67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. We ask the Members and our guests in the gallery to turn off laptop computers, cell phones, and pagers. And we ask our guests in the gallery to rise and join us for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in pray today by the Reverend Jessie Knox who is with the Church of Good Shepherd Congregational United Church of Christ in Chicago. Reverend Knox is the guest of Representative Ken Dunkin."
- Reverend Knox: "May we bow our heads. God of us all, we come to You today humbled by Your presence, thankful for all the blessings gently shed into our lives. Search our hearts, that we may be confirmed in the truth. Guide our course, that we may never stray from Your path. God, grant this august House, wisdom in all its deliberations, justice and right judgment in all its decisions. Let us see by Your light that we may understand and value what really matters. Remind us always that Your will is the only true and lasting peace. Teach us to love and care for the world You have given us so that our work may truly be Your own, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Kelly Burke."
- Burke K. et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Yarbrough is excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that...
 that Representative Barickman, Brown, Tryon and Leader
 Cross are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall take the record. There being 112 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 434, offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 5 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 122, Representative Carli."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Carli."
- Carli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an Amendment to Senate Bill 122, which will provide us statistical information on three areas: admission, retention, and graduation. Senate Bill 122 will require public institution of higher education to track the status of those students who are the first in their family to attend an institution of higher education. The institutions then will submit an annual report to the General Assembly and Governor on... on the increasing participation of these first generation students. This will help to see if any improvements need to be made to

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

further assist these students. I'd be happy to answer any questions, right after I put on my red sweater."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, did you come up with the idea for this?"

Carli: "No, I did not. I was given this Bill from Representative Ford."

Pritchard: "Given this Bill?"

Carli: "Yes."

Pritchard: "I didn't realize..."

Carli: "Actually, I jacked it from him..."

Pritchard: "...we... we gave a lot of things..."

Carli: "...as he said."

Pritchard: "...here. I thought we took a lot of things."

Carli: "Yes. I... he says I jacked it from him, so I guess I did."

Pritchard: "Well, hopefully, you don't have to take a lot of heat for this Bill because it is a good Bill."

Carli: "It's a very good Bill."

Pritchard: "So, are we already collecting this kind of data from other sources?"

Carli: "We are, but now this will make the institutions submit the data to this General Assembly and the Governor in order to help provide more programs and more assistance for these students."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Pritchard: "So, why is it a good idea to focus on first generation students?"
- Carli: "It's a good idea to focus on them in order to just make sure they are successful in their future and graduate, and for future generations to come."
- Pritchard: "So, are the statistics though that first generation students are less likely to be successful and reach their graduation goals?"
- Carli: "As of right now, but that's why we're implementing these programs to help assist them to actually graduate."
- Pritchard: "Will universities be required to do anything with this information?"
- Carli: "They will be required to submit it to the General Assembly and the Governor annually."
- Pritchard: "But I mean will they follow up and have to invest more in counseling or mediation or whatever?"
- Carli: "Well, it depends on what the analysis of the... the information that's given to the... the General Assembly, and then we'll make more arrangements after that. If counseling is needed, then that's what we'll do. But no other... they're already taking this information. They're just not required to submit it to the General Assembly."
- Pritchard: "Okay. And... and are universities and colleges in favor of this Bill?"
- Carli: "They are because they won't need to hire anymore personnel for it 'cause they're already collecting this data. They just need now to submit it."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "Very good. Well, thank you for introducing this Bill, and best wishes in your career here in the Legislature."

Carli: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Let's take a look. That's the sweater. Thought it was supposed to be a jacket, but it is Saturday, so perhaps securing a jacket on a Saturday would be a little too much work. Let... let me... you... you had mentioned that Representative La Shawn Ford originally had this."

Carli: "Yes."

Eddy: "Have... did... is he here somewhere? I don't see him on the floor."

Carli: "I'm sure he is, somewhere."

Eddy: "I don't see him though, and I'm wondering if he knows that you have this Bill."

Carli: "Yes, he knows."

Eddy: "He does know?"

Carli: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, you... okay. Let... let me ask you a question. Are you aware of any language in this Bill that deals with trans fats?"

Carli: "No."

Eddy: "Have you read the Bill?"

Carli: "Yes."

Eddy: "Because for years now, Representative Ford has tried to pass a Bill to ban trans fats, and the other day he stood

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

up on the floor and mentioned that his Bill had failed miserably in the Senate. So, I'm looking at this as kind of a Trojan Horse Bill."

Carli: "No, I don't think so, especially 'cause we're supposed to be getting... what is that? Fried chicken today and cookies."

Eddy: "Cookies were yesterday..."

Carli: "Yes."

Eddy: "...fried chicken anytime..."

Carli: "Right."

Eddy: "...but I'm concerned... I'm concerned that somewhere in this Bill, there is a trans fat ban."

Carli: "No. It's nowhere in the Bill."

Eddy: "Are you sure?"

Carli: "I'm positive."

Eddy: "Well, then, what does the Bill do?"

Carli: "The Bill makes higher education institutions submit their data to the General Assembly and the Governor, annually."

Eddy: "Well, what... it seems like a reasonable thing to do, but I notice that this Bill got 20 'no' votes in the Senate."

Carli: "Maybe they didn't read up on it as much as I did."

Eddy: "Oh, you've been here long enough to understand how Senators work, apparently. They just send things over here willy-nilly, 100 votes on it, even though it's only 57 of them. Then, Representative Mathias picks the Bill up. That's my concern here. This is the kind of Bill that Representative Mathias has stayed away from too, obviously, because it has 20 'no' votes, to let someone else try to

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

carry the water. I... I'm not sure why you want to stick your neck out."

Carli: "I think it's a great Bill and it's the future..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Carli: "...of our education."

Eddy: "Speaking of that, since it got 20 'no' votes, and if there are any problems with this, if people find something wrong with it in the future, would you do a... would you be willing to introduce a trailer Bill in November when we come back, or October in the Veto Session to fix anything that needs to be done with this?"

Carli: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, Representative, despite the fact that you have a sweater instead of a jacket, I think that this makes sense, but because it's your first Bill, I'll be voting 'no'."

Carli: "Well, thank you for your consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Thank you. Why did you roll your eyes at me, Representative?"

Carli: "I was prewarned about you."

Lang: "Some... some people think, not all, but some people think

I'm a respected Member of this Body..."

Carli: "I think... I think you're a great Member."

Lang: "...and yet, you turned and rolled your eyes at me, along with your staff people that are standing with you. Would you like to... would you like to identify your staff people?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Carli: "No, it's okay."

Lang: "That's okay. All right. So, Mr. Eddy asked you about a trailer Bill. What's a trailer Bill?"

Carli: "Second Bill that comes at a later time..."

Lang: "Oh."

Carli: "...which changes this Bill."

Lang: "So you got that from your trusty assistant there?"

Carli: "I did."

Lang: "Okay. All right, so, this Bill says, in Section 9.16...
don't look at the Bill. You're not allowed to look at it,
Representative. You're supposed to know your Bill. It
says under representation of certain groups in higher
education..."

Carli: "I have to put my thinking cap on."

Lang: "All right. Put your hat... nice hat."

Carli: "Okay. We can go on now."

Lang: "Thanks, Jack. That is one great hat."

Carli: "The red sweater, the blue hat, I am ready..."

Lang: "Yeah, yeah."

Carli: "...for Saturday. I'm ready."

Lang: "I haven't seen one of those in a long time. Maybe I can buy it back from you. So, under representation of certain groups. What are... who are these groups?"

Carli: "They're minorities, and first generation students."

Lang: "Minorities. So, you've got (a) black, (b) Hispanic..."

Carli: "Handicap."

Lang: "...(c) Asian, (d) American-Indian or Alaskan Native. Is that correct?"

Carli: "And handicap."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Lang: "And... I don't see that category, but I'll..."

Carli: "I believe it was the first one."

Lang: "...take your word for it. So, do we get a lot of Alaskan Natives that are involved in this program?"

Carli: "How many natives? I don't..."

Lang: "Well, you have Alaskan Native..."

Carli: "...know the numbers."

Lang: "...here. Isn't this a Bill for Illinois?"

Carli: "Yes, it is."

Lang: "Do they have a reciprocal agreement that Alaska... where Illinois natives can go up there and take advantage of their universities?"

Carli: "I would have to look into that, but students..."

Lang: "All right."

Carli: "...are welcome everywhere."

