as Mayor of Chicago from 1979 until 1983; she is remembered as a dynamic leader, loving mother and grandmother, innovator, and friend; and

151st Legislative Day

and

12/3/2014

- WHEREAS, During her mayoral term, Jane M. Byrne tackled issues like collapsing school finances and contentious labor relations head on; she also moved into the Cabrini Green public housing project to focus the need for better police and public service in troubled neighborhoods; and
- WHEREAS, Jane M. Byrne understood the need to showcase the unmatched natural beauty of the City's Lake Michigan shoreline; she also helped create the "Taste of Chicago" and propelled the City into becoming a leading domestic tourism destination, which enabled Chicago to be recognized as "America's Most Livable City" by the U.S. Conference of Mayors; and
- WHEREAS, Jane M. Byrne's vision of Chicago as a modern international destination led to the creation of unique direct rapid transit links to O'Hare and Midway Airports; and WHEREAS, Jane M. Byrne recognized the need for new jobs to take Chicago from being a manufacturing hub to a prosperous center of creativity through efforts like the High Tech Task Force;
- WHEREAS, Jane M. Byrne is recognized as a pioneer on gun safety for approving the first ordinance to get handguns off the streets; and
- WHEREAS, While breaking gender barriers was a highlight of her career, Jane M. Byrne was by any standard a dynamic elected official; therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we express our sympathies to Jane M. Byrne's daughter, Kathy Byrne, her grandson, Willy, her brother Edward Burke, and her sisters

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Carol Burke Sexton and Jill Burke Wolf, and honor Jane M. Byrne for her years of service and for making Illinois a better place; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Jane M. Byrne as an expression of our deepest sympathy."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank... thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Jane Byrne was certainly a trailblazer. She was feisty as the day is long. I wouldn't describe her as unflappable, but she did take on serious issues when she engaged in skirmishes in City Hall and out. One of the things that I was particularly pleased by was not only her performance with respect to guns on the streets of the City of Chicago, but also her support for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. When she became mayor of the City of Chicago, many of the members of the Chicago Delegation were not particularly keen on equal rights for women, but Jane Byrne, as the leader of that town, was able to convince many of them that, in fact, ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment was good for, not just women, but for men and for working families. So, Jane Byrne did a real job in turning votes around on this floor for one of the important issues of the 1970s and 1980s. So, she deserves the plaudits you just heard about in the Resolution, but she did even more than all the items that were there and mentioned. Her... her legacy is a strong and proud legacy. And I hope that her daughter and her grandson appreciate, fully, all that she did for not just the city, but for the people of the State of Illinois."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm really saddened by the loss of Jane Byrne, first female mayor of the City of Chicago. She was feisty. She was vibrant. And because of her election, it led the way for other women to become elected officials. After she had been mayor and Herold Washington became mayor, many of us African-American women were supported and encouraged to be in the Legislature. I think one of the most memorable things about Jane Byrne that I have is that she appointed the first African-American woman, Ruth Love, to be the Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools. And when you get people who are not afraid to open that door and bring equality and justice, they will well be remembered. May God bless her and the rest of her family, and especially her daughter and her children. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I, too, would like to thank Kathy Byrne and the late mayor's grandson, Willy, for joining us today. Jane Byrne was the woman who inspired me to get involved in politics. She still remains the only woman who has been mayor of a major U.S. city. She had changed the face of politics for many of us, growing up in the City of Chicago. Things went from black and white to technicolor when she became mayor. She was feisty. She was gutsy. She challenged authority and she was a reformer. And we loved and respected her for it. How many other women would have saved Dan Goodwin, who was climbing up the side of the John Hancock Building, when the firefighters wanted to take him off the building with a fire hose? She brought the media back to Chicago. Many, many

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

books and articles have been written about her. Forgive but Never Forget, by Ray Hanania, tells wonderful stories about her as mayor. And I will always remember her fondly and she leaves an amazing legacy for those of us from the city."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, also, rise in support of this Resolution. My career started with Jane Byrne. I remember when she first was running office in '82, I believe, when I started with her. And I kind of owe my career, and today, now, I'm a Legislator at the State of Illinois. I remember, I also had a restaurant that she used to like to come and eat. She called it Puerto Rican Rice. And she spent a lot of time in my community. And I also remember when she was one of the ones that appointed the first Puerto Rican Commissioner for Streets and Sanitation in the city, a long time ago when... when... she was a trailblazer. She was really petite but very strong. And I also remember her husband, Jay... Jay McMillan, also was a dear friend. And those two kind of got along very well. And she got things done by being so petite. Kathy, I also want to thank you and your grandson. Thank you for what you did with her in the last few years when she was ill. It was very good to see that, finally, they named a couple of things after her, because she really deserved it. She was forgotten for a little while. I want to probably try to do a Resolu... another Resolution of probably... try to come back to the General Assembly next year and try to bring this fountain that she has... a kid's fountain that is put away in a storage. And I would like to see if the Members of the General Assembly could help get some funding to bring this fountain back to

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Chicago, because it was a nice fountain and is right now is put away. So, Kathy, thank you for what you do. And if you ever decide to seek elective office somewhere, I'll be happy to support you. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to take this honor to pay my respect to the late, great Jane Byrne. You know, I remember those days. I remember how dark and gloomy Chicago was. And then, when this feisty lady came on the scene, she brought hope and she brought excitement. And I want to say that if Chicago had continued to follow the lead of Jane Byrne, the City of Chicago would be a much better place today in regards to its schools, in regards to its integrated housing, in regards to education, in regards to gun control, in regards to so many things, in regards to women's issues, in regards to people's issues. Jane Byrne cared about children. And if there were any more Jane Byrnes around here today, this city and this state would be a much better place. But I want to thank you for sharing your mom. And thank you for coming down and allowing us to have a last word in regards to the thoughts that we had. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House last night, in reflecting on what I would say today in support of this Resolution, I reflected on the events that led up to the election of Jane Byrne as the mayor of Chicago and then the events that developed during her four years as the mayor of the city. And I think a good way to understand Jane Byrne as

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

mayor of the City of Chicago is to view her as transformative mayor. She took the city through transformation. Prior to her time, the city had elected Richard J. Daley as its mayor for about 20 years. And then, his prodigy, Michael Bilandic for a short term as the mayor. Mr. Bilandic lost to Jane Byrne, who then became the mayor of Chicago for four years. During those four years, the city was transformed from the city of Richard J. Daley. So, as an example, we all know of the Taste of Chicago. That was started by Jane Byrne. Many of us know about the Jazz Fest and Blues Fest. They were started by Jane Byrne. If you drive along the south Lake Shore Drive, in the vicinity of Soldier Field, you've probably noticed that there's a beautiful museum campus right next to Soldier Field. It's beautiful. It's easy to walk from building to building. It wasn't always like that because the road went right through the middle of it. Well, the idea for the formation of a museum campus was Jane Byrne. She's the person that caused that to happen. The Resolution, spoken in terms of rapid transit lines from downtown Chicago to both Midway Airport and O'Hare. Today, we just take that for granted. Well, prior to Jane Byrne's time, you didn't have rapid transit service to either of those airports. Jane Byrne was responsible for the development of that service to two major airports. For those of us who have visited Navy Pier and we see what a delightful place it is to visit, especially in the warmer weather with families enjoying the attractions, and restaurants, and whatever, credit goes to Jane Byrne. Because, again, prior to her time, Navy Pier was an abandoned pier that went out into the lake. During her

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

time, the city received an award as the most livable city in America. And for those of you who are familiar with the movie industry in Chicago today credit Jane Byrne. She's the one who brought that activity to the city. So, reflect on these events and these projects and these developments that I just mentioned, and if you can remember what Chicago was like prior to that time, then you can easily see that she was a transformative mayor. She left her imprint on the City of Chicago when she left office. Those of us who have lived in the city, like I for all of my life, and those of us who have spent most of their life in the city, owe a great deal to Jane Byrne for what she did for the place where we live. And we're very thankful. We're very appreciative. Previous speakers have mentioned that Jane's daughter, Kathy, is down at the Page's bench, and next to her is her son, Willy. And we're very thankful that they're here today to join us in the presentation and the adoption of this Resolution. And in conclusion, I would request that all Members of the House be made cosponsors of the Resolution. And I would encourage all of you to spend some time with Kathy and Willy to reminisce about Jane's life and the many contributions she made to the City of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "It has been requested all Members be added to this Resolution. Seeing no objection, all Members will be added. Speaker Madigan moves that the House adopt House Resolution 1378. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. On page 3 of the Calendar, under

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 2774. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2774, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment
  #1. It becomes the Bill. I'm happy to discuss the Bill on
  Third."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate the Gentleman moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2774. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

  Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

  Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2774, a Bill for an Act concerning

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2774 represents our attempts to impose a commercial ridesharing Act on Illinois. We were all very familiar with this issue. Over the course of the holiday break, we came... we engaged in negotiations with Uber and tried to reach an agreement. And this encapsulates that agreement. It's a lighter version of what we passed in the spring dealing with driver regulations, dealing with local ability to regulate these services, and dealing with insurance. We're doing this now because we... we

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

agreed to do it in the 98th General Assembly. And it's important to protect our constituent's safety and get something on the books as soon as possible. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Mike, can you just walk through, a little bit, for folks that haven't been playing close attention, the agreement... the components in the agreement."

Zalewski: "I... I think, everyone's been playing close attention, Ron. I take offen... umbrage with that remark. I'm just teasing you. Starting with insurance, when the app is on and there's a ride in progress, there... there has to be a thousand... a million dollars in coverage for death, personal injury, and property damage, 50 thousand dollars in coverage uninsured, underinsured motorists. When there's no ride, when there's not passenger in the vehicle, but the app is on, the coverages are 50thousand per person for death and personal injury, hundred thousand for death and personal injury per incident, and 25 thousand for property damage. And the ridesharing company must maintain contingent automobile insurance in the amounts above in the event the ... the company's own policy excludes that coverage based on its policy and terms. There has to be disclosure of insurance requirements. And then we deal with driver eligibility. There has to be a requirement that the individual submit an application giving their age, their driving history, their driver's license status, criminal... national and local criminal background

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

checks, and in review a driving history search. There's a requirements of who and who can't be a driver. There's nondiscrimination policy. And there's safety and operational requirements in the Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you. And you're not wrong. There's been quite a bit of attention. But for the record, and for some people that maybe haven't..."

Zalewski: "I..."

Sandack: "...put this at the forefront, it's kind of important to get those details out."

Zalewski: "Understood."

Sandack: "Mike, I need you to exam... help me out with one concept on the insurance side. I've heard anecdotally that there... the... that many of the insurers do not support the agreement."

Zalewski: "Right."

Sandack: "And I'm... I suspect it has to with on-duty versus offduty ridesharing components."

Zalewski: "It has to do with when the app is on, but... It has to do with when the app in on, but the person's not in the car.

This is what's called app on picked coverage period."

Sandack: "Okay. Can you just tell me... elaborate a little bit on what the difficulty is with the insurers?"

Zalewski: "I... I think they would argue... they would like to see a mandate that we passed in the spring requiring this full coverage policy in place. They would like to see us do that. I think, in conversations with Uber and conversations with the... with the companies, they feel that this is a market issue. And either the market will adjust to these new and innovative technologies or eventually... or there's enough

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

safety in pla... there's enough safety for the passenger in place with this contingent policy that they believe works in Chicago and has worked in other places. So, I know they... they expressed their disagreement with the... with the removing that in committee today. My sense is we'll be revisiting this issue or the market will adjust. But..."

Sandack: "Well, could I... let me... Could I stop you there?"

Zalewski: "Yeah."

Sandack: "So, are they asking you for a trailer? Are they opposed right now?"

Zalewski: "My understanding is stet property casual (siccasualty) insurers in the insurance industry are opposed, as we speak."