Lang: "All right. I'm... I don't... I don't really have too many more questions because I'm being thrown off by the hat, I must say."

Carli: "It's... I love it. I love... I don't know if you're going to get it back."

Lang: "Yeah. All right. So, one additional question. It says this of the… the underlined Section says admission, retention, and graduation statistics of all students or the first in their immediate family. How do they know who the first is?"

Carli: "I'm assuming it would be on the application."

Lang: "So, is it going to require all of our universities to change their application to determine... do they have a check

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

box, are you the first person in your family to attend college?"

Carli: "I believe that's already there."

Lang: "You believe, or you know?"

Carli: "I believe. I'm not... I don't know for sure, but I could find out for you."

Lang: "All right. So, who would... but it... it would require the universities to reprint their application forms if it's not on there. Is that correct?"

Carli: "It would require some type of paperwork for them to fill out in order to..."

Lang: "And... and..."

Carli: "...go there."

Lang: "...what would the cost of this very important Bill be?"

Carli: "Very minimal."

Lang: "Did you give... did you make up that number yourself?"

Carli: "I did, with the..."

Lang: "So, with that... you do know you need to have specific answers on the House Floor. I'm wondering if you want to take the Bill out of the record and do three things: get rid of the hat..."

Carli: "No. I can't."

Lang: "...get a real jacket, and get an answer to my question."

Carli: "There's not a lot of funding that's going to take place in this 'cause they already do it. They just need to submit it. So, no other employees need to be..."

Lang: "Do you... do you have copies of the applications of our fine state universities to determine whether they're already doing this?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Carli: "I do not."

Lang: "Well, then, you don't really know, do you?"

Carli: "I do not."

Lang: "So, you said you knew, but you really don't know. But I'm going to forgive you because of the hat. I think that's very, very interesting. No one else has ever worn a hat like that on the House Floor, and so I agree with Mr. Eddy. You're a great person, good Bill. I'm voting 'no'."

Carli: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker and will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Ford: "You know, I'm still new here, I would say, but I've waited for the day to ask the… the officer to yield. You're an officer, right?"

Carli: "I'm a Sergeant."

Ford: "Oh, okay. So, I even get to have a Sergeant yield. You know, I... I have a few questions. Is it a crime to jack someone for something?"

Carli: "Not when I do it to you."

Ford: "Oh. You know, I really like this Bill and you came right in and took the Bill right from me. I didn't know if you were packing at the time, but I was afraid to tell you no."

Carli: "And you don't know. I could be packing right now."

Ford: "Oh, that's the next question."

Carli: "So, be nice. Be nice. Be nice."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Ford: "Well, you know, I just want to... throughout my years of driving, I have some questions, and I think this is the most appropriate time. I've been pulled over by the police for driving under the speed limit. Is that okay to pull a person over for driving under the speed limit?"

Carli: "Yes, it is."

Ford: "Why? I mean, because I don't drive fast. I drive below..."

Carli: "We have to make sure for your safety nothing's wrong with you. You could be medically something wrong with, we have to check on you."

Ford: "And I've been pulled over for stopping too far back from the stop sign. So, I did stop, but I stopped, you know, way back. Is that against the law too?"

Carli: "We can put a stop on you, yes."

Ford: "But I stopped."

Carli: "But you stopped. You didn't stop at the... at the sign."

Ford: "Oh, I have to stop at the line?"

Carli: "Yes."

Ford: "And the next question, is it illegal to take a half a block to my garage, so I could go down a one-way to get to my garage like..."

Carli: "Yes, it's illegal."

Ford: "I can't do a half a block?"

Carli: "No."

Ford: "Well, I... I just wanted to know because I know I'm going to be racing home and I might want to do a half a block to get to my garage."

Carli: "Just tell them you know me. I'm sure it'll be okay."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Ford: "Okay. And so, what's the best way when I'm driving in the City of Chicago, what should I say, if by chance the police pulls me..."

Carli: "You know, there is a Rules of the Road book right out here in the lobby."

Ford: "No, I'm just... no..."

Carli: "I could probably get it for you if you'd like."

Ford: "I don't mean that. I'm just..."

Carli: "You have a lot of driving issues I'm..."

Ford: "No. Just in case, you know, I just want to know if the police pulls me over is there something I can say to sort of make them happy or something?"

Carli: "Nope. Just have all your credentials. You'll be fine."

Ford: "All the credentials. All right. Well, I just want to know... donuts. Someone said donuts."

Carli: "Oh. We're... we're upper class now. We have... we have muffins and bagels now. We've moved on from donuts."

Ford: "Well, I just want to tell you, as long as you..."

Carli: "And the trans fat. It's a big issue."

Ford: "Thank you. Well, I want to tell you, thank you very much for being one of the Chicago's finest..."

Carli: "Thank you."

Ford: "...and I look forward to passage of your Bill. Thank you."

Carli: "Thank you very much. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Winters."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Winters: "Representative, over here. First off, I would like to ask if you're aware that we have a former Governor on trial for ethics lapses this week? Are you aware of that fact?"

Carli: "I am."

Winters: "And are you also aware that the hat that you have on your head is probably an ethics violation of the House Rules? I believe that is a campaign hat, and that would imply that you're endorsing somebody for political office. Is that not an ethical breach?"

Carli: "This is an old hat, so it doesn't count."

Winters: "Are you talking about one of the older Representatives or..."

Carli: "It's from 2002. It doesn't count."

Winters: "Well, I... I'd like to present..."

Carli: "Even though I love it, it doesn't count."

Winters: "I believe Representative Mitchell is headed over there with another hat that I'd like you to replace the Lang hat, and then if you would describe what you see on the front of that white hat. Can you describe what's on that shield?"

Carli: "The future..."

Winters: "It's in Latin. Just... just describe what's in the shield, one of the symbols, not the... not the language."

Carli: "It looks like a thumbs down."

Winters: "A thumbs down."

Carli: "A hundred."

Winters: "One hundred. That's a bomb. The sound of a whistling bomb."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Carli: "Oh, I don't want the Century Club hat."

Winters: "Well, that is a Century Club hat and the Latin is a direct translation that Representative... former Representative George Scully had done for us that says something about your Bill, and the implication is there will be an awful lot of red votes on your Bill. If you exceed 100, you become one of the most esteemed Members of the Century Club. You may get that on your first Bill. Particularly because I was looking at... at your name. Now, Carli Ford... my generation, the only person we ever heard of by the name of Carli, was Carly Simon. Are you... are you a singer by any chance?"

Carli: "I am not."

Winters: "You're not a singer? Because..."

Carli: "No."

Winters: "...sometimes people have gotten up on the floor and to defend their Bill, they've written lyrics and they will sing a song about first generation colleges. I think it's a great... would be a great symbol..."

Carli: "Maybe at the Globe later, but not right now."

Winters: "Well, now, that's an opportunity. Would you consider pulling the Bill out of the record until you can actually get some lyrics written for this song?"

Carli: "No, I cannot."

Winters: "You're not going to pull the Bill out of the record.

You're holding in your hand the Century Club hat, ready to
don it. I would urge every Member of this Body to help me
in welcoming Representative Carli to the Century Club with
'no' votes. Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate, and so I need to clear up some... I need to clear some issues that Representative Eddy mentioned. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Mathias: "Representative Carli, did you pre-file for this Bill?

You didn't?"

Carli: "No."

Mathias: "Did... did you know if Representative For... Ford prefiled from the... for this Bill?"

Carli: "Yes. I believe so."

Mathias: "Ahhh. That answers the question. See, Representative Eddy, that's why I don't have the Bill because Representative Ford prefiled for the Bill. One final question. You are a... you are a police officer?"

Carli: "I am."

Mathias: "Do you have any identification to prove that?"

Carli: "I... I do."

Mathias: "Okay, great. Because that's usually the first question that you ask, don't you?"

Carli: "Yes."

Mathias: "Okay. Thank you, and good luck with your first Bill."