Sandack: "Right. 'Cause you were answering previously as if there was a trailer Bill. So, I wanted to make sure. They're still opposed, but you're open to a trailer Bill?"

Zalewski: "I think we'll be revisiting the issue soon."

Sandack: "All right. And other than the insurers that you've spoken of, with respect to this app, any other opponents of the agreement, as we stand here, today?"

Zalewski: "I don't know about one of the ridesharing companies knows as Lyft. I don't recall. Sidecar, which is a third company, has an issue with our language in terms of the receipt. I've committed to their representative; we should revisit that. The bankers would like to see some language on the liens. We'll have to take a look at that. So, again, we felt it was important to honor the agreement we made with Uber, but my sense is we're not quite finished with this issue yet."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Sandack: "Okay. Moving on to another issue, Mike, that came up in the original Bill. The concept of Home Rule."

Zalewski: "Yeah."

Sandack: "How does Home Rule fit in? Are we preempting or are we leaving things as is?"

Zalewski: "We... we went to a standard by which local authorities are given exclusive ability to regulate these issues, with the exception of what we articulate in our Bill. So, we're silent in our Bill. The local gets to decide it."

Sandack: "All right. For Chicago, they have..."

Zalewski: "They have."

Sandack: "I think, some ordinances in place. One or more, with respect to ridesharing, whether it's Uber or another provider. This doesn't do anything to what Chicago has already done."

Zalewski: "No. No."

Sandack: "Or what any locality wants to do going forward."

Zalewski: "Correct. Correct, Ron."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. The Sponsor has been working tirelessly. And I appreciate his being open to talk about this issue one more time. It's complex. It obviously has divergent interest. And of course, new novel things always take time here in Illinois. We don't necessarily embrace them. But I know the efforts have been employed by Representative Zalewski. I appreciate them. And thanks for answering the questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And questions of the Sponsor?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Harris, D.: "So, Representative, it's an agreed Bill that not
   everyone agrees with."
- Zalewski: "Yeah. Welcome to this issue, Representative. Yes. Yes, that... Uber agrees with this Bill."
- Harris, D.: "Well, Uber agrees with the Bill. The rights..."
- Zalewski: "The insurance... the industry... the industry... the insurance industry has challenges with it and there's a couple of... a couple of other challenges, as well. But we're going to try to work those out as soon as we possibly can."
- Harris, D.: "So, we expect to see another Bill, probably then. Stet."
- Zalewski: "I would be stunned if we didn't."
- Harris, D.: "Is there any limitation on the number of driving hours that someone can operate in a ridesharing app?"
- Zalewski: "We give that regulatory power to... well, we're silent on it... we give it to the local governments' ability to regulate that."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. What about surge pricing? Which is an issue that developed with the ridesharing apps. Is there any limitation on surge pricing?"
- Zalewski: "What we say is if a ride is hailed on a transportation digital network or... what these are in the statute, that rul... the same rules apply for everybody. So, if you could surge price if your Uber, you can surge price as long as you have an app that's functional and it's on the network. Because again, Uber felt that this was a restriction on the market to touch that. So, our feeling was, well, let's give the locals the ability to regulate that any way they want."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Harris, D.: "Is there any regulation on surge pricing in the city of Chicago's regulations?"
- Zalewski: "I think there's a requirement that they tell the riders when they hit... for the ride that their surge is in effect. Stet, when you get an Uber ride..."
- Harris, D.: "So... so, taxi cab fare that might normally be \$10, if there... if there... it's snowing or raining and there's not a taxi cab available, that ridesharing app might charge you \$20 or \$30 or more dollars for what..."
- Zalewski: "If... if a taxi... No. If a taxi chooses to get dispatched by an app... if a local government has a disclosure requirement about surge pricing going into effect, that regulation is imposed upon both now, taxis and ridesharing companies."
- Harris, D.: "Okay. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an agreed Bill. This agreed Bill that will probably pass with, who knows, 90 or 100 votes, but let me tell you why I'm going to be one of the 'no' votes. And first of all, I want to compliment the Gentleman on the work that he has done on the Bill. He clearly has recognized that there are important issues dealing with the regulation of ridesharing applications like Uber and Lyft and others. And there really are serious issues to be addressed. As an example, the security of passengers, background checks for drivers. You know, you want to make sure that when you're picked up and taken to your home that the driver's not 'Joe the sexual assaulter'. I had a conversation, as an example, with my young son, who is a young professional in the Chicago area and all of his friends use Uber. And he talked to me over the Thanksgiving holiday, and he said, you know, my female friends

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

get hit on by their Uber drivers. Because what's the one thing that ... that ridesharing driver has that a taxicab driver probably doesn't have, they have your cell phone number. And they are calling, not all, but they are calling up passengers that they might like to date later on. Are we addressing that? I don't know that we are. The insurance coverage is an issue. And I think the insurance industry is concerned that the coverage when the app is on, not when there's a passenger in the vehicle, but when the app is on is insufficient. So, the Gentleman recognized that there was a... was a wide range of issues that had to be addressed. And you know what, he did that in House Bill 4075. It was a good Bill. It was, in my opinion, the right way to go. And that's one of the reasons I'm voting 'no' because House Bill 4075 was a better Bill. Now, I'm not against innovation. I'm not against competition. As a matter of fact, the taxicab industry has had virtually a monopoly. And the best way to defeat a monopoly is to introduce competition into the marketplace. And the ridesharing apps do that. They bring in competition. And that's a good thing, but the regulation of apps, ridesharing apps, is warranted. And let me read, just very briefly, a sentence from the Chicago Tribune editorial of August the 26. And it says, Governor Pat Quinn was presented with a tough choice... and get this ... with a tough choice between the desire to protect consumers and the desire to promote innovation. On Monday, he decided to err on the side of innovation by vetoing House Bill 4075. Now, the Tribune went on to say that that's what they wanted. They wanted a veto of the Bill. But think about that, ...a tough choice between the desire to protect

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

consumers and the desire to promote innovation. You know what, I'm for innovation, but I'm more for protecting consumers. And I think that House Bill 4075 did a better job of protecting consumers than this Bill does. It introduced sensible and reasonable regulations that, I think, this Bill is weak on. And I'll close by simply saying the regulations in 4075 didn't prevent the ridesharing apps from operating. It didn't put them out of business. The <a href="Tribune">Tribune</a> in its final sentence said, regulation should make it better not make it shrink. And you know what, the Bill that we had was... 4075 was good regulation. This is okay. But the Gentleman, himself... the Gentleman, himself, for all of his hard work, has said there is more to come. If there's more to come, let's not pass this. Let's go back and get it right from the beginning. That's why I'm voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Representative Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Representative Ives: "Just a couple questions along the same vein as Representative David Harris spoke about. And Representative Zalewski, is this strictly an agreed Bill between you and Uber? And where is Sidecar and Lyft on it?"

Zalewski: "So, Sidecar has a challenge, Jeanne, with a piece of the Bill dealing with a type of receipt you give... ridesharing company gives. And what, basically, their challenge is, is we require certain disclosures in a receipt. It's a small issue. My understanding, from their representation, is they're comfortable; we can get it worked out soon enough. I have not

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

been told what Lyft... how they feel about this Bill. I don't recall if they filed a slip. I simply don't know the answer to that."

- Ives: "Okay. And why... is there a rush to get this done now, for some reason r because... I know you can do rideshare in Naperville and in Wheaton, and I'm imagining they're regulated to some degree. Or are you saying there's absolutely no regulation other than what that industry is putting on itself?"
- Zalewski: "So, there's two reasons why I want to do it now. The first is because we said we would. When we agreed not to call the Motion, we said we would work this out before the expiration of this General Assembly. And I just think, it's good to keep our word. The second reasoning behind it is this is an incredibly... and I'm not trying to... it's a very hard issue to deal with in terms of legislation and statute making. And I don't feel as though this can linger on, because it's just hard to get agreement on these issues. So, my feeling is if I have an agreement... and I just got a text that Lyft is okay with the Bill... My feeling is that if we have agreement we should pass a Bill and not risk having this regulatory vacuum in the State of Illinois."
- Ives: "And do you intend to work with the insurance companies then, also, on an agreed process? What is actually going to... what are you going to work on in the next GA?"
- Zalewski: "I think that the insurance industry is convinced that the market won't adjust to what these companies are doing.

  That there won't be... that eventu... that there won't be policies

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

put in place that cover this period of app off... or app on, but driver not in the car."

Ives: "Mmm mmm."

Zalewski: "Conversely, I think, Uber and Lyft are of the opinion the market's already adjusting. And that eventually there's not going to be a need for legislation mandating these coverages. It's... You should know, Jeanne, it's a mandate. What the insurance company's asking for is a mandate. So, to answer your question, do I think the insurance company will want to adjust this in the spring? Yes, I do. Do I ultimately think this Body will allow that to happen? I'm not entirely sure yet."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman will yield."

Mautino: "Mike, I do intend to support your Bill. I know that you've gotten to a agreement, but I'd... would like to get a commitment to work on the insurance portion. Because as I've seen this... the original Bill that passed had recoverage through all three periods. When someone was trolling for a match, the app was on. Then when they hooked up and the apps made the contract and then when they were in the car, you had a million dollars' worth of coverage during that point. Now, that was agreed to by this Body and is probably a protection that the consumers deserve. Where you may end up is in the time when that app is on prior to them making the agreement, you have a red zone where..."

Zalewski: "A gap."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Mautino: "That's your gap coverage. And so, the personalized insurance may say, you know what, we're not covered at that point and the company may not wish to cover it. So, you have a potential source of a lot of litigation. And I think that's a piece that was worked through in the original Bill that should've stayed. So, I'll support this, but I do believe that you have a glaring gap within that coverage. And I know, I've worked with you on other issues. This is one where we don't want to see litigation when there are already two separate forms of making this correct."

Zalewski: "I agree, Leader. And I appreciate... You obviously have a lot more expertise on insurance than I do. I think, I'm fully aware and committing to you that we will evaluate these insurance concerns going forward and work with you and the others in the spring. I do, though, believe that the market may adjust too. So, I want to leave the possibility for that. But you have my word, we'll continue to evaluate the Act as we go forward."

Mautino: "It may and it may not adjust. But there really shouldn't be a time when an individual consumer does not have the full million dollar coverage that an app on, which is still not the best way to do this, would provide. So, in order to ensure that we don't have those, I look forward to a trailer Bill."

Zalewski: "Thank you. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Tracy: "Representative Zalewski, what kind of background checks do they do for taxicab drivers in the State of Illinois?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Zalewski: "So, a taxi driver has to obtain an initial chauffer's license. So, that necessarily requires them to obtain a background check from, I believe, the licensing agency, their Secretary of State, or department of regulation. I don't know which one."
- Tracy: "Does that background check include... I'm presuming it includes an investigation as to whether, of course, they have a valid... ability to have an Illinois driver's license. Does it include criminal background?"
- Zalewski: "I would assume it has a driving history background, correct."

Tracy: "What about criminal background?"

Zalewski: "What about criminal? Yes."

Tracy: "And if you have a criminal background, are you prohibited from having a chauffeur's license?"

Tracy: "Jill I'm having a hard time hearing you. Can you repeat that?"

Tracy: "If you have a criminal background, are you prohibited from having a chauffer's license?"

Zalewski: "I don't know the answer to that. My guess is depending on the nature of the criminal background. And some things are probably disqualifying and some things probably aren't."

Tracy: "In comparison then, for a person that would want to be an Uber driver, what type of background check would be provided on those persons?"

Zalewski: "So, under this Bill?"

Tracy: "Yes."

Zalewski: "Under this Bill, we give the local govern... local unit of government complete discretion to determine how they're

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

going to proceed with background checks. So, the city... But we will require... we will require local and national criminal background checks."

Tracy: "Okay. And if it comes back with... say a person was a convicted sex offender, what... would that driver be able to be a Uber driver?"

Zalewski: "I don't think so. I don't know. If they're in the sex
 offender database, the answer is no."

Tracy: "So, your answer is no?"

Zalewski: "Right."

Tracy: "What other kind of criminal background conviction would prohibit somebody from being a Uber driver?"

Zalewski: "Three or more... Is a match in the database for sex offender, has been convicted within the last seven years for DUI, fraud, sexual offenses, use of a vehicle to commit a felony, thefts, or act of violence. They're prohibited from being a TNC driver."

Tracy: "From being a.m. excuse me.m. from being a what?"

Zalewski: "For being an Uber driver or a rideshare driver, but one moment, Jil. And at that point, if you see that on their... on the person's background check, my sense is and it's safe to assume, not only is there a legal prohibition from them working there, but Uber and Lyft are hopefully going to have challenges placing that person into employment."

Tracy: "Is that in your Bill?"

Zalewski: "That they... that they have the ability to not hire the person?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Tracy: "That the background check must be conducted and that those people that have... I think you said seven years felony conviction..."

Zalewski: "Yeah. That piece is in the Bill, correct."

Tracy: "Okay. Do you recall what part it's in?"

Zalewski: "I'm... Say that... What Section?"

Tracy: "Yes."

Zalewski: "It's on page 6, Jil, Section 15. The driver requirements."

Tracy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Reboletti could be excused for the rest of the day, please."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative
Andrade."

Andrade: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman will yield."

Andrade: "Mike, I just want... I have a question. I called my insurance agent. And my insurance agent said that when they receive a phone call, they're telling the drivers that by their policy and their legal counselors that if the app is on, they are saying that their personal insurance is not covering them. Their insurance... that insurance company said, listen, we are not going to cover you. So, at that moment... what Representative Mautino was talking about, there is no coverage."

Zalewski: "That's not... that's not true. That's not true."

Andrade: "No. Well, the question I have is, does the insurance company have the right to say no, we're not... we're not

covering you? Can they say, listen, at that moment you had

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

the app on. We are not going to cover you? Are we silent on that or are we mandating them that they have to cover them?"

Zalewski: "So, what we're saying is a ridesharing company's going to be allowed to do what's called a contingency in the policy. So, the driver's going to have to have their personal policy in place. If their personal policy doesn't cover the accident because of their activities as a commercial driver, Uber, or Lyft, or whomever, has this contingency in place whereby they will cover the accident, the victim of the accident. That's the way Chicago... the Chicago version did and we are stremenhancing the Chicago version of insurance. We're a little less than California; we're a little more than Chicago."

Andrade: "The contingency. Does it have a dollar amount?"

Zalewski: "It's the same as what the driver would be required to have, which is 50 thousand per person for death and personal injury, a hundred thousand for death and personal injury per incident, and 25 thousand for property damage."

Andrade: "So, by market, are you... that saying that by market it might adjust itself?, Are we saying that basically we're going to end up... there's going to be a case and precedent's going to be set by law. When's there's a lawsuit and they say no, that person... we want a million dollars."

Zalewski: "No. I think what we're saying is eventually there's going to become a product on the market, insurance market, that Uber's going to decide is what cost prohibitive in this contingency that they have right now. And they're going to buy that and that way the driver's covered. That being said, when I told the Leader Mautino is the insurance companies

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

don't believe that's accurate. They think that we need this... we need to set the market ourselves and that's going to be an ongoing discussion."

Andrade: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "We had... we had good discussion this morning in committee and I appreciate your work on this. I know it's been a long time... a lot of issues and things of that sort. So, my... my question is on that 25, 50, hundred thousand. Who is required to have that coverage? Is it the individual driver or is it the company or does it state who is required to have that? And if that coverage isn't there, who would be breaking the law?"

Zalewski: "So... so, by law the driver has to have in their individual insurance policy a little less than what is in our Bill. And I believe that Uber or Lyft will then have to cover it... what's articulated in the statute."

Davidsmeyer: "So, if my insurance... like the previous speaker said, if my insurance... my personal insurance said that I am not allowed to operate for-profit under my personal insurance, when I turn on the app, I'm operating for-profit, correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Davidsmeyer: "So, that could possibly go away. And so, this Bill will require Uber, Lyft, whoever the rideshare person is, it would require them to cover the driver, correct?"

Zalewski: "Yes. They have the contingency in place to cover them when the app goes on."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, it will be the company that is required to ensure that the driver is insured."

Zalewski: "Assuming the personal policy doesn't have this commercial rider on it, correct."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. I still have a number of concerns about this.

I think there's a major gap. I think we are somewhat picking winners and losers in an industry that provides the same service, so I think we need to continue to work on this. But I appreciate all that you've done. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Thank you, C.D."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to support the Bill and congratulate the Sponsor on a substantial effort. Many of us preferred the original Bill. I heard Mr. Harris, particularly, talk about that. And I certainly preferred the original Bill, but this is a place of compromise. And I think this... this Bill does move the process forward and I appreciate the hard work of Mr. Zalewski. I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, I'm told Sidecar and Lyft are neutral on the Bill. Again, we want to address some concerns going forward. The bankers have raised concerns about liens and notice to lienholders. We had an at length discussion about... about insurance. This is a good piece of legislation that gets a commercial ridesharing act on the books. It's important to enact it. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2774 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2774, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 03, 2014: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 636. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on December 03, 2014: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3834."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to note that on Senate Bill 172, my intention was to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. On page 5 of the Calendar, we have Senate Joint Resolution 42. Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 42 is a Constitutional Convention Resolution. It was passed over from the Senate over here. And I'd be more than happy to take any questions on it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Sandack." Sandack: "Question the Sponsor."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "I know there's... we're getting near the end. I'm sorry,
Linda, I heard very little of what you just said. Would you
mind, just elaborate a little more?"

Chapa LaVia: "...Sure."

Sandack: "On your Bill?"

Chapa LaVia: "Sure."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "The Senate Joint Resolution was brought over by the... by the Senate over here, 42. And it actually calls for a United States Constitutional Convention to deal with campaign finance reform. We are one of three states, once hopefully we pass this, the first one being Vermont that was predom... is predominantly run by a Republican Party. That we have, under the Constitution of the United States is one of the two oaths we take to swear allegiance to. We have the ability under Article V of the Constitution to form, by the states, a convention at the federal level when we feel that Congress is not doing its job, especially when it comes to certain issues, whether it's a balanced budget, whether it's campaign finance reform, whether it's term limits where we might be seeing that. But, my counterparts in other states, which are Majority are Republican, we are working together to put together applications to open up a convention to look at a series of issues that we feel once again, at the federal level, that for some reason they're not enacting. And because the states have this ability through the United States Constitution, we felt it appropriate time to start looking at... into these matters. And this is one of 34 applications

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

that needs to be done. But we are the third state: first one being Vermont, Republican run; second one California, Democratic, for the most part but ours would be the third state. We would need 31 other states to put in applications of the same scope in order to open up the Constitution."

Sandack: "Thank you. And I appreciate that. The method, this convention of states, is obviously one way of having a Constitutional Convention. And can you just help me out with the scope."

Chapa LaVia: "I can elaborate for you. There's two methods." Sandack: "Yeah, with the scope of it."

Chapa LaVia: "There's two methods under the United States Constitution in which we take an oath to. One being under Article IV, and what it reads verbatim is, 'The Congress, whenever two thirds of both house shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to the Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several states, shall call a convention for purposes under that amendment, which is either case, shall be validate ... valid in all intent and purpose, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several states, or by convention in three fourths thereof, as one of the other mode of ratification.' So there's actually two. First, being that the Congress, itself, can call for a convention. And it has to be three fourths, of course, of both chambers, bicameral. The other when they... when they're not acting on issues, and the states feel an urgency to serve we the people, the states can come together and call for this. The fir... the second application calls... calls for 34 states to

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

have the same scope of the application. Upon the receival of that at the Congressional level, they must call for a Constitution Convention within that scope. Then the ... the states themselves find the regulations within their own guides, so we probably put together some form of committee to form their convention and their members and their delegates. Maybe something like, you know the 19 members we have of our Congressional delegations, two members, et cetera, et cetera. But once we form at the federal level, if you... if you will, with all the states... all 50 states and we ratify what that scope is, then it has to be ratified by 38 of the states in order to go back to the federal level, then to change the Constitution. This by no means is an early... an easy process, okay? Most of the time in our history, we've never called for a convention before, but it's amazing how many of my colleagues that are Republican throughout the United States are calling for conventions at the same time under their applications, which excites me. It's because people are working together, finally, because they see Congress being ineffective in certain areas, okay? So, the application itself seems simple on the face, but is a very difficult thing to commit to. And the great thing is sometimes, we'll might get... the last one I think is selection of Senators. The last time we got close to holding a convention, Senate then acted and Congress acted on its own, so we didn't have to get to that point. I know I'm long-winded, sorry."

Sandack: "No, no, no. I appreciate it."

Chapa LaVia: "But I'm very committed to the process when we raise our hands to serve the people of this great state and of this

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

great country, that somewhere down the line, at least in the scope of this application, 70 percent of all the dollars that go to Congress right now, in both chambers, arise out of 100 people throughout the United States."

- Sandack: "Thank you again for that, and I... and you're not long-winded. I think the answer was perfect. You mentioned scope.

  Can you just give me... you can be as long-winded as you want,

  Linda... the scope. Because I know that... I think Citizens United

  probably is the propelling cause, at least of this
  application, but can it be expanded to other issues?"
- Chapa LaVia: "No. It has to be within this scope of frame. I've...
  we have to work with 31 other of my colleagues throughout the
  United States in different chambers and different ilks of
  Party in order to submit the same application. Now there's a
  lot of talk, since the beginning of the time, our Founding
  Fathers were amazing and beyond intelligence of what I feel
  I have the ability to look into the world, but they put it
  there in the process of. And the important thing..."

Sandack: "Yeah, thank... thank you."

- Chapa LaVia: "The important thing is, is that they knew that if Congress was ineffective about doing something, that they'd give us the ability to... to take on this portion of Article V. So, within that, we have to stay within the scope on that application."
- Sandack: "Thank you. And I appreciate all the elaboration very much. Just as a point of clarification, a colleague handed me the information about Vermont. Its Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and State Auditor, the elected

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Constitutional Officers are all Democrats, not that that matters, but you said it was a strong Republican state. The..."

Chapa LaVia: "The Speaker... the Speaker of the House?"

Sandack: "Well, I'm... I'm getting..."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm talking about our colleagues, not necessarily the people who... because this doesn't have to go to the Governor."

Sandack: "I get it."

Chapa LaVia: "This is we as House Members."

Sandack: "Well, usually when we characterize a state's quality of whether Republican or Democrat... I mean"

Chapa LaVia: "I... I apologize."

Sandack: "No worries."

Chapa LaVia: "I was talking about the Leadership in the House and the Senate."

Sandack: "Very good. Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "You're welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Representative, you said that... that the main concern for calling this is so that they will... so that we could deal with campaign finance reform. Is that correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Within the scope of this application, yes."

Bost: "Okay. How do we know... 'cause I... when I first came to this Body, there was a... there was a proposal out there to try to drive or... and dealing for a conference of the states. Not a Constitutional Convention, but a conference of the states. They were always... the argument against that was, it could be

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

then driven to a Constitutional Convention and there was a danger of that. We had to put a clause in that Resolution that says we wouldn't do that. But once you open and you do a Constitutional Convention, it is not going to be and cannot be focused just on one issue. You must then open up... because it's a Constitutional Convention, you will be dealing with the entire Constitution and the danger of that is, is those things that we have... we have protected so strong in our Constitution, might be then opened up by this group that would be sent there to represent us, and truly change our government in an unbelievable way that might be detrimental to our government. Do you not see that with this?"