Carli: "Thank you so much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Fortner: "Representative, I was looking at your Bill here and, now, I happen to be the first person in my family, this side of my family, to have attended an institution of higher education to get a college degree. Are you implying that... that I would have had... that I'm the kind of person who would have trouble completing college? 'Cause that's... you know, it says people who would be the first generation in their families. That would... that would certainly include me."
- Carli: "Well, that would be up to you to determine if you needed counseling. If... if you need it, it's available."
- Fortner: "So, you're... but I didn't think your Bill is talking about getting counseling, is it?"
- Carli: "It's getting counseling or any other... any other assistance they need in order to graduate and become successful with their higher education."
- Fortner: "So... so, you think that people like myself..."
- Carli: "So, if you needed assistance, it would be there for you."
- Fortner: "So people like myself, who happen to have been the first generation in their family to go to college, I... I specifically would specially need counseling, based on your analysis."
- Carli: "I was also a first generation, and I didn't have counseling. However, if they would've provided it to me, I would have taken it."
- Fortner: "Well, statistically, this is now... it sounds like we're two for two of people who were able to go to college and not need counseling. Why do we need this Bill if... here

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

we have two fine Representatives speaking on either side of our microphones at this point, who both have been able to succeed. Why... why should we... why should we have to do this Bill at all?"

Carli: "'Cause we're just very fortunate. We were fortunate to get through it and become successful. However, some people need counseling or assistance. So, that's why we want to provide it for them."

Fortner: "What about people who weren't the first generation? Should they get counseling?"

Carli: "Well, there's counseling, but they want to focus on first generation... this Bill focuses on first generation, and that's what we're doing."

Fortner: "So, why wouldn't I want to equally focus and not leave out people who are second generation or third generation?"

Carli: "Because they have someone to turn to and ask questions, and guide them. First generations don't have anybody to turn to and guide them."

Fortner: "So, who did you turn to for guidance?"

Carli: "I did it on my own."

Fortner: "And so did I. See this will work pretty well."

Carli: "But it was difficult. So, if I would have had the assistance, I would have taken it."

Fortner: "But isn't it difficult for some people who are second generation, as well?"

Carli: "I'm sure it is, and I'm sure if they requested assistance, they would also provide it for them."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Fortner: "And I'm just trying to understand why we wouldn't want to focus some attention on them to make sure they've got all the help that they need to succeed."
- Carli: "I'm sure universities are focusing on all their students, so they're all successful."
- Fortner: "Well, I understand. I think they are. I just don't want to have them suddenly have to move resources too much towards one class of students at the expense of other students who are all working hard to get a good education."
- Carli: "The resources aren't being moved. The only difference with this Bill is that they're submitting that data to the General Assembly for first generations."
- Fortner: "Oh, I... I thought earlier you said they were offering them special counseling. So, all we're really doing is simply providing a report as to how it's going."
- Carli: "Right. And then... then we will determine if other programs need to be set in place, or the university will determine that."
- Fortner: "So... so we're not actually providing special counseling, we're simply..."
- Carli: "We're... this is just the data."
- Fortner: "...we're just collecting data."
- Carli: "Yes."
- Fortner: "And... and we think this data is going to show us something unusual or different?"
- Carli: "We're going to see what it's going to show us. That's why we're collecting it, to determine that."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Fortner: "So, we're going to class... are we classifying it by which generation, or are we just picking the first generation and comparing them..."

Carli: "First generation."

Fortner: "...and comparing the student body at large then."

Carli: "Yes."

Fortner: "And... and do you have an... any expectation yourself as to what you might see?"

Carli: "I hope that this data comes back and shows that they do need some assistance and we'll... we'll be able to provide it for them."

Fortner: "Okay. Well, it... it seems a little suspicious since, as I say, we had... to the Bill. We have two people who have done very well with... as first generation students in college. It just seems very suspicious that we would have to collect data when we have two good data points, right here, on the floor of the House. I'll have to listen to further debate."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Carli to close."

Carli: "Thank you, Members, for listening to me, and I'd ask you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 102 people voting 'yes', 11 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 395, Representative May. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 395, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although I'm the Chief Sponsor of the Bill, there have been many other Amendments by other Members, who will explain The underlying Bill is simply the extension of a special compromise that was made for public/private partnerships. The... the history is that when Army bases, Navy bases, when... when their personnel live in a district, they don't pay property taxes. So, as they redeveloped the Navy base in Fort Sheridan, and in Glen View, they came to a compromise to give... have the public/private partnership pay a small amount of what it cost to educate the children. It was passed in 2006 with sunset. This just lifts the sunset because it's working well for all parties involved. that's the underlying Bill, and I believe So, Representative Zalewski has added a lot of Amendments, and Representative Berrios. I think they're wrapped into one for Representative Zalewski."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the rest of the Bill.

The Bill does several things. It allows for the stipulated agreements during the Property Tax Appeal Board's process.

It clarifies which properties are exempt under the Code, if there is a lease agreement between two governmental entities, and it does several things with certain respect to homeowner's exemptions. Most specifically, it allows for a process by which a county assessment officer can

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

examine erroneous exem... exemption, homestead exemptions. If there is one erroneous exemption, the assessor can go forth and try to recoup those... those moneys. If there's two or multiple, a different structure is set in place. The take away is that the assessor can ask for these lost monies, put forth a lien, and the homeowner can have a rebuttable presumption and go before the assess... assessment officer and try to exercise their due process rights if they feel that this was an error. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote. I'm happy to take questions on the portion that I just described."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, my understanding is that this is kind of a compilation of several reform aspects related to the Property Tax Code. There were several Bills that were kind of combined into one Bill that handled several issues."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "That... that's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Just real quick. Is there... is there anything in this Bill that would kind of allow for homeowners, who may otherwise be innocent and... and not knowledgeable about some of the reforms in this, to have a penalty?"

Zalewski: "Did you say penalty?"

Eddy: "Yeah. Some type of penalty."

Zalewski: "Well, what... what we're doing in this Bill,
Representative, is we're saying that if they were deriving
the benefits of the homeowner's exemption, and the
assessment officer determines that was erroneous, they will

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

be liable for the taxes, the interest... or the tax... the taxes... as long as they've been paying their property taxes as they've been... as... as the years have progressed."

Eddy: "So, basically, if a property owner makes a mistake on the check off related to an exemption, what's the penalty?"

Zalewski: "How many... how many exact... how many erroneous exemptions have... are they responsible for is the... I would need to know that before I could properly answer your question."

Eddy: "Okay. So, is the… is the intent here to, I… I guess the word fraud, if they're intentionally checking boxes…"

Zalewski: "Sure."

Eddy: "...or taking exemptions that they are not entitled to. I that..."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speak..."

Eddy: "...is that the idea here, that fraud, that it would have to reach the level of... of fraudulent act?"

Zalewski: "Mr... To your... to your question, Representative. There is... we've heard testimony in committee that there... this process is, in certain instances, exposed to fraudulent actors. I think the intent of the Bill is to set forth a procedure by which the assessor can go and recoup the moneys that were given to the homeowner if they were not properly entitled to the benefit of the exemption."

Eddy: "Okay. So, let's focus in the homestead exemption. If...
if an individual property owner over a period of years,
mistakenly, checked... that they believed that they should
receive the... that exemption and it was later found that
they were not entitled to that exemption, what... what would

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

the… is there an enhanced penalty, or is the penalty simply a recalculation of… of the back taxes?"

Zalewski: "How many... how many properties have they... are we talking about one additional property?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

Zalewski: "So, under the scenario you just described,
Representative, they would be responsible for the taxes,
plus five percent interest for the years upon which they
derived the benefit of that one erroneous homeowner's
exemption."

Eddy: "Okay. So, it really, if you have multiple properties, it begins to be additional, but I guess I'm wondering about then their ability to receive due process based on the explanation. Is there a reduction possible..."

Zalewski: "Sure."

Eddy: "...or is this automatic?"

Zalewski: "Well, there... there's a couple of things to remember about the... about the Bill, Representative. The assessment officer is the one that makes the determination. It's permissively allowed for them to go back and... and enter the lien and... and seek reparation for the back taxes. And then, there's specifically a procedure set forth in the Bill which allows that homeowner to rebut what the assessment officer has said, and bring forth evidence to mitigate or... or reduce, or remove the penalty in... in tax."

Eddy: "Okay. So, in our area, in rural areas, we have the Board of Review, and... and if the penalties are assigned based on what you believe to be was a mistake you made, you could go before the Board of Review, explain the situation,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

explain your misunderstanding, and that Board of Review would have the authority to reduce the enhanced penalty to, perhaps, just paying back taxes. They could do that."

Zalewski: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Or, if they feel that it was obvious fraud, if... if they can show a pattern, they could also... they are the judge and jury."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. All right, Representative. Thank you. I wanted to try to... 'cause that one I've had some questions about because sometimes, especially with multiple properties, mistakes have been made. They're mistakes, and then, of course, there are times where... where people are claiming exemptions..."