Chapa LaVia: "From the schooling, if you will, that I've received in speaking to a lot to Legislators throughout the United States, regardless if it's balanced budget Legislators or the scope in which I'm... the application we're trying to get passed, it's always stated, is that the way the Constitution of the United States is framed, is that that application... no... you cannot go out of its scope. And if you have delegates that you've sent there that kind of become radical, they can be pulled back and other people put forward in their place to make sure we remain on that focus."

Bost: "And that's the way you've studied and understood it. The way I unders... study and understand, I don't see the safety net in that. I've heard the argument before that you're giving, but when you truly read... when you go to a Constitutional Convention, a Constitutional Convention is just that. It is not narrow focus. You can't narrow focus. A... but you can do that with a conference of the states. I would

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

suggest that we come back and try to encourage a conference of the states, but not a Constitutional Convention. The sheer fear of losing what our Constitution is, and this... and this is definitely not a partisan thing. This is... this is just a belief from the study of... of what I've done and I did it early on, like I said, when I first got here and it was because we were driving toward that conference of the states. I would support a conference of the states because I believe that you have control over that. I can't contr... I can't support this for the sheer fear of... of losing control of our Constitutional Convention to the point that we would break up what it is that we've come to love so much in this nation."

Chapa LaVia: "And I can respect that about you, Congressman."

Bost: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "You never cease to surprise me. Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, help us in understanding this concept a little bit further. How many conventions have there been held in our country's history?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, the prior one that... which our Constitution was founded on. Okay. We had the federalist papers and then we had a Constitutional Convention of the original 13 states. There was one state, one vote and where we've come... to where we've come. We've never, to date... we've gotten pretty close and I think it was with our Amendment #17; I can't remember exactly right now, that we got close to holding a convention, but one has never been done. So, that's where you'll find

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

there's a lot of unknowns, right? The Founding Fathers, like I said, of this country were so amazingly intelligent beyond comprehension, they would have never given us an Article V, if we... in order to make sure that everybody was represented at all times. And there are times in our history that we find that... and you could probably poll people in your district and my district... the overwhelming lack of support that we have at that federal level, giving we the people back the support. original question, we've... we've never Constitutional Convention at this level. There's about 13 or 14 states that are going to be meeting this December 8 and 9 in Washington, D.C. and I'm one of the people that's going as a delegate from Illinois to put down the foundation, Robert's Rules, on what would happen when we get to that point. We're not dealing with what application. We're dealing with the ground rules on how we would operate as a delegate to the Constitution there. We deal with how we select, we deal with our delegates here, together we would ... each state would do that."

- Pritchard: "So, have these conventions, or the states passing Resolutions do, have a Constitutional Convention, ever stimulated action in Congress on other issues?"
- Chapa LaVia: "No. It would have to be within the scope in which we're..."
- Pritchard: "No, no. No, no. My point is, has the threat of a Constitutional Convention stimulated Congress to act on things that we the people may not have agreed with?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Well... Yeah. I really don't know how to answer that.

  Okay? Because usually when we get to the point where Congress

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

feels we're getting close to the 34 states in order to call for a Constitution, they listen to we the people and they change their minds about something. So, we never have gotten to that point. But..."

Pritchard: "There..."

Chapa LaVia: "Go ahead, I'm sorry."

Pritchard: "There are a number of groups that are also promoting Constitutional Conventions for other things."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Pritchard: "Why not broaden the scope to include some of these other things if we're going to have a Constitutional Convention?"

Chapa LaVia: "Well, it's interesting that you said that 'cause I've talked to the conventions of state and Vicky, and I don't know Vicky's last name, there's another Constitutional Amendment that they'd like to see come forward next year having to do with term limits at that level. And I told her I'd be more than happy to look at that stuff, but if we can't agree to the fact that we have powers in order to represent we the people when they feel like their Congress isn't, then we really can't go much farther. So, I'm hoping that we're able to work together and get this passed out, so we can work on something in that manner next Session."

Pritchard: "If this is successful and there is a Constitutional Convention, what happens with the output of that convention?"

Chapa LaVia: "So, what would happen is the decisions made at that convention then get sent back out to the states and 38 of our states have to ratify what that Amendment change is..."

Pritchard: "It's a typical convention."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Chapa LaVia: "...in order to get the Amendment changed at the federal level. So, it's a very lengthy, drawn-out process. And this being the first of, we have to have 34 applications in from 34 states asking to stay within this scope, in order to change the... or to start or engage the process of calling for a convention at the federal level. Once we have 34 applications of the same scope, like this one and Vermont and California and now Illinois, once I get thir... we get 31 other states to agree to do that and pass that from chamber to chamber, the Congress calls for the election of delegates from all those states to convene in Washington. And then there, we agree, just like we are here debating, on what we would like changed and how we would like changed in that Amendment."

Pritchard: "So, it's a typical Legislative Body."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. So we..."

Pritchard: "That then passes out some action that goes back to the states for ratification."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

Pritchard: "That's my question."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. But let me... let me go back 'cause you said legislative action. It dep... it is written in the... in the piece of Senate Joint Resolution that the delegates are elected per whatever we come up with the... the outlines, the guides. What we're looking for is regular average people. We the people to represent us to make sure that's being done. So, it's not... it's not formulated to have Legislators. There'll be some Legislators, but for the most part, just regular amazing

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

people out there in our community in Illinois to help come up with solutions."

Pritchard: "How many delegates from Illinois?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Pritchard: "How many delegates from Illinois?"

Chapa LaVia: "We would have to come up with that. And it... it's funny speaking to the convention of states, it'd probably be another piece of legislation, along with another Constitutional Amendment that we'd try to do in the next Session and put the ground-work on what the delegates would look like from our state, in order to represent us, if we ever got to that point. I think it's always good to have those in our toolbox when we get to that point."

Pritchard: "Well, it looks there's a lot of details that have to be worked out yet. So..."

Chapa LaVia: "It does and this is just the first step."

Pritchard: "Question of the Chair. How many votes are going to be necessary to pass this?"

Speaker Lang: "The parliamentarian has advised this will require 71 votes."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 42 assure us that a convention called this way would be able to deal with only the one topic, and that is overturning the result of the opinion in Citizens United. I share the reservation of those who think that that may not be right. The answer is we don't really know. The only time we've had a Constitutional Convention was one that

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

met in order to amend the Articles of Confederation. As you all know, instead it decided to offer the states... the 13 col ... the 13 states at the time, the opportunity to adopt the United States Constitution, the one that we know and love today. So, I'm not convinced that a convention called this way would not be a runaway convention, but two things made me decide to vote for Senate Joint Resolution 42. First, I'm not sure that I'm right that it could be a runaway convention. I'm no more sure than they are with their interpretation of what would happen. But second, the deleterious and the bad effects of the Citizens United opinion, I think, are going to be felt long and deep in the democratic politics that we know and that we in past have loved. The fact is, under Citizens United, we are very... very unlikely to be able to control campaign finance spending. And, I think, that path is a path that we do not want to take. So, any effort to overturn Citizens United is one that, I feel, I must support. I would prefer the Federal Congress to decide to offer an Amendment through the states that would overturn Citizens United. They don't seem likely to do it at this point, but it is fair to say that in the past many times when a... a proposal like this reaches a critical number of states supporting it, Congress wakes up, smells the coffee, and does the right thing. So, it is my hope that we may not even need to go to a convention on this topic, to find out whether I'm right or they're right on the question can it be a runaway convention, but that maybe congress will... if we act, maybe Congress will finally wake up and say, let's get the job done. So, I will support Senate

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Joint Resolution 42, in spite of my reservation about the runaway convention opportunity."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I rise in support of this Resolution... in strong support of it. And I... I understand that we have a fear of this process, but I also find it fascinating that the framers of our Constitution, in their infinite wisdom, put this tool in for us to take advantage because they knew that future generations of Americans, that they would have the confidence in them to do the right things, just as they did the right thing when they put together the Constitution that now so enjoy. We shouldn't be afraid of exercising this authority. We should embrace it. We should embrace it carefully, cautiously, systematically, but we should move forward. I don't think there are very many people in our country or even in this ... in this Body here today that would suggest that the ramifications of the Citizens United decision has been healthy to our process. It has taken a government that was founded on the principles of by the people and for the people, and then put it in the hands of secret money. There are an enormous amount of huge donors that are able to secretly effect our elections. And... and the citizens of our country have no idea how that's being done. And that... that's just wrong. We all know it. This is an opportunity to move forward. It's not going to happen today. It's not going to happen tomorrow, but it begins the process of moving the ball back and bringing democracy back to the people of our great country. We should all support this. This

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

should be a unanimous vote. I urge everyone to please support this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

"Thank you, Members, for the debate and your... the Chapa LaVia: counterpoints. I just want to go through a couple things so we can get it on record. Two-thirds of the Congress may vote to propose an Amendment and two-thirds of the states, 34 of them could demand a convention to propose Amendments. Either way po... proposed 75 percent of the states, which is 38 states, must vote in favor of the ratification on any Amendment to be added to the Constitution. That's 38 states. And I don't know if you've looked at our state... the United States lately, but there are all different colors and all different Congresses. Four out of the previous 10 Amendments began with states calling for a convention to propose Amendments: 17th, the 21st, the 22nd, and the 25th Amendments. Seventeenth Amendment was proposed by Congress when the states got within one or two applications of calling for a Convention. The ... there exists over 700 state applications on a variety of issues including those from 49 states previously passing Resolutions, including California, and 45 states with current applications. Only conventions called on the same issues are counted together, which is how we know that the convention scope will be limited to a single issue once convened. There... there have been over 233 state conventions to amend and adopt State Constitutions with zero, once again, zero runaway conventions, which is just a conspiracy theory promoted by certain society. If you could take 10 applications on issue A, 20 applications on issue B and 4 applications on issue C,

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

count them together and call them a convention on those 3 issues, we would have already had a convention. So, it has to stay within the scope. And please remember this, with the undoing of Citizens United, today, as we sit here, anybody from around the world could take a Linda Chapa LaVia or Joe Sosnowski or anybody and give you \$2 billion and run you for President of the United States and we wouldn't be able to do anything about it. Our politics and policy, in this country, is not for sale. Please, allow us to have a voice at that convention. I ask for its adoption. Thank you, Speaker and Members."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello, Davidsmeyer, DeLuca. Cabello, Davidsmeyer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Joint Resolution 79. Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. SJR79 requests that the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission to study effective policies and practices concerning juvenile record confidentiality and expungement and submit a report to the Governor and General Assembly. The Commission's report should include recommendations and best practices from across the state and nation. Additionally, it encourages local law enforcement, attorneys, county clerks, judges, prosecutors, program providers and others to participate in the study and review current practices and procedures. The Commission is requested to submit a report to the Governor and General

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Assembly by March 1, 2016 and to catalog the progress of expungement with its recommendations on March 1, 2017. I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution.

There being no debate, those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves.

Cabello, Davidsmeyer, Franks, McAuliffe, Senger, Wallace. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted.

On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Total Vetoes, there appears Senate Bill 2015. Mr. Costello on a Motion to override."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House concur with the Senate to override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 2015. This Bill... this Bill clarifies that highway and tollway speed limits are 70 miles an hour. I would like to remind everybody that Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, Madison, McHenry, St. Clair, and Will Counties have the ability to opt out. I thank you. And I ask for your 'yes' vote for this override."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 2015. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davidsmeyer, Jakobsson, McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does override the Governor's veto.

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under the Order of Amendatory Veto, Senate Bill 1630. Representative Feigenholtz on a Motion to override."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to move that the House concur with the Senate on Senate Bill 1630. This is a Bill that passed both the House and the Senate, overwhelmingly, in the spring. The underlying Bill eliminates financial incentives and essentially codifies Federal Law of the American Medical Association. I'm glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Zalewski: "So, Sara this... this Bill came out of my committee and I... I'm wondering if there's any way to pull the Motion, and simply try to work through this in the spring. 'Cause I don't know that... I don't necessarily... I don't necessarily know that the parties, in this instance, are so far apart and the issue isn't so nuanced that it can just be hit... reset with a new Bill in... in the 99th."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Zalewski, I believe that the murkiness of, perhaps, what you're discussing may have come with what the Governor attempted to do.

Zalewski: "Sure."

Feigenholtz: "I know that the Senate Sponsor has worked on this for two years. I think I believe that the underlying Bill that we passed, with 95 votes or 92 votes, is pretty clear. I would be more than glad to work on a trailer Bill. But at

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

this time, I would really like to just move this forward, but commit to working with you on whatever concerns you have. But I have listened to those concerns and I do not see how they pertain to this Bill."

Zalewski: "Okay. I'm going to listen to the debate, Sara. I appreciate your comments. And Senator Haine is well regarded by myself, so I... I don't want to ever go against his will. I just... in this instance, with these issues, I hate to see conflict when I feel like there could be agreement. But I appreciate where you're coming from and I'll just continue to listen to the debate."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I'd appreciate your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that we override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 1630. Those in favor of her Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Arroyo, Berrios, Davidsmeyer, Evans, Tabares, Williams. Davidsmeyer, Evans. Please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present'. And the Motion is successful. And the House does override the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 1630. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3341. Mr. Tryon. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3341, a Bill for an act concerning local government, Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3341 affects conservation districts which are adjacent to counties with a population greater than 2 million. That just happens to be one conservation district, the McHenry County Conservation District. And it clarifies a conflict between two legal opinions that the conservation district has from their General Counsel and their Bond Counsel. And it goes to the heart of their ability to be able to manage their tax rate for non-referendum debt. So, that ... what the Bill will do, it will... it will basically give them the same authority to manage their non-referendum tax debt as every other conservation district. In fact, it's every other of government that has that same authority. Additionally, it will also codify and put in law that they have the ability to re... refinance their bond debt as well as add a provision to the law that will allow them to maintain historic buildings with their non-referendum bond money. That's what this does. It will put them on par with all the other units of government, including forest preserve districts, park districts, municipalities. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer them. If there's not, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, 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? Burke, Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

declared passed. Remaining on page 2, Senate Bill 2677. Representative Mayfield. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2677, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 2677 is an initiative of Lake County, but it benefits all counties throughout the state. This Bill simply allows counties to recap taxpayer funds spent to eliminate a hazardous... a hazard on property, if the property goes to a tax sale. Municipalities already have this ability. So, what Senate Bill 2677 would do is simply allow counties the same opportunity as municipalities. The Bill passed the Senate unanimously and there is no opposition. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "There being no debate, 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? Evans, Tabares. Tabares. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1400, offered by Representative Kay. House Resolution 1401, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 1402, offered by Representative McAuliffe. House Resolution 1403, offered by Representative Cross. And House Joint Resolution 118, offered by Representative Brauer."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the order of Consideration Postpone there appear House Bill 162. Representative Chapa LaVia, please proceed."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I think I probably should rename this Bill to Violet's Bill. Hi, Violet. Say 'hi' to everybody. Hi, Violet; we love you and we love all the food you give. I'll take any questions. I think everybody... it's a Postpone Consideration, so we ran this last time. It has to do with small court affidavits. So, if there's any issues please voice your concerns now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "All right. There's no issues, Linda. Just... again for record purposes and for what we do, just elaborate a little bit..."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Sandack: "...on what the Bill does."

Chapa LaVia: "So, House Bill 162 makes several changes in the publi... Probate Act of 1975. It makes five of them. One, being financial instructions may established and maintained guardianship accounts for minors. Financial institutions include but are not limited to a bank, credit union, investment company, savings bank, savings and loan associations, securities dealer, or trust company. Two, when opening a guardianship account for a minor, the guardian has a duty to present a court order to the financial institution, and the financial institution has the duty to ask the guardian

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

if any court order exists. Three, if an account is subject to court order, the financial institution must obtain a court order granting the authority to release funds. Four, a person, corporation or financial institution cannot grant access to the deceased, small descendants, small estate unless the agent presents a small state affidavit and a court order. And fifth and last, the content... content of the small estate affidavit is changed by adding language to help ensure that there are no unpaid creditors and the heirship is not disputed. The Bill came about, about five years ago... four years ago when Miss Violet came down. And what happened is she was married, her husband passed away. The... her stepson was able to go to the bank and take out... withdraw all of her life savings and her husband's deceased life savings, based on him having the account number. And she had no recourse whatsoever. This doesn't help Miss Violet, it helps people after this. And it's for anything under a hundred thousand."

Sandack: "Thank you for that elaboration. Why am I... my analysis shows the Illinois Banker's Association and the Illinois State Bar Association as opposing. Do you know why they oppose?"

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Sandack: "The analysis that I have, shows the bankers and the Illinois State Bar Association..."

Chapa LaVia: "They're... they're still in opposition. They feel that it should be the courts that rule on the... the documents and things like that shouldn't be in their hands."

Sandack: "So they want a case by case analysis and not some strict
 rulings?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Sandack: "Thank you very much, Linda."

Chapa LaVia: "You're welcome, Sir."

Sandack: "I appreciate the elaboration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "It's just a follow up question to just what Representative Sandack said. Because we worked on the other Bill for two years, and we're ready to pass that Bill. But... and it was not going to solve the situation, but it was going to help others. But this Bill was a much broader outreach Bill that the lawyers and the bankers were adamantly opposed to. So, they are still adamantly opposed to this Bill. Is that correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "That's correct."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close, briefly."

Chapa LaVia: "I'd really appreciate your support to pass the Bill.

Thank you."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Please record yourselves, Members. Pritchard, Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Reis."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Reis: "Inquiry of the Chair, please."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry, sir."

Reis: "Can we have a verification on the effective date of that Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "I don't understand your question."

Reis: "Can we have a verification as to when the effective date of that Bill is?"

Speaker Lang: "Are you asking the Clerk what the..."

Reis: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "When you used the word verification, it confused the Chair."

Reis: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk..."

Reis: "I'm a very confusing person."

Speaker Lang: "can go back to that... it has no effective date."

Reis: "No effective date?"

Speaker Lang: "That's correct."

Reis: "So does that need 60 votes or 71?"

Speaker Lang: "Sixty votes, Sir."

Reis: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Why didn't ask that question in the first place?"

Reis: "I was trying to confuse you."

Speaker Lang: "And you did. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1209.

Leader Currie. Members, please rise. We have three Death
Resolutions. Excuse me. We have four Death Resolutions.

Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

we, along with his family and friends, mourn the passing of Bill Luking; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Bill Luking as a symbol of our deep sympathies and great esteem.

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker and Members of the House. Bill Luking was an institution in this institution. He was somebody who began working in Illinois State Government in 1986. He was a representative of the administration of Herold Washington. He stuck it out through later mayors. And he really enjoyed the ability to strategize, to remember what had happened in Illinois history and in... in the Illinois courts. As the Resolution, at one point, says... let me just find the specific passage. He worked for the Chicago Transit Authority, the Botanic Garden He was m... in major ways thoroughly respected by his peers, no matter what side of an issue he was on, even if it was very different side from some of the other. His mastery of legislative history and arcane Supreme Court decisions made him a better reference source even than Google. That was the kind of person Bill Luking was and those of you who worked with him know the depth and the breadth of his intelligence, his understanding and his knowledge. Bill was important in another way and that is that he showed the ropes, the legislative strategic ropes, to generations of people coming as young people to the Capitol. And you all know who you are. People like Vince and Derek, Jerry, more recently Victoria from the city, Laura from the Board of Education, Samantha who is now with the Governor's Office. He showed care and respect and love for all of these

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

people coming along. And while Bill is not with us any longer, his legacy of people who know how to do the job that he showed them will long live after him. Bill was the oldest of nine children. We are joined today by his sister, Beth Luking, who is in the gallery, along with friend Susan Zingle and Clair Manning. So, I... I hope that they appreciate what kind of a difference Bill made to the institution that is the Illinois General Assembly, as well as to the people across Illinois. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "In memory of Bill Luking, we'll take a moment of silence. Thank you. Leader Currie moves that all Members of the House be added as Sponsors. Is there leave? Leave being granted. Those in favor of the Resolution will say... the Resolution has been adopted already. Thank you, Members. House Resolution 1327. Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1327, offered by Representative Sullivan.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of former United States Congressman Philip M. "Phil" Crane; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That we acknowledge Rep. Phil Crane's more than 35 years of public service as an Illinois representative to the United States House of Representatives, his lifelong love of the discipline of history, his commitment to Constitutional principles, and his love of the traditions and values that have made America the shining light of the world. Be it further

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this resolution be presented to Rep. Phil Crane's 7 surviving children, Rebekah Crane, Susanna Crane, Sarah Crane, Catherine Hott, Jennifer Oliver, Carrie Crane, and George Crane."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was fresh out of college when I went to work for Congressman Crane, or 'The Boss' as we effectively... affectionately called him, or at least those that worked for him. I was thinking about public service, and I... I asked my father, 'you know, what should I do?' And he says, well, if you want to learn about government, there's only one person to go talk to, and that's Phil Crane. And so, I marched down to his office and asked for a job, and ended up working as his assistant campaign manager in the... sheesh ... 1992 General Election. So, it's way back. Crane was really one of the pioneers of the conservative movement. When you think about issues that we talk about today: the flat tax, term limits, jobs... you know jobs was about just free trade agreements. He was very big advocate on the House Ways and Means Committee. One of his favorite phrases was he would never vote for a tax increase short of World War III. I must have heard that a thousand times on the different campaign stumps that... that we did. But he was always a larger than life figure and could captivate an audience, whether it was two people he was talking to, or a hundred people he was talking to. You listened to him, because he made sense. People believed him 'cause he believed in himself. His basis of his beliefs was really his faith in God and his faith in country. It was pretty... pretty outstanding to listen to him. But his

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

arguments were forceful, because they were guided by history. They're guided by the Constitution. He was really an incredible man, and certainly will be missed. His legacy really will be one of integrity and honesty. And I'm sure there's other that would like to share some stories about him too. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison."

Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to echo many of Representative Sullivan's words. Phil Crane was very highly regarded in our area in Palatine and Arlington Heights, Barrington, Hoffman Estates. And as I was approaching college, I applied to a number of schools, and my parents asked me if I'd had ever heard of Hillsdale College. I thought, no, I'd never... never heard of the place. And they said, well, Phil Crane went there. And immediately, I thought, this is a place I want to check out. And I visited the campus. It's a very small school in central southern Michigan, only has about 1200 students there per year but it has a very long and rich history. It's a very, very unique place. And Phil Crane graduated from there in 1952. He continued to serve on the Board of Trustees for decades. He's probably the best known graduate of the school. And I... as ... I was thinking a visit I made earlier this summer to Eureka College. If you haven't been there, you should go. As many of you know, that is the home of President Reagan, or that's where President Reagan got his bachelor's degree. And you understand how much a school can have an impact on a great leader and I think Hillsdale had that for Phil Crane. And I'm very grateful 'cause I greatly enjoyed the school, as well. But I think we

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

all as Illinoisans should appreciate the work of Phil Crane. He definitely had a huge impact on the country in a positive way. And so, we give him honor today."

- Speaker Lang: "Body will take a moment of silence. Mr. Sullivan moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1351, Mr. Smiddy. Please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we, along with his family and friends, mourn the passing of former United States Representative Lane Evans; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Representative Lane Evans as an expression of our sympathy."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy."

Smiddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Lane Evans was born on August 4 1951 in Rock Island, and passed away November 5, 2014, one day after the election. Lane never let an election get away... get away from him or get in the way of anything, including his death. Lane served in the United States Marine Corps. And it was also fitting that he was laid to rest on the Rock Island Arsenal on November 10, the Marine Corps birthday. He was avid about being a Marine. I was fortunate enough, in 1993, to go work for Congressman Evans as a staff assistant. When I first met him, I said, hello, Congressman Evans. And it was funny, he says no one calls me that, they just call me Lane. And that epitomized what Lane did and was to his

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

district. The true measure of a person was not how much that they had in life, but how much they gave back. And Lane gave back every day to make sure that the constituents of his district were taken care of. He was a very strong advocate to the veterans of, not only Illinois, but also to the United States. He ensured that everyone was able to be covered and fought very strongly for those who suffer from posttraumatic stress syndrome, those with Agent Orange, and also the children that contracted spina bifida after that war. I would not be here today if wasn't Lane's mentorship and what he meant in my life. And I cannot express in words exactly what he has done for me over those past 20 years. And I would like to have a moment of silence, and, then, if anyone else would like to speak."

Speaker Lang: "We'll take a moment of silence. Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Congressman Lane Evans was my Congressman for many years, worked with him on many different occasions. He truly was a man of the people and just highly, highly regarded throughout the district. He never ever forgot who it was that sent him to Washington. If you ever... I guess I would say to people just starting out in their career, if you want to understand what it means to give good constituent service, all you need to do is follow the Lane Evans model. And he always had time for everyone that had a question, needed help, wanted to see him and people never forgot that. He set the bar very high for honesty, integrity, and... and constituent service. It's already been mentioned that he didn't like to wear titles. He just preferred to be called Lane. And in that vein, I can't help but think many of the

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

letters that I've seen that Abraham Lincoln sent they were always signed, 'Your humble servant, A. Lincoln'. And that was really the servant attitude that Congressman Evans had was just... simply, you know, he... he's working for the people and he showed that every day. He was certainly very proud of his Marine service was such a strong advocate on behalf of those in the military and veterans, and he was one of the first voices I heard so strongly championing and raising the concerns about the effects of Agent Orange and other problems that returning veterans sometimes have. He really became their champion on all issues. It is... clearly, as we think about the Lane Evans, he was dedicated, he was committed, and Lane Evans made a difference. And he will be missed. God rest his soul."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank Representative Smiddy for bringing this Resolution to the floor. As everyone... the two speakers before me said, he was a unique man. Really a friend of the veterans. I believe, it was a convention that the veterans had out in Arizona. All the delegates, when he came into the room, gave him a standing ovation for all that he had done for them. And like Representative Moffitt said, his constituent service was next to none. Everybody that came to him, no matter what it was, he would always make sure that they got answer or got a solution to their problem. So, I, again, want to thank Representative Smiddy for bringing this forward."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- adopted. Mr. Clerk, Senate Joint Resolution 76 Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution 76 offered by Representative Davidsmeyer.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE SENATE OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCURRING HEREIN, that we recognize Sheriff John Lammy, Marshal Charles B. Rose, Illinois State Trooper George L. Frederickson, and Chief Deputy Sheriff Brian K. Gibbons; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That we designate Route 96 between Kampsville and Mozier as the "Sheriff John Lammy Memorial Highway"; and be it further RESOLVED, That we designate the Illinois State Kampsville Ferry Landing, on both the Kampsville and Eldred sides of the river, as the "Kampsville Marshal Charles B. Rose Memorial Landing"; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That we designate a stretch of Route 100 from Grafton to Pere Marquette State Park as the "Illinois State Trooper George L. Fredrickson Memorial Highway"; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That we recognize the naming of Route 100 as it passes through Calhoun County as the "Chief Deputy Brian K Gibbons Memorial Highway"; and be it further
  - RESOLVED, That the Illinois Department of Transportation is requested to erect at suitable locations, consistent with State and federal regulations, appropriate plaques or signs giving notice of the these names."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I bring this Resolution to the Body. It's a little bit different. Normally...

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

normally, we have Resolutions that just name one individual. This is... this is the result of a lot... a lot of hard work from four different students who did projects to research the contributions of different law enforcement individuals to the southern part of my district. And after... after years and years of work, this is about a four-year project. It finally came here, came through the Senate, and I am happy to work with these students to make this... this come to fruition. So, I really appreciate all your support."

Speaker Lang: "We'll take in a moment of silence. Mr. Davidsmeyer moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Resolu... You're right. This requires a record vote, Members. Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1382. Representative Jehan Gordon. Please read the Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 1382.

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives were saddened to learn of the death of our friend and former colleague, former State Representative Michael K. Smith, who passed away on August 9, 2014; and

WHEREAS, Rep. Smith was born to Dale and Betty Bertetto Smith on May 23, 1966 in Canton; he graduated from Canton High School and from Bradley University with a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science; and

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- WHEREAS, Rep. Smith married Donna L. Shaw on February 1, 1991 in Canton; and
- WHEREAS, Rep. Smith began working with the Illinois House of Representatives as a legislative assistant; he continued his public service as Canton Township Trustee from 1991 to 1994 and as a Citizens Advocate for the Illinois Attorney General's Office from 1992 to 1995; he was elected State Representative in 1994 and diligently served the people of Fulton, Peoria, and Tazewell counties and the State of Illinois for 16 years; and
- WHEREAS, Rep. Smith was a dedicated and passionate advocate for Illinois' schoolchildren as Chairman of the House Elementary and Secondary Education Committee; he fought to increase funding for schools, literacy programs, early childhood education, and students with special needs; he served as a member of the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board from 2011 to 2014; and
- WHEREAS, Rep. Smith fought for middle-class families, working to bring jobs to Central Illinois; he secured valuable State assistance to support local employers and workers at the Keystone Steel and Wire Co. in Bartonville and at Cook Medical in Canton; he helped to promote regional growth through the establishment of the Heart of Illinois Regional Port District, the Western Illinois Economic Development Authority, and with his support of the bio-fuels industry; he made his district a priority by securing millions of dollars in infrastructure improvement projects, including upgrades to Veterans Drive in Pekin and through efforts to revitalize East Peoria's downtown; and

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

WHEREAS, Rep. Smith served as a Chairperson and Member of the House committees on Appropriations-Elementary and Secondary Education, Agriculture and Conservation, Environment and Energy, Financial Institutions, Judiciary II-Criminal Law, and Personnel and Pensions; he fought on behalf of first responders as a founder and Co-Chairman of the Illinois Legislative Fire Services Caucus; he served as Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Downstate Democratic Caucus; and

WHEREAS, Rep. Smith loved his community; he served as a Trustee Emeritus at Graham Hospital in Canton, a founding member of the 336 Highway Coalition, and as a member of Pekin Moose Lodge #916, the Knights of Columbus, and Ducks Unlimited; he was a past president of the Canton Area Chamber of Commerce, a past vice-president of the Rotary Club of Canton, former board member of the American Heart Association's Illinois Chapter, and the Fulton-Mason Crisis Service, and a past Parish Council President at St. Mary Church in Canton; and

WHEREAS, Rep. Smith's public service was recognized with the Glen Walters Memorial Award, the Associated Fire Fighters of Illinois Legislator of the Year, the Illinois Association of Fire Protection Districts Award, the Friend of Agriculture, the Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association 1999 Legislative Award, the Illinois Association of Rural Electric Co-Operatives Representative of the Year, the Illinois ABATE Outstanding Legislator Award, the Illinois Education Association Legislative Service Award, the Illinois Hospital Association Award, and the Leo Sharp Award; and

WHEREAS, Rep. Smith is survived by his wife, Donna; his mother, Betty; his sisters, Sandra Schuman and Pat Fowler; and several

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

nieces, nephews, great-nieces, and great-nephews; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we, along with his family and friends, mourn the passing of former State Representative Michael K. Smith; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Rep. Smith as an expression of our deepest sympathies and respect."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon-Booth."

Gordon-Booth: "When I decided to run for office in 2007, Mike Smith was one of the first people to reach out to me. He took to lunch. He talked to me about Springfield, the Springfield way, the kinds of things that you have the opportunity to do in Springfield if you are so blessed to be elected. Upon being elected, Mike Smith sort of showed me the ropes down here. In the back row, he was always someone who you could depend on for a word of advice, a friendly laugh, or tell you where the bodies were buried around here. Mike Smith was such a caring, loving human being. He was a friend to all. He met no strangers. And he loved, I mean absolutely loved and cherished his wife and mother. Mike Smith wanted to see all children in the State of Illinois receive the same type of high quality education, and he fought tirelessly to see that that happened. One of the greatest things that you can be given in this life is a friend and Mike Smith was a friend to this back row, to the Downstate Caucus, to this Body, and to this process, and to the people of the State of

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Illinois. And when we lost Mike Smith, we truly lost a friend."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was a real loss when I learned of the death... heard of the death of ... the passing of Representative Mike Smith. He was a very, very good friend of mine. Our districts joined and we'd oftentimes go to meetings together. We worked on a lot of things together. One of the things was what we called the central six. The ... it's a group of six Legislators. It was bipartisan and it was bicameral working on the livestock legislation. And we worked very hard on that and... and came up with a package that has been very successful in allowing the livestock industry to thrive, and yet protect... communities protect environment and be a workable piece of legislation. Representative Smith did have a tremendous sense of humor. And I always... whether it was going to a meeting or walking past his desk here in the back row, he'd often, hey, Don, have you heard such and such? And you'd lean over there and he'd tell you a story, which I will not repeat now, they were great stories. And... but always had another story and it was so much fun to hear that. I had the honor and the privilege of cochairing the House Task Force on Fire Protection Funding. And just in that light, we traveled around the state to 22 different locations. Many of you in here, we came to your districts to hold fire protection hearings. And... and Mike took that so serious and we... we worked hard on a whole package of legislation that came out of that. Twenty-two hearings altogether around the state. He was cochair of the... one of the first cochair of the, along with

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

me and the two Members of the Senate, on the Fire Caucus. And again, we continued to promote things and helped on fire protection. Mike Smith made many contributions. Mike Smith was truly a public servant. And I think it would be only fitting to say that part of his legacy is that Illinois is a safer place because Mike Smith served in the Legislature and the things that he worked on and had a passion for. He was a great friend and I miss him. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Michael Ken Smith was a champion. He was a beautiful person who died too young. He defended me when I was a young Legislator and under attack. He was loyal. His heart was pure. He was honest. And what a great legacy to be known as a champion of children. My grandfather Bradley said that when you die what you do for yourself dies when you die, but what you do for others lives on and on and on. From Tom Holbrook and myself, in the back row, your buddies, Michael Ken Smith we miss you, we love you and God bless."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mike Smith was a man of integrity and a man of decency and full of class. Mike is... Mike was an incredibly honorable person and he was kind to everyone that met him and got to know him. And certainly, he is very, very deeply missed by his family, but he is also very deeply missed by everyone who had the opportunity to get to know him. And as the Resolution was read into the record, Mr. Speaker, and the mention of course of his wife and his mom and his sisters, but he did have many nieces and nephews. And as I have gotten to know his family more and learn more about his family, I've

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

also learned that Mike Smith was really, truly a father figure to all of them. And I know that they are really hurting right now, because he is deeply missed, because of that father figure that he brought to all of them. And I think, especially right now with this holiday season, I would just ask everyone to continue to keep his family in your thoughts and prayers because, certainly, this is the time of year that there'll be many memories and many stories that are rehashed and gone through again, and it's a tough time of year. And certainly, his family is in my thoughts and prayers. And again, he will be deeply missed. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I served on the Elementary Secondary Education Committee when Michael K. Smith was the chairperson. He ruled or served on that committee with such bipartisan favor. He was excessively kind to everyone. He really... sure taught all of us how we might try to be. He respected everyone's time. He knew that each individual who came to testify in Springfield deserved to be heard. And he was always of good humor. I never remember Michael K. Smith getting angry. I remember him deliberating. I remember him asking real prudent questions before we made decisions in that committee. I knew Michael K. Smith and any of us who have known him, we should be better for it. I ask that blessings are extended to his family. And he will surely be missed. I'm proud to have served with Michael K. Smith."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "I, too, served with Mike Smith. And one of the… one of the most pleasant people here in this Body… that was here. He

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

actually acclimated me to southern Illinois, or central Illinois, and just gave me different perspectives on what folk in other parts of our state thought and how they viewed government. We would laugh at Members here when... certainly, when Bill Black was here, when Terry Parke was here, Fritchey... he'd laugh at me quite often. We had a great time in that back row great time. When Lou Jones was here, Mike Smith would be back there, he'd just be shaking his head laughing. It's what makes this place so very special to many of us when you get to know someone. Was really... just a really good guy. You never seen Mike angry or upset. Respected everybody in... here in this Chamber. Was fair. We would often sort of laugh at each other on who had the latest telephone. I got here in 2002, and so I think the Palm was out and then the BlackBerry, and then these iPhones came about. So, we always had something in common. And I just remembered his smile, big smile. Pleasant demeanor. Certainly something that we can all use at times. And he taught me a great deal. And it's very difficult to believe that he is no longer here at such a young age of 48. So, my heartfelt condolences go out to his family. And we're definitely a better place because of Michael came in here and served. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We'll take a moment of silence in memory of Mike Smith. Thank you. This Resolution has already been adopted. Members may be in their chairs. Moving to Supplemental Calendar #2, there appears House Bill 3834, on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask to concur on this Bill.