Zalewski: "Sure."

Eddy: "...and to sort that out, the important part is where the due process takes place. And the assessor, at the very end of the Board of Review's determination, does the assessor have any power over the Board of Reviews?"

Zalewski: "No."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, may I ask, on your analysis of this Bill what does it show your committee vote as?"

Zalewski: "I... well, just... technically, to be accurate, House Floor Amendment #7 was the Bill that we are currently

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

incorporating into the Bill. House Amendment #5 was recommended be adopted, however, pursuant to the conversation you and I had yesterday, we... we had to make some technical changes and go with House Amendment #7."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you."

Zalewski: "So, I... the Revenue vote of House Amendment #5, I believe it was 6 to 3..."

Harris, D.: "All right. Thank..."

Zalewski: "...I believe."

Harris, D.: "Thank you for refreshing my memory. I know what we put on, basically, a technical Amendment with the changes we made in... in Amendment #7. Does Amendment #7 remove the opposition of the Illinois Realtors Association?"

Zalewski: "No, not entirely."

Harris, D.: "So... so, there still is a... there still is a concern about the standard of fraud measure here that..."

Zalewski: "So..."

Harris, D.: "... that is used in this Bill?"

Zalewski: "I'd be happy to address that, Representative. The realtors have made what I consider to be a very strong argument that what we need to do in the future is reevaluate how we're going to have homeowners affirm that they understand what exemptions they're receiving. They put forth a number of ideas to both myself, Leader Currie, and... and staff. I don't know that we were ever going to reach a meeting of the minds in the limited time we have left, but I have certainly agreed we'll work with them over the course of the summer and come forth, along with the...

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

the Taxpayers United of Illinois... Federation of Illinois... I can't... I get my federations and my associations confused... to bring forth some... some potentially technical... or... or changes to the Bill in the fall."

Harris, D.: "Thank you for your answer, and there is a concern by the realtors on the standard of fraud. They are still opposed to the Bill. I think that... that the problem you are trying to address is a real genuine problem. I don't necessarily sense the urgency that we have to do this right before now, before we adjourn in the last couple of days, and we can... we can work on the problem, but the concern about that standard fraud is still there. But thank you for your answers."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Rep."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this has... has been a long process with many aspects that have, gone into this Bill, and it's been negotiated over the last month, and I... and I think this truly is a... is a very good piece of legislation. So, I'm going to... I'm going to break down the aspect of it fairly simply. This Bill, at the end of the day, will lower property taxes, period. That's what this Bill does. We're talking about going after fraud. When you fraudulently claim an exemption, you take the value of that exemption in tax dollars and you pass it to your neighbors. That's what this Bill does. We're telling people that you can no longer claim a fraudulent exemption because now you're going to get penalized. When you take the fraudulent

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

exemption away, you lower property taxes for everybody else. That's as simple as what this Bill does. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Will the Sponsor yield for a brief question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative Zalewski, appreciate the work you've done on this. Let me just ask you a question as an attorney. What... why wouldn't there already be a remedy in equity for this through a constructive trust? Typically, if there's a fraudulent claim, and fraud is found, you can get a constructive trust in some instances, and I don't... I don't believe I've ever done one of these in my little career, but going back to law school, I seem to recall that you can get interest, but I could be wrong on that point. But... but could you... couldn't you use a constructive trust to get at this right now and recoup the... recoup the cost?"

Zalewski: "I'm not sure I understand your question,
Representative. Your question is whether a... a person who's
erroneously claiming the exemptions could use a
constructive trust to..."

Rose: "I'm saying that the… the taxing body that lost that money due to fraud could file a… a claim in equity and get a… get a constructive trust and recoup those funds then and collect upon that."

Zalewski: "I... what... what..."

Rose: "I understand you're... this'd make it a lot easier..."

Zalewski: "Yeah."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Rose: "...but I'm just trying to make sure that... that... 'cause I do... the claim was made that we couldn't do this and I'm...

I'm pretty sure you can do it through a constructive trust.

Anytime fraud occurs, the court has the equitable power to...
to trust the... the assets."

Zalewski: "Representative... Representative, at the beginning of this process, we... we talked a lot about that... that particular issue of what... what was already in... in place and what we're finding, studying this issue, is to go through... and what... to do what you're suggesting, we would have to require the state's attorney's intervention..."

Rose: "Correct. And I agree with that."

Zalewski: "...is my understanding. That would be very... state... as you well know, as a former and state, that... they're... dealing with law and order, and crime issues, other issues like that, they just simply are not cracking down on this particular issue as well as we would..."

Rose: "So, who would be..."

Zalewski: "...hope."

Rose: "...who would come in and... and file this action then?"

Zalewski: "The… in our Bill, it would be the… the Cook… the assessment officer."

Rose: "But wouldn't the state's attorney have to represent them on that?"

Zalewski: "I... not... not in the Bill. No, Sir."

Rose: "Okay. All right. That's... that's fine. Thanks... thank you. Appreciate it."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative... Representative Mulligan."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As this debate has gone on,

 I have more questions than when it started. When does this

 Bill go into effect?"
- Zalewski: "It has an immediate effective date, Representative."
- Mulligan: "Well, how can you work it over the summer... if you've got a Bill that's basically flawed, and you're going to work on it over the summer, but it goes into effect immediately?"
- Zalewski: "Rep... Representative, you..."
- Mulligan: "So, how do... so, how do people decide what to do, because this is not... this is a complex Bill that impacts people..."
- Zalewski: "Representative..."
- Mulligan: "...and what happens with whether they have to pay fines or not?"
- Zalewski: "You haven't heard me say the Bill's flawed, Representative. You heard me say that the realtors oppose it because they would like us to work on a way in which owners can know that... what exemptions they're... they're taking. So, I haven't once said the Bill's flawed. It's a good Bill that'll crack down on those who choose to abuse the property tax process."
- Mulligan: "Well, I think there are a lot of questions about this Bill. Did it pass this way in the Senate, or did you change it in the House?"
- Zalewski: "This is an Amendment on a Senate Bill that we would send back over for concurrence."
- Mulligan: "So it's going to go back over to the Senate for another bite of the apple."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Zalewski: "Yes."

"Well, I think this is a Bill that impacts the Mulligan: taxpayers, the property taxpayers in my area, and I think that the fact that it is not finished and you're telling me that it goes into effect immediately when it impacts taxpayers and yet, the Bill is really not soup yet, it's a terrible Bill to be presenting at this late date. That's the kind of times when things happen, when we stuff through things at the very end that aren't finished. And you have... there are more questions to this than what appears here. You've got umpteen Amendments on it, you've changed it from the Senate, and it impacts penalties that people have to pay, perhaps, if they were at fault or not. I think this is obviously something that Mr. Berrios needs. think you need to pass it now. I think we can work it out... work on it in the fall. To have it go into effect immediately when it's got these many different questions on it is really foolish."

Zalewski: "Well, Representative, I stand ready to answer the many questions you have, and I would also say that the… the only way to tax taxpayers is by reducing their… their burden that, as your colleague on the other side of the aisle, just attested to. I urge an 'aye' vote if you wish to crack down on tax scofflaws."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I concur with the last statement.

This is a Bill about going after, not taxpayers, but tax cheats. This is a Bill about going after people who are fraudulently getting homestead exemptions to which they are

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

not entitled. And the point was earlier made and it cannot be underscored enough, that when other people are cheating on their property taxes, the rest of us are picking up the slack. So, there is not a free lunch out of there... out of here. If you... if you want to go after the bad apples, you are helping the taxpayers who are doing an honest, proper response to their taxing requirements. So, this is really about the bad apples, the bad actors, and I think everybody in this chamber ought to be voting a good, strong 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Dugan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Representative, I just want to check, I'm just looking at the analysis, and I just want to make sure I understand it. So, as I look at Amendment #6, which I'm not sure... we're on #7. Okay. So, originally in the analysis, it said something about a change that was requested by the Cook County Assessor, but when I look at #7 it says it would allow county assessors outside of Cook County. So, can Cook County do this now and this is just going to allow ones outside of Cook County?"

Zalewski: "I'll... I'll answer your question. I'll answer your question as best I can, Representative. We... in House Amendment #7, we've taken out the downstate assessor's ability to go back on C of Es for more than three years and... and we've... we're going to work... the downstate assessors don't want that to be in the Bill at this time. With respect to your que... what was your other half of your question?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Dugan: "Okay. So, I guess that was my question, 'cause when I'm reading my analysis, it says that House Amendment #7 allows County Assessors outside of Cook County to grant certificates..."

Zalewski: "No, we took that out. We took that... we took that out, Representative, in 7."

Dugan: "Okay, but it's in our analysis, Amendment #7."

Zalewski: "Our analysis says House Amendment #5, a change was made to allow assessors outside of Cook County to grant Certificates of Error. House Amendment #7 removed that language."

Dugan: "Okay. Then I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you." Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to give my time to Representative Eddy."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, I... I don't want to belabor this, but I think the important part and the... the interest that a lot of people have is whether or not the due process exists for those individuals, because I think we all do want those who are abusing this self-reporting on certain exemptions to be caught, and to pay some kind of enhancement, and certainly back taxes, but I have two questions. At the point that the Board of Review or the assessor makes a determination as to whether or not fraud has occurred, and the individual says, you know what, I don't think I committed fraud, this was a mistake, I didn't understand the form, can they then appeal somewhere the decision of the Board of Review or the... or the assessor?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Zalewski: "I'm... I'll get an answer for you on... on the appeal, Representative. What... what the scenario we would envision happening under this Bill... is they would get noticed that we've... we've discovered you have one, or two, or three homeowner's exemptions that you weren't entitled to. Come forth to us, to the Board of Review, outside of Cook, and say to us, what happened here."

Eddy: "Okay."

Zalewski: "Was it a clerical mistake that you simply... the... the clerk at the courthouse told you that... to check off the box. Was it an... an inheritance that you didn't simply know that the..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...the title had come down, or... or do you not have a good reason? Or... or let us find... find... or the Board of Review determine the good reason."

Eddy: "I get that part. The concern and it's not... I really think we should do something like this at the end of that process. Board of Review are, to my knowledge, appointed..."

Zalewski: "I..."

Eddy: "...and..."

Zalewski: "Could I..."

Eddy: "...and they are really kind of serving as, as I mentioned earlier, the... the judge, jury, and in this case, they would make some type of... you know, claim against the person in the form of up to whatever the percentages allow. My question for that individual taxpayer, who maybe wants to appeal that, where do they go at the next level for due process. Can they go to the Circuit Court?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Zalewski: "That's my understanding."

Eddy: "So, they... they then can at least take this somewhere if they feel like the Board of Review was not following some type of format, they didn't get heard, they weren't allowed to speak, those things. They will have another level that they can go to."

Zalewski: "They would have another level of redress, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. I think that's important because there's... there's that concern somehow that those individuals maybe... now, one final question. If someone has not claimed an exemption that they were entitled to, and after three or four years they decide, you know what, I haven't been claiming that. Can I make that appeal as well?"

Zalewski: "It's a very good question, Representative. I would point you to House Amendment #5 where we work with the downstate assessors to accommodate that request, let them go back three years to issue C of Es. Beyond three years, our feeling was it would get sort of tedious and cumbersome. But we set three years to issue C of Es. We also made it permissive for those assessment officers to decide whether or not this was a course they wish to undertake. However, at the urging of the assessment officers... at the urging of the Downstate Assessment Officers Association, they said, you know what, we're not entirely comfortable with the idea of doing that at this time. We want our association to think about it over the That's why it was removed from House Amendment summer. #5."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Eddy: "So, the answer is future consideration will be given to that issue, but there's nothing in this Bill that would allow those..."

Zalewski: "My... my feeling was that it..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...it would have been good policy, but we... we were asked to remove it and let them commiserate about it over the summer."

Eddy: "Okay, Representative. I... I feel more comfortable with the due process that someone could go beyond the Board of Review to the Circuit Court, because it's not a PTAB issue then. It becomes an issue of... of you going to court for additional due process. I appreciate the clarification. I... I think that's an important point."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'
Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 99 people voting 'yes', 11 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1040, Representative Mussman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1040, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mussman."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1040 is a proposal that is supported by the Illinois State Police, the Attorney General's Office, the Illinois Justice Information Authority, the Criminal Sheriffs' Association, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, and Crime Stoppers. As amended, this Bill will take a significant step forward in bringing Illinois into greater compliance with the federal Adam Walsh Act. This proposal does several things, so I want to highlight a few of them. It expands the definition of sex offender to include those are convicted of conspiracy to commit a sex offense. It adds luring a minor for a second or subsequent conviction and unauthorized video recording of minors to the list of crimes that warrant registration. several reportable items to the registry, such as temporary domiciles, day labor, vehicle registration numbers and aliases. It mandates a three-tier registration system, which changes us from 10 years and life, to currently... to ... to become a 15 year, 25 year, and lifetime registration, depending on the offense. It changes the frequency with which offenders must report to law enforcement to every 90 days for lifetime registrants, annually for 15 year registrants, and 6 months for 25-year registrants. places offenses such as kidnapping and child abduction on the sex offense registry as required by the Adam Walsh Act, and it triggers a lifetime registration for offenders convicted of failing to register properly. These changes are mandated by the Federal Government. Failure to adopt these changes will result in the... our federal Byrne Jag

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Funding, which is used throughout the state to… to support law enforcement programs. This legislation passed through the Senate and needs to go back for concurrence. I am happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, do we have any idea of what the cost impact of this is for the state?"

Mussman: "The cost will actually be minimal. We are very far along, much farther along than the majority of other states throughout the nation. So, therefore, it... it's not going to cost us much to come into compliance, all of the fiscal notes have indicated such."

"Well, that was not the fiscal note that I saw. The Nekritz: fiscal note I saw said that there was no way to... to calculate because we didn't know how many... how ... what ... what the universe of folks was that we were going to be adding to the registry, which doesn't mean... seem to me to say that... that it's minimal. It's we can't... we... we can't possibly know. And I'm troubled by that because it seems to me that we, you know, this is yet another in the... the lengthy series of... of Bills that we have to... to further penalize, you know, those... those on the sex offender registry, and we piled costs on, we piled costs on. made it impossible for them to live anywhere. We made it impossible for them to work anywhere. We made impossible for them to go anywhere. And so, all we're doing is forcing them into noncompliance. And so... so, I... I

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

would hope that we would be able to take a step back on this and analyze what we're doing in the... not only in this legislation but in legislation generally with... with regard to this issue, and see if there's a way we can rationalize our policies, make sure we're protecting the public, make sure we're spending our... our tax dollars well and achieving a goal of... of knowing where the sex offenders are, keeping track of them, but not overburdening the system."

Mussman: "I..."

Nekritz: "I urge... would..."

Mussman: "I absolutely appreciate your concern. I feel that some of those registration requirements that have to do with loitering or... or home location are not addressed in this Bill. Again, the items addressed in this Bill are federal mandates, and if we don't come into compliance with these, we will start losing significant portions of the money that comes allocated to our state. We, as a state, actually receive a larger amount of funding than many other states. We will lose 10 percent a year until we come into compliance. So, while those are concerns, if... if we're looking at it from a financial standpoint, we stand to lose a significant amount of money every year that we're not doing this."

Nekritz: "Representative, are there... are there other states that have analyzed this and made a decision to... to not come into compliance because of it?"

Mussman: "There are states that have said they may choose not to come into compliance, but the actual compliance date has not passed yet. So, until that happens, we won't know for

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

certain which states are specifically falling out of compliance. Again, many states have much farther to go in order to enact these registration policies, so it will take them more time and more expense, as compared to what they would potentially be gaining under the Byrne Grant Fund. And again, we receive more money than many other states to begin with, so we're not entirely comparing apples to apples at that point."

Nekritz: "Well, I understand... I can understand that, but I still believe we need to take a step back, really fully analyze what it is that we're... that we're doing here, what the cost impact is going to be to the state, and then make a decision if we have time... since we have time to... to determine whether or not we want to move ahead with something like this. I would ask for your 'no' vote 'til we can... 'til we can study this a little bit further and make sure that we're... that we're doing the best by the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, you indicated that the cost is negligible to the state. Has there been any study of the impact on local government because they're the ones that are going to have to track these offenders and maintain the local records?"

Mussman: "It is... there... there has not been a specific study to that per se. It's true that the majority of the expense

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

would fall upon local government, because they will... they will have to deal with increased registration, so they may have to hire on additional staff, but you're looking at a loss of funding. They've already lost 17 percent of their funding through cuts throughout the state this year because of our budgetary crisis. For them to lose another 10 percent every single year is a significant loss of money that they use to support numerous other programs, not only the sex offender registration."

Pritchard: "So, have you considered some way of supplementing this shift of responsibility and burden to the local governments? I mean, you indicated that our General Revenue Fund being cuts have been significant. I mean, how can we continue to require more and more work from local government without a source of revenue?"

Mussman: "The police chiefs and the sheriff's department already are aware of this concern and... and they are willing to comply with it. They certainly understand that it's a burden, but they also feel that it's very important for them. They find this very, very useful information when it comes time to... to find these individuals. They're willing to accept that, as I've been told."

Pritchard: "Representative, this Bill moves to the three-tier system from our current two tier. Do those three tiers include what's normally referred to as Romeo and Juliet offenses?"

Mussman: "If you are currently a juvenile registering, it... it does, because in the State of Illinois, we do count Romeo and Juliet offenders. And we have not taken any steps to

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

change that. There was a Bill on the floor earlier in this year to make those changes, and there was a very distinct 'no' vote. We have... we have not taken steps to change that."

Pritchard: "So, this three-tier system though does not set up a tier for the minor offenses that don't have to register?"

Mussman: "That don't have... it..."

Pritchard: "That's what the Romeo and Juliet provision provides."

Mussman: "If you need to register, then you will continue needing to register."

Pritchard: "That's not my point."

Mussman: "The juveniles do have an option to remove themselves."

Pritchard: "My point is in the three-tiered system, one of the tiers is for Romeo and Juliet, to exempt them from having to register."

Mussman: "This does not exempt them."

Pritchard: "So, this isn't fully complying with the options that the Adam Walsh Act gives us."

Mussman: "The Adam Walsh Act does make Romeo and Juliet an option but currently, under Illinois law, we do not accept Romeo and Juliet..."

Pritchard: "I know we don't under current law."

Mussman: "...and we did not change that. So, that is not part of this."

Pritchard: "So, that's not part of your Bill."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Mussman: "That is not part of this Bill because we already attempted to change it individually and it was not the will of this Body to make that happen."

Pritchard: "So, this also talks about the time frame that an offender has to report to their local police department.

Could you explain what that time frame is?"

Mussman: "You have 3 days to report instead of the present condition of 10 days. And..."

Pritchard: "Well, what..."

Mussman: "...that's after your release."

Pritchard: "...what is the purpose of moving up that time frame?"

Mussman: "I think they felt that it was too generous and... and it was too easy to lose track of the individuals as they moved about, once they've been released from the system. That was their request."

Pritchard: "So, Representative, have you ever moved?"

Mussman: "I... I understand that it's onerous, that this is...
this... these are the requirements..."

Pritchard: "There's so many things that you..."

Mussman: "...that we've been given."

Pritchard: "...have to let the post office and other people know, and now you're shortening the time period for this to happen?"

Mussman: "Yep. It's important that these individuals can be found should it become necessary. It is... for them to go off the grid is a very serious issue."

Pritchard: "I still agree that we have to maintain identity, but we're making this more and more onerous for people to comply. Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Cassidy: "The funds that are at risk under this, if we don't come into compliance, I heard you in response to the other questions about the amounts that are at risk. Do you know the sorts of programming that is funded with these moneys?"

Mussman: "It... it goes all throughout the Juvenile Justice System, the Criminal Justice System. It's for drug task forces, prosecutors, courts, probation, corrections, technical of programs... tech programs, victims' services. It is a wide variety of programs throughout the state that would be impacted, not only sexual offenses."

Cassidy: "Thank you. To the Bill. I have spent the last 10 years administering those very funds on behalf of the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. These moneys critically important to the... to the successful implementation of the Criminal Justice System here in... in the State of Illinois. We fund domestic violence programs, we fund Drug... drug enforcement and drug alternative treatment programs with these funds. And I would argue that these funds could be used, the... the various law enforcement agencies could make application to the Criminal Justice Authority to utilize these funds in order to come into compliance and find the sex offenders that have gone off the grid, who are a risk to our... our children. So, I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

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

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Gabel: "There are many, many organizations who are opposed to this Bill, among them: the Loyola Civitas ChildLaw Center, the Juvenile Justice Initiative, the ACLU, Illinois Voices for Reform. Could you explain to me why there are so many opponents to this Bill?"

"There's concern about the state requiring Mussman: registration in general, and... and we are not going to be able to change that specifically. There seems to be misinformation with the Juvenile Justice League under some of their concerns. They have concerns that juveniles would no longer be able to petition to be removed from the list, which is not true, they can still maintain being able to be removed from the list. Again, there were concerns about the Romeo and Juliet laws, but we see that... that that is not something that our state has been willing to change at this moment in time, therefore, it does become part of this Bill. But otherwise, registration is... is a part of our system and it's been a part of our system since 1999. And again, we... we need to maintain registration in order to maintain our funding. It is not something we're going to be dissolving anytime soon."

Gabel: "Well, it... it just seems to me that with so many opponents to this Bill, and great organizations who are concerned about our children, that this Bill just may not be quite ready yet to... to pass. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Reboletti: "Representative, are... what... what offenses would require the different tiers of registration? I see there's a 15 year, 20 years, and 25 years."

Mussman: "It has to do with whether or not it's a felony offense or not."

Reboletti: "And... and this is, again, complying with federal guidelines?"

Mussman: "Yes."

Reboletti: "What our Congress and our President believe should be the standard all across the country. That would be fair to say."

Mussman: "Absolutely."

"Thank you. To the... to the Bill. Reboletti: testimony from law enforcement in Criminal Law Committee, as well as from a sex offender, what his thoughts were on it. I had an occasion to talk to the Elmhurst police chief, who was also interviewed by the sex offender, and what the Elmhurst police chief talked about was how important this piece of legislation is, and we talked about a case that, actually, recently happened in Elmhurst. As a teenager was walking to York High School, she was approached by a registry sex offender who tried to lure her into his vehicle. If it were not for the sex offender registries, they would not have been able to capture the suspect with the speed that they did. Within hours, they went through the registry and were able to identify him. So, it makes a lot of sense to have these folks on a registry because many times they reoffend. It's not a matter of if, it's a matter of when. And if it was your

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

daughter or your son walking to school, you'd want to know who was trying to lure them, or who was trying to take them away, or trying to hurt them. This makes common, good sense. It works in regular practice. Many of the law enforcement departments don't even charge these offenders the registry amounts that they could charge them. Is it additional burden for law enforcement? Yes, it is, but they understand the value in keeping their communities safe. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, Representative Gabel asked you about the 13 opponents to this Bill. I'm not sure... did you talk to the majority of them, or did you look... you know, try to address their concerns?"

Mussman: "Very few of them came forward. I did speak with some individuals from the Juvenile Justice League and we did talk about a number of their concerns, but... but many of them we cannot change because of the failure to come into compliance at that point."

Mulligan: "This is a very touchy issue as Representative Pritchard brought up. Illinois, for a long time, has... every new set of Legislators come in and they pass Bills on crime because it looks good when you go back home and you say, I'm tough on crime. So, what happens is, we're now layered with Bill after Bill after Bill, and there was legislation a number of years ago that actually, then Representative Rutherford passed, that said we should clean

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

up the criminal code to get rid of duplication in laws that calls for extended sentences when there shouldn't be because zealous state's attorneys charge people three and four times with things for one offense. That was never done. I understand, as a newer Legislator, your desire to pass this law, and most of us will vote for it because it looks bad if you don't, which is a mistake that happens continue to pass these kinds of Representative Pritchard's issue about the Romeo and Juliet Law is very valid because that often will ruin a young person's life. So, I have concerns that there are 13 associations that are questioning you and you have not answered those concern, and that the Body will feel morally obligated to vote for this. It's really too bad."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Franks: "Representative, yes... a few days ago I was on the House Floor and I was concerned because of the audit from the Sex Offender Management Board Compliance Examination. Have you had a chance to go through that or possibly speak with members of that board?"

Mussman: "I was able to speak with one member of the board, and they actually... they didn't have a specific statement as to why they did not use the money. We do have... we would like to sit down and speak with the Senator who is running the Bill and... and talk about whether or not those funds, that are not currently being utilized, could be utilized for perhaps examining risk assessments, especially at a

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

juvenile level. That is certainly something that they would like to examine further, and that is a great concern of the Juvenile Justice League. So, we think that there are opportunities to increase what's going on with that particular department. And actually, and... and I'm sorry, I don't have the e-mail in front of me, she did indicate a number of things that that... that that department does do and accomplish, that... that committee."

Franks: "Was that Cara Smith? Is that who had contacted you?"
Mussman: "No. Actually, I was speaking with Tracie Newton."

Franks: "Okay. 'Cause I received some calls yesterday. But for the Body's edification, I'm concerned because we passed these... this types of legislation and I know the intention of the Body is to create tough laws to protect those that are most vulnerable, but I'd like to remind the Body what the recent audit showed. On the Sex Offender Management Board Compliance Examination for the two years ended June 30, 2010, it indicated that the board has not developed tracking and monitoring systems for sex offenders, nor has it established a formal plan with specific timelines to develop those systems. It showed that the board did not develop and prescribe a system for tracking sex offenders who have been subjected to evaluation, identification, and treatment under the Act. The board has not developed assisting... a system for monitoring offender behaviors and offender adherence to prescribe behavioral changes. it also stated that the board has been given \$500 thousand for the last three years, but has expended less than \$25 thousand for each of the last three fiscal years.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

sure what they're doing. It also indicated that there was sporadic board meeting attendance and that there are seven vacancies on the board in the last few years, and the Governor has failed to appoint to... to reappoint... to appoint anyone to these vacancies. So, I just want to make sure should this Bill pass, that there's accountability to those who are held to... to do these laws. So, I want to make sure that once this Bill pass that we follow up to make sure that the implementation is being carried out. And I just want to make... I want to bring this out publically again because I think that's the way to keep pressure to make sure things are being done correctly."

Mussman: "In... in 2..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is a good Bill, and it's something that's required and... less than two years ago, a friend of my daughter, Chelsea King, was murdered by a sex offender in California. She moved there her senior year in high school. This is a Bill that is very similar to a Bill that was passed in California called Chelsea's Law. So, this is something that's required. This is something I know my local community supports in regards to registered sex offenders. This is something that we should put in place for the State of Illinois, and I want to... I would really suggest that you'd consider a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Kay: "Representative, I see this is Senator Hill's... Haine's
Bill. Do you know Senator Haine?"

Mussman: "I just met him recently."

Kay: "You know that he was a prosecutor, state's attorney for about 25 years."

Mussman: "Yes."

Kay: "And you know his record in... in fighting crime, especially in this area is very tough. Do you know that? So, it's... it's my, since I know Senator Haine, and I know his record in Madison County, I don't think he would run this Bill if he didn't think it had real merit and real need to be in place. I... so, I'm going to support this Bill with real enthusiasm. One... one last question. You... you did come here to represent people of your district, didn't you?"

Mussman: "Absolutely."

Kay: "And the fact that you're a freshman doesn't diminish that
 capability, or shouldn't, should it? No."

Mussman: "No."

Kay: "Thank you. I... I urge everyone... everyone to vote 'aye' on
this. This is an excellent Bill. Congratulations to
Senator Haine. Representative Mussman, if you hadn't
picked this up, I would have. Thank you."

Mussman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Williams: "Representative, I'm just reading in the analysis a component of the Bill which says that certain offenses are transferred, and the requirement they are sexual motivated

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

is removed. Could you explain why we would put crimes that don't have a sexually component on the sex offender registry?"

Mussman: "That has to do with the Adam Walsh Act. That... that is direct from the federal guidelines that they specifically wanted those items put on that list."

Williams: "Okay. And why then is that... I mean, why then would we put it on the sex offender registry if it doesn't have a sexually motivated component? I'm just confused on, what about the Adam Walsh... the federal requirements that'll require that? 'Cause it does seem inconsistent. I mean, it is called a Sex Offender Registration Act, so it's a little misleading to have someone on the Sex Offender Registration Act if they weren't guilty of a sex offense."

Mussman: "Absolutely. And my understanding now is that the Adam Walsh Act is not solely concerned about sexual offenses. It is... it is concerned with child safety and protection. So, those are offenses like kidnapping and forced control. That falls under that purview, not only sex offense."

Williams: "One item that one of my colleagues brought up is a situation where, we hear about this from time to time, a parent may take their child... leave with their child. It may rise to the level of a kidnapping or abduction because they feel the other parent may be sexually abusing the child. That could result in a kidnapping charge, but they might end up being labeled as a sex offender, which could hamper their ability down the road. It just seems that if it's not a sex offense, I don't understand why we would put it

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

on the Sex Offender Registry. Doesn't mean it may not be an extremely onerous crime, but it does seem like maybe we need to think about changing the name of the Sex Offender Registry Act 'cause people do look for offenders that have sexually motivated crimes on that list, and it's a little, I think, misleading and a bit confusing. But thank you for answering the question."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman to close."

"I just want to address, very quickly, the concerns that Representative Franks brought up with the Sex Offender Management Board. There is currently a Bill out there to do revisions. As soon as he notified me of that concern, I immediately contacted someone on the board, and we are going to start looking into that situation right away. Another concern with the Juvenile Justice Department was, again, that the idea that juveniles could get themselves removed from the registry is an underutilized tool, and we are already going to be talking with them about how we can increase the participation in that program. But otherwise, again, this is... this is material that needs to happen under the guidelines of the Federal Government. There financial consequences to not participating, and in our current state of affairs, that is a very serious issue for the state. We also know that it is very, very important for our law enforcement, for our families, to be kept as safe as possible and this is one tool in our arsenal. And I would very much appreciate your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1235, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1235, basically, is a clean up Bill. It is an initiative of DHS, and this particular Bill came forth because the Bill itself, after an audit... after an audit was done with DHS, they found that the moneys, which were coming out of Head Start and a matching grant the only thing that they were doing in this Bill was actually working with immigrant workers. And the Bill stated that they were making grants to local government agencies, volunteer agencies, and non-for-profit associations that provide day care services. And so, after looking at this and the audit, this Bill is absolutely necessary to take that language out and state that these moneys for Head Start, with a matching federal grant, is only for migrant workers for help for childcare services. I would be happy to take any questions at this time."

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

Stephens: "Would the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Stephens: "What is a migrant worker?"

Golar: "A migrant worker is a immigrant worker."

Stephens: "Then why the word migrant?"

Golar: "That is what is used, Representative."

Stephens: "So, if you're from Alabama and you go to California to help harvest lettuce, you're not considered a migrant worker?"

Golar: "I wouldn't say that. Those... are you saying that?"

Stephens: "It was a question."

Golar: "Okay. That's a question that I can't answer because that, to me, is not a migrant worker."

Stephens: "Well, that would be it... then..."

Golar: "Migrant workers... Representative, migrant workers to me are people that move from place to place, and they need the necessary services that this Bill will provide."

Stephens: "So, you don't agree with me that if you go from Alabama to California that you... that's a migrant worker, but you do..."

Golar: "It could be that person is going from California to Alabama, or Alabama to California at onetime. We're talking about people that are constantly on the move and they need the necessary help on this."

Stephens: "Well, actually, it's in... the definition of the migrant worker is a person who moves seasonally from one place to another. So, we're not talking about foreign nationals necessarily, are we?"

Golar: "No, we aren't."

Stephens: "Thank you."

Golar: "You're welcome."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members record yourselves. Mr. Winters. Mr. Winters. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1292, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1306, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1306, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1306 is the culmination of about three years worth of negotiations and it establishes the Collateral Recovery Act. It sets up licensing and requirements for those who are in the repossession business. It's been negotiated with the Attorney General, the Illinois Commerce Commission. ICC that regulates, currently, the towing industry and... and relocators. Along with the... with those... with those folks, the rest of the opposition to the Bill has been removed and it's agreed in its current form. The two Amendments we added made it... took out any objections. And I'd appreciate a 'yes' vote. I would also be happy to answer any questions regarding the issue."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

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

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? It's Saturday, Members. Record yourselves. Brady, Davis, Dugan, Reis, Unes, record yourselves, Members. Mr. Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to Senate Bill 1292, Representative Lilly. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to present Senate Bill 1292. Senate Bill 1292 is an initiative of the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Children and Family Services to allow the juvenile cour... courts that proceed over the minor delinquency hearings to have continued jurisdiction to conduct permanency hearing to determine whether reasonable efforts are being made to place the juveniles. This is also a 50 percent federal match for the State of Illinois. I ask for your support, and thank you, and are there any questions."

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

Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1544, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino on 1544. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1544, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1544 increases the caps. This is done by agreement on the rates and fees paid by insurance companies for... for filing an insurance policy with the Department of Insurance. The original Bill was at \$1000; this raises it to 1500, and the companies would be raised from \$2000 to 2500 for advisory rating organizations. And that's basically what the Bill does. It is agreed."

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Osmond: "Representative, just so this is clarified, is there any additional fee in this Bill?"

Mautino: "No."

Osmond: "Does this not cap the fees?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those... Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have one question."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Davis, M.: "Why is the... why is the Department of Insurance still opposed?"

Mautino: "My understanding is they are not."

Davis, M.: "They told you they were no longer opposed?"

Mautino: "Right. They were... they were neutral. That was from their liaison as well. With the... with them going from..."

Davis, M.: "With the last Amendment."

Mautino: "...a \$1000 to 1500..."

Davis, M.: "...is that right?"

Mautino: "Correct."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Carli. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the order of Mautino is Senate Bill 1555. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1555, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1555, as amended, does two things: one) it... it structures the health insurance exchange a study commission. Basically, a commission very similar to COGFA will be set up, and it will convene throughout the summer to look at items from the size of the... the policies and the groups that are

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

covered, to how we will set up an exchange, which is required by the Federal Government, as we move towards implementing the... the health insurance exchange portion of the federal health care. Additionally, the Bill addresses health savings accounts and says that they will be available to the employees of the State of Illinois as a choice within their option. Currently, they can choose between fully funded, self-funded plans, HMO, managed care... or excuse me, PPO plans, and this would also allow the option for health savings accounts. Prepared to answer questions. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Osmond: "Representative, does this in any way accelerate the Obama care?"

Mautino: "No, it does not. It's... does what we need to... each state has to put in place a plan for the exchanges that will be set up where people who are looking for coverages, small businesses, can go and try and find coverage. The ground rules for it have to be set up, and this is our manner of studying it and then putting into place. In September, we'll come back with reports that says this is our opinion of how the exchange should be structured."

Osmond: "The date changed in this Bill to October 1 of 2013.

That is only to put in place what we need to do to get ready for 2014."

Mautino: "Correct."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Osmond: "And in doing so, with what you are setting forth right now, we're going to actually study what is needed to make this work for the State of Illinois."

Mautino: "Correct."

Osmond: "And if this is not funded on the national level, all of this goes away."

Mautino: "And there's language specifically regarding that in the Bill."

Osmond: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino..."

Mautino: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "...will yield."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Representative, Citizens Action Committee, they had some opposition. Did you address their concerns?"

Mautino: "The... the Bill has changed. There are still some those who prefer a different method, which was involved in the Koehler Bill. That has not been called for a vote, but it's... this basically meets all the federal requirements. They would have liked to have seen more, or a faster acceleration of the federal health care."

Davis, M.: "Okay. I do know that they weren't there when you placed the last Amendment on the Bill... when you put the Amendment on the Bill. They weren't there, so..."

Mautino: "They... but they were represented in... in testimony and by witness slip. I believe Brian gave their testimony."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Dugan. The Lady passes. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

- Flowers: "Representative, I need some clarification. Is it required under the Affordable Care Act that we set up in... insurance exchange?"
- Mautino: "No. If we... no, it is not required. If we do not set rules and governance in place, then they will come in an they will do it themselves."
- Flowers: "So, either we do it, or they will do it, but either way it go, there must be a way in which everyone will have access to purchase insurance."
- Mautino: "Absolutely. And that is the one point of all things that all parties have agreed on that it would be best if we charted our own destiny in this, as opposed to allowing the Federal Government to come in and say this is what you will do."
- Flowers: "So, in essence, it's in our best interest to do this legislation?"

Mautino: "Yes. This... this put it..."

Flowers: "So, we don't..."

Mautino: "Go right ahead."

Flowers: "Okay. I'm sorry. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. I urge... urge an 'aye' vote."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Jakobsson, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1557, Representative Golar. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1557, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1631, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1631, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Cassidy: This is the Bill that we amended yesterday addressing some technical changes relative to allowing for more flexibility to the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts to permit the use of probation fees for salaries. Tn addition, it establishes a \$10 court fee for probation operations in cases where the Circuit Court clerk also adds a court automation fee. The fee's not assessed in cases where an appearance is not required and the bail amount is \$120 or less. This was introduced at the request of the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association, and I'm honored to present their request to you today. The statute governing probation requires us, the General Assembly, to reimburse counties for probation salaries subject to

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

standards and procedures approved by the AOIC. required reimbursement level is \$95 million. Anytime we fail to appropriate 75 million to the counties, they may use fees to make up part of the shortfall. In each of the last two years, the... the last General Assembly has cut probation funding to dangerously low levels, to 35 million each year. Yet, in the last four years, there have been significantly increased program costs for counties and probation departments for new legislative and criminal justice initiatives. These increases include adding 17year-old misdemeanants to the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Detention Centers, creating the Cindy Bischof requiring a larger investment in GPS, and electronic monitoring of violators of domestic orders of protection, mandating drug courts in every circuit while also cutting substance abuse treatment funds, numerous changes to the sex offender monitoring statute, and adding... adding an all new Violent Offenders Registry. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and would be honored to answer any and all questions you may entertain."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, last year we passed a Bill that raised the amount of a minor traffic ticket, a speeding ticket, to \$120. Does this \$10 fee... for example, if someone pleads guilty, sends their money order in for that, does this add \$10 for that, as well?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Cassidy: "If you could repeat the... the fee level you just discussed."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Eddy. Could we hold the noise down in the chamber, please, so we could get some work done today, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please, hold the voices down.

 Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Basically, what I'm trying to do, Representative, is find out if, for those traffic violations, this adds a \$10 fee."
- Cassidy: "But I did hear you state a fee level and I wasn't...

 the bail... a bail level and I was... didn't hear the number of
 what it was."
- Eddy: "Well, a traffic ticket is \$120 now. We... we passed that Bill a year ago."
- Cassidy: "Right."
- Eddy: "You get a speeding ticket, you pay \$120. Would this \$10 fee be added to that \$120 traffic ticket?"
- Cassidy: "In cases where the bail amount is \$120 or less, this fee is not added?"
- Eddy: "Okay. So, if the traffic ticket though were for an offense that were more than \$120, the \$10 fee would be added."
- Cassidy: "Okay. And the fee is supposed to go into a fund.

 Now, does this Probation Court Services Fund exist now?"
- Cassidy: "Yes, it does."
- Eddy: "Okay. And the \$10 goes in there. What can that money be used for?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Cassidy: "Under this... right now it is for various probation services. Depending on the level of funding the General Assembly provides for probation services..."

Eddy: "Yes."

Cassidy: "...this may be... the AOIC may allow the funds to be used for salaries, when we do not sufficiently fund as we are... are mandated to do, when we do not provide the appropriate level of funding the A... AOIC may allow counties to use these funds for probation services."

Eddy: "Okay. What... then what if they don't allow... if it's permissive, so if they don't allow the money to used for those services..."

Cassidy: "It... it is otherwise just for general operating costs."

Eddy: "Okay."

Cassidy: "Salaries have to be permitted, specifically."

Eddy: "Okay. Now, can this fund... is this... is this a local fund, or is this a state fund? Where's the control of this fund?"

Cassidy: "The A... AOIC, the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, is the body that decides whether or not the funds can be used for salaries."

Eddy: "Is this fund then subject to sweeps?"

Cassidy: "I don't believe so, but I'm not... and I'm not a hundred percent certain."

Eddy: "Well, it's important in this day of raiding funds that we know whether or not we're voting for a fee that's going into a fund that can be used for other purposes rather than what you intend those purposes to be."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Cassidy: "I don't believe so, Representative."

Eddy: "Well, it'd be nice to get a... a final answer to that. Final question, does this only apply to... the fee only apply if you go to court, even if the fee... even if the fine is over \$120, does it only apply if you actually have a court appearance?"

Cassidy: "It... it applies in cases where an appearance is not required, and it is greater than 120."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the... the purpose of the fee..."

Cassidy: "It's not assessed when an appearance is not required.

I apologize."

Eddy: "Pardon me."

Cassidy: "It is not assessed when an appearance is not required, or it's 120 or less. So, it is both... both an appearance and above 120."

Eddy: "Okay. So, if the fine is 120 or more and you don't have to appear, you don't have to pay the fee, because this is a fee related to the court services that you're not availing yourself to."

Cassidy: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, thank you. I think this clears up the fee part of this. It