This Bill... what it... this Bill is actually... the Amendment is

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

a Bill that we've already passed in this chamber. The Bill is... it was House Bill 3834, which we already passed, and it reflects parking fees. The... it changes the... where our parking fees in Springfield go to. And it asks that all of them go to the State Parking Facility Maintenance Fund, so that there can be corrections made to this... to the parking facilities. So, it passed in this chamber before with a vote of 109 to 0. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "Robyn, I'm sorry. I got a little bit of what you said.

Could you please explain your Bill a little better, so that
we can understand what it is we're being asked to vote on?"

Gabel: "Sure. It... it changes parking fees. It asks for the... currently, the parking fees... the State Parking Facility Maintenance Fund receives 20 percent of the parking fees and Capitol Development Bond Retirement Fund receives 80 percent. And what they're asking for is that... this is from the Secretary of State's Office... is that all the... all of the fees go to the State Parking Facility Maintenance Fund, so the facilities can be maintained. The... all the bonds that were in that other fund were... have long been retired. Those bonds were... were put out in the 1980s, and those bonds have been paid back. So, it is... it's just a way to be able to fix the parking facilities."

Sandack: "Is there a fee change in your Bill?"

Gabel: "No."

Sandack: "There's no fee increase?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Gabel: "No."

Sandack: "Thank you."

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Mitchell, Thapedi, Unes. Mr. Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3834. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1342, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #5 and 6 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski. Representative, are you withdrawing this Amendment? It's not on the… we'll put it in the record for you, Sir. The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Nekritz and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to adopt Floor Amendment #6 and debate the Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1342, a Bill for Act concerning

criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last spring the Illinois Supreme Court struck down the ... our eavesdropping statute as being overly broad and therefore, unconstitutional. This is... this legislation will reinstate an eavesdropping Bill that we believe will comport with the direction of the Supreme Court. I think, first and foremost, what this Bill does and most importantly, is to restore Illinois to a two party or all party consent state. So, that if a... someone is going to record a conversation, they have to get the consent of everyone in that conversation in order to be able to record. That's a very important public policy for the State of Illinois. If we're going to protect the privacy of citizens and we are going to make sure that... that we are protecting the rights of citizens vis-a-vis government, as well. The legislation does four basic things. One, is it criminalizes the recording of a conversation to which the person recording is not a party. So, you're standing outside a door and you're recording a conversation going on in another room, the participants to that conversation don't know that you're recording, it criminalizes that behavior. Second of all, it... it makes it a crime to surreptitiously record a conversation to which you are a party. So, if you're... got your cell phone stuck in your pocket and... you're having a private conversation, and a conversation that you that you would expect would be private, that would... it would also criminalize that behavior unless

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

you have the consent of everyone to the conversation. Third, surreptitious use of criminalizes the electronic communications to which you are not a party. So if you hack into someone's e-mail and use that and to... and to publish that, that would also be a crime. Finally, one of the other components... important component parts of this legislation is... deals with one of the exceptions that we have, the many exceptions we have to the eavesdropping statute. Right now, at least until January 1 of 2015, there is an exception for law enforcement that allows them to forego getting a judicial warrant and instead as a drug crime is unfolding, they can go to a states attorney, get permission to... to record a conversation that... and we allowed that so that... we gave law enforcement a tool in order to be able to catch those committing drug crimes and not have to wait to get a judicial ... a judicial waiver to do that. We are expanding... we're extending the deadline on that particular tool, enforcement tool, from Janu... January 1, 2015 to January 21 ... January 1, 2018. We are expanding the number of crimes that... that is available under that tool. It will now cover things like murder, murder for hire, kidnapping, aggravated sexual assault, more forcible felony crimes. We also will want to make sure that we keep track of how often this... what I would consider to be a warrantless wiretapping is going on, and so we have asked the Cook... the state's attorneys across the state to keep track of how often they use... are utilizing this tool and for what crimes they are utilizing this tool and make an annual report to the General Assembly so that we can make an

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

evaluation of that. I think those are the major components. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think the Sponsor very eloquently laid out the changes of this challenging Bill, and I commend her on negotiating a very fair Bill in a difficult environment. And that... we're really better for it, because right now we do not have an eavesdropping statute, and that is a problem throughout our state. Law enforcement has clearly told us that they favor this Bill. No, it's not perfect, there are some difficulties and there may be challenges later on, but the fact of the manner is, on balance it does many good things that law enforcement, universally, accepts as being helpful in trying to, frankly, stop and deal with crime. So, I would recommend a 'yes' vote. And again, I commend the Sponsor on a tricky Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Elaine, I want to compliment you on this Bill. We vetted it, I thought, very thoroughly this morning. And I think, it's a good Bill that I... I would just tell you, it can't wait. Because what happens if it does wait is we are liable in this state to criminalize innocent activity and we don't want to do that. You've gone a long way to take this Bill where we need to be. It is imperfect, but most of the things that we do here are not perfect. And I would just recommend support of this Bill today, saying that I know that the imperfections

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

will be worked on. And I urge an 'aye' vote because this is a badly needed piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, I certainly I want to be very, very brief and vet several speakers in favor of it. And I think, it was a unanimous vote out of committee, if I understand it correctly. There were a couple opponents initially even with the Amendment. Were the Sheriffs' Association and the School Management Alliance still opposed? I don't think they testified against it. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "So, Representative, I spoke with the Representative from the School Management Alliance after committee. I think there had been some confusion. And so they have removed their opposition. I... I believe the Sheriffs' are still opposed, but my understanding was that that was because we did not address the issue of the... of officer-worn cameras. And I can tell you that there is a commitment from both the House and the Senate to deal with that issue. I think if we... we all believe that it's imperative to deal with that. But with the short time frame we had here and the complexity of the issues surrounding that particular legislation, we felt it better to wait until the spring."

Moffitt: "Representative, I appreciate that response. And I agree that this... it's timely, it's needed, it's important that it's passed. And you've made a commitment to continue to work with law enforcement to address, perhaps, some lingering questions out there. So, thank you very much."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Leader, we pretty much explored the Melongo case pretty deeply in Judiciary today, and I just had a couple of questions with respect to legislative intent, because it seems that the issue we were really driving home this morning was looking at (q). Could the new eavesdropping statute be used to prosecute a civilian who records a government employee doing their government job, as was done with Annabel Melongo by the Cook County State's Attorney's Office?"

Nekritz: "I'm sorry Representative, could you ask the question again? I'm sorry."

Thapedi: "Sure. I was asking you could the new eavesdropping statute be used to prosecute a civilian who records a government employee doing their government job as the Cook County State's Attorney's Office did with the Annabel Melongo situation, where she spent almost two years in jail as a result of recording that conversation with that court reporter?"

Nekritz: "I'm sorry, Representative. The answer is no. I think we've tightened up the statute so that that kind of conduct would no longer be capable of being criminalized."

Thapedi: "All right. And also, is it correct that the new eavesdropping statute would prohibit... would prohibit the recording only of private conversations? Is that accurate?"

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Nekritz: "Yes. The... I believe the standard is that it has to be...

you have to have a reasonable expectation of privacy in order

to... in order to have the conversation be protected."

Thapedi: "And again, this is in light of the Melongo, the 7-0 decision that was decided by the Supreme Court in March of 2014. And lastly, to clarify in general, when an on-duty government employee talks to a member of the public as a part of their government job, that conversation would not be private. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that the legislation does have a severability clause in it. And the ... and the construction of the legislation is in three separate Sections. And it is ... it would be the intent of the General Assembly that... that if anyone of those Sections would be struck down by the courts, that the others would remain in effect. And so, this legislation has been specifically constructed to withstand that. Like so many pieces of legislation around here, you know this one is the subject of a lot of negotiation and a lot of compromise. And there are certainly things in this legislation that I personally would object to and would not like to see in here, but I think, as some of the previous speakers said, this is an issue that requires us to act quickly, requires us to resolve this to protect the citizens of the State of Illinois. And so, I know that where there's a lot of desire to keep working on this, we will certainly keep doing that. But I think, the time is

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

now and I think this is the right solution for us. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on a series of Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 1385, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Mike Bost. House Resolution 1386, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Renée Kosel. House Resolution 1387, offered by Leader Durkin, representing... honoring Representative Dennis Reboletti. House Resolution 1388, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Jil Tracy. House Resolution 1389, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Schmitz. House Resolution 1390, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Halbrook. House Resolution 1391, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Hatcher. House Resolution 1392, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Harms. Resolution 1393, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Senger. House Resolution 1394, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Osmond. House Resolution 1395, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Cross. House Resolution 1396, offered by Leader Durkin, honoring Representative Pihos. Resolution 1397, offered by Speaker Madigan, honoring Representative Jefferson. House Resolution 1398, offered by

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Representative Burke, honoring Representative Berrios. And House Resolution 1399, offered by Representative Robyn Gabel, honoring Representative Jakobsson."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, by agreement of the Leaders, we are going to have one speaker on each side of the aisle to honor the retiring Members. The first person to speak will be Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And before I start, I would just like to say that Leader Durkin would have liked to have been here and asked all of us to keep him in his prayers due to the death of his father and the funeral of his father, today. So, in respect, Deputy Minority Leader and ... Leitch and myself gathered together last night, personally, to honor the people that are leaving. And today we would like to give a little bit of official recognition to those who have spent years and years and years of service. And today may be very well the last time the 98th General Assembly comes together and we are all saddened on this side of the aisle at the prospect that 11 of our House Republican Caucus Members will not be back next year. And I think, all of us can agree, that each one of these individuals has brought something unique, not only to our caucus, but to the entire Body of the House of Representations and each one will be terribly missed. First of all, Mike Bost. Mike has served in the Illinois House since 1995. And we are all proud that Mike is leaving us to join the U.S. House of Representatives as the new Congressman of the 12th District. Mike, we will miss your very passionate speeches and floor debates and will be watching for you on C-SPAN. Tom Cross, has been a Member of the Illinois House since

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

1993 serving as the Assistant Republican Leader in 1999 and before being elected by his own caucus as the House Republican Leader in 2002, a position he served well in until September 2013. Tom, thanks for serving as our Leader for 10 years. It's not an easy job. Anybody who serves in this House knows that but we all appreciate all the extra time, miles and the hard work that you put in be... on our behalf and away from your family and all those tennis matches and sporting events that your family enjoyed so much. Josh Harms, in our row. During his short tenure here in the General Assembly, Josh has served his communities by supporting many pro-business issues, pro-life and pro-taxpayer agendas. While we are sad to see Josh go so soon, we wish him the best and we're thrilled to see that he's going to be able to spend more time with his family, his two lovely children, Paul and Molly. Kay Hatcher, we couldn't say enough about Kay and her special wit. We had a lot of laughs last night. She's been a Member of the Illinois House since 2009. Kay is a dedicated public servant and was so long before she came to Springfield. She served as the Republican spokesman on the Human Service Committee, not an easy job all the time. And she's a marketing genius from her past history. And we're all going to miss her quick wit. Our best wishes to Kay and to her husband, Steve. Brad Halbrook was the first appointed to the House Representatives in April 2012. He's been a small-business owner and operates a very diversified farm. Brad has been a tireless advocate for the 2nd Amendment, lower taxes, farmers, economic development and reduced government spending and transparency in government. All of us want to wish Brad

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

the best success and spending time with his wife, Linda and their two children. How could I say enough about Renée Kosel? Renée is currently the longest-serving woman Legislator in our caucus, having served since 1997. Prior to joining the Illinois House, Renée Kosel enjoyed a career as a wonderful school teacher in her home communities. Renée Kosel served many years as an Assistant House Republican Leader for our caucus. And as an Assistant Leader, she served as a mentor to many new lawmakers, not only in our caucus but in the entire House, and for that we are all very thankful. Today, we thank State Representative Renée Kosel for her 18 years outstanding dedicated service to the people of this state and wish her and her family success in her retirement. Sandy Pihos, a close friend from DuPage County, has served 12 years in the House of Representatives. An educator and former school board member and president, and entrepreneur, Sandy Pihos will be remembered for her outstanding record of support for education of which all of us would come to Sandy on for advice and for her small-business initiatives. She also was very active in the new leadership program in Illinois in COWL, in developing women leaders to serve in Illinois in future years 200 of which will have graduated from that program this year. Thank you, Sandy and good luck... luck to you and your husband Bill. Dennis Reboletti, another wonderful DuPage person, has served eight years of service in the Illinois House. I don't think there's anybody that doesn't know Dennis in this House of Representatives. We're going to miss Dennis on our side of the aisle as one of our outstanding Floor Leaders. As a Member of the House Republican Leadership team, he's done an

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

outstanding job for all us at all times. Republican spokesman on the Judiciary Committee and as the Republican spokesman on the Restorative Justice Committee. And the sole Republican on the Criminal Procedure Penalty subcommittee. Best wishes to you, Dennis, your family, and your son, Zachary, that you're hoping to spend more time with. Tim Schmitz has served in the Illinois house for 14 years. Tim was one of the youngest elected Members in the Illinois General Assembly when he was first elected to the House in 1999. We came in in the same class together. We want to thank Tim for his service as the Assistant Republican Leader and later his outstanding dedication and service as the Deputy Republican Leader. Amid all the craziness, Tim has always maintained the ability to remain calm and always have a sense of humor that we all enjoyed. That and everything about Tim, we will miss his years of service and we wish him and his family a wonderful, wonderful retirement, and we will miss him terribly. Darlene Senger. In the last two years, Darlene has been at the forefront of a lot of major issues here. And she has served since 2009, but nobody could forget all of the work Darlene has put it to the pension reform. We all admire her financial expertise and what she came in with as a licensed financial investment advisor, how that ended up proving to be very helpful in working with all of us on the important issues of pension reform and money initiatives. Darlene has always given 100 percent and more to this Body and all of us will miss her financial expertise and along with that financial expect... expertise, her wonderful friendly demeanor at all times and ability to keep calm also. Next, Jil Tracy. She

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

first joined the Illinois General Assembly in 2006. She graduated from SIU School of Law and practiced law in Mt. Sterling, Illinois, for over 17 years before she came to the General Assembly. Jil is one of 6 Members of the Legislative Ethics Commission and she was one of the 21 House Members selected to serve on the Investigative Impeachment Committee that found reason to import... impeach Governor Rod Blagojevich in December of 2008. She is also the outgoing cochair of the Illinois Conference of Women Legislators, which again, she spent a lot of time helping to develop the women Leaders in the House and future women Leaders of Illinois through the new... new Leadership program. We are going to miss not only her outstanding work and diligence that she has given to our House, but also her sense of humor and how to always make a difficult situation seem easier when taking votes important legislative contentious issues. Last, but not least, and not here with us today, I'd just like to say a few words about JoAnn Osmond. While she is not here, she was a wonderful colleague and friend to everybody on this floor. I don't think a negative word was ever said about JoAnn, even if you disagreed with her position on a Bill. JoAnn stepped in when her husband, Tim Osmond, died in office. And that was... since 2002 she did a wonderful job. She retired this summer from public service, of which she had spent over 30 years in serving public service in her communities and down here and is reportedly enjoying spending time with her children and grandchildren. She was a wonderful friend and a wonderful, wonderful Representative in this Representatives. So, just, thank you to all of you for, I

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

think, it was probably over a 100 years of service that we talked about today that made our Representatives that are leaving, this outstanding Body, even more outstanding because of their high integrity, their values and their hard work and diligence to making Illinois a better place to live in. I'd ask all of you to give them a round of applause. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Burke is recognized."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly Representative Bellock's presentation is a hard act to follow. With all of those wonderful friends and associates and colleagues of ours who have left service in this Legislature. I hope to be as brief as I can be. It's kind of difficult to talk about one who has been a dear, dear friend, great colleague, major participant in this process here in the House of Representatives. Let me first introduce her dad, the Assessor of Cook County, Ladies and Gentlemen, Joe Berrios, has been with us all day. Joe, if you would please rise. Ladies and Gentlemen, please receive him. And Mr. Speaker, in an effort to make this as brief as possible, I would ask that any of our colleagues that would have cared to offer remarks on behalf of my dear friend and colleague, Toni Berrios, would join me here at the desk and hopefully encourage me and maybe recommend a remark that I may have missed. But Ladies and Gentleman, it's hard to encapsulate 12 years of service. A young woman came to this experience, probably, if I'm not mistaken probably the youngest female Member of this...."

Speaker Lang: "Bear with us Mr. Burke."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Burke, D.: "There we are. As I was saying, Toni Berrios came to us as a very young woman, but came with a family experience, with a commitment to service, not only to her family, but certainly to the society that she was brought up in. Her father gave her certain instructions, in terms of what you have to do in order to survive in politics, what you have to do in order to survive in this society; and that is to be honest, to be decent, to recognize the fact that you are here as a servant of the people who put you here. I was fortunate just a few years ago, to introduce Toni to her fiancée, who joins us today, Jimmy Weiss. Many of us know Jimmy and Jimmy stand up. We're expecting great things from Jimmy Weiss. And he knows that we will find him if anything goes wrong along the way. But Ladies and Gentlemen, again, it's one of the toughest jobs I ever had to say farewell to a dear, dear friend, someone who, I... I believe, I had a little bit to do with in terms of her experience here. Hopefully, those of us who have encountered Toni has had a very, very fortunate experience. I know I've watched her blossom from a child to a grown woman. She has been articulate, kind, generous, considerate and I know that her life as she goes forward, along with her soon to be new husband, is going to be wonderful. And I can only... maybe in referencing... referencing one of my favorite authors, Dr. Seuss, I would suggest to Representative Berrios that she would take heed of Dr. Seuss's words when he suggests that you have brains in your head, you have feet in your shoes, you can steer yourself any direction you choose. You're on your own and you know what you know, and you are the girl who'll decide where to go. Ladies and

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

- Gentlemen, I congratulate Representative Berrios on her 12 years of service. I know we're going to be seeing her in our experience in the future. And please, join me in congratulating Representative Toni Berrios on her wonderful service to this society."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolutions, all of them, will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Good luck to our retiring Members.

  Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1404, offered by Representative Jones."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 117, offered by Representative Currie.
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THIS...."
- Speaker Lang: "All right, Mr. Clerk, we'll put a hold on the Adjournment Resolution. Members, announcement. In January you must leave your laptops here at your desk. It's all right Mr... the Chief of Staff has asked that you leave your laptops here now when you leave, do not take your laptops with you. I misread his note. Leave your laptops at your desks when you leave. The 2015 legislative schedule is being distributed to you at the moment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege. I may have been remiss in not mentioning a couple

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

of our other Members who are leaving this Body. And I believe, that there have been Resolutions introduced by other Members. And I would just hope that maybe we could take a moment to acknowledge those other Members on the Democratic side."

Speaker Lang: "Are you prepared to do that Sir?"

Burke, D.: "I am not, Sir. But I know that other Members have introduced Resolutions. If I would be provided with those..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel, do you wish to speak on behalf of your seatmate?"

"I do. Thank you so very much. So, Naomi it's... Naomi Jakobsson is going to be leaving us. And it has really been just such an honor and privilege to be your seatmate over this last period of time. I don't know if everybody knows, but Naomi has a very, very generous heart. She has in her life, she has adopted... how many... six... six adopted children that she has taken care of in her life. And I think that that has been reflected in the work she's done here. She's been on Human Services Committee. She has worked very hard on education, representing the University of Illinois Champaign. And Naomi's been a perfect seatmate for me, because as you... she eats very healthy. So, it's been somebody I can share our lunchable food with, our vegetables and fruits. So, Naomi, I really appreciate your healthy eating. As you know, we can all gain so much weight down here, but you have helped me stay... stay slim. You've... Naomi, I know that you have good things in the future. There's still so much that you want to do and I really... on behalf of all of us here, I wish you the best. And thank you so much for serving the years that you did."

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution 117, offered by Representative Currie.

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, December 03, 2014, it stands adjourned SINE DIE; and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, December 04, 2014, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 13, 2015 at 12:00 noon, or until the call of the President; and when it adjourns on Tuesday, January 13, 2015, or if it does not convene on that day, the Senate stands adjourned SINE DIE. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns SINE DIE on Wednesday, December 03, 2014, and when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, December 04, 2014 pursuant to this Joint Resolution, both the House of Representatives and Senate stand adjourned SINE DIE with respect to the First Special Session of the 98th General Assembly."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Adjournment Resolution will say 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Mr. Martwick for an announcement."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of personal privilege if... if you'll entertain me. There is cake in Room 300 for...that was brought down by former Member Sam Panayotovich and Calumet Bakery for... on behalf of

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

Representative Berrios and all of the retiring Representatives. So, I ask the whole Body to join us for cake."

Speaker Lang: "Sure. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Mayfield: "There was one Member that was missed that is leaving as well. And I do want to recognize Representative Derrick Smith and thank him for his service. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Members will be in their seats. Staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. Chair recognizes Speaker Madigan for a Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to adjourn, adjourn sine die. I wish to thank every Member of the House for what they've done over the last two years. Every person here contributes, some do it in one way, some do it in another, but everybody contributes. Everybody's duly elected by people in their district. We all come here in January of the odd number year and we take an oath of office. And our obligation under that oath, taken to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Illinois, is to the best of our ability, the best of our ability to discharge our duty and our obligation to the people that elect us. All of us have done that. All of us have done it very, very well. This Session is no different than others. There have been successes and there has been a lack of success. That doesn't mean that in the next Session of the General Assembly that many of us will come back and address the same issues with the same problems and in doing that with the same amount of

151st Legislative Day

12/3/2014

energy and dedication. That's what to be expected by the voters and I'm sure that's what in the minds of everybody that's here and everybody that will be here when we convene the new session in January of next year. So, again, thank you for everything that you have done. I wish all of you a very happy holiday season and hope that for those who are returning to get a good rest over the holidays and be ready for hard work come January. So, thank you very much. And Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn sine die."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan moves that the House adjourn sine die. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And pursuant to the Motion and the Joint Resolution that has already been passed, the House adjourns sine die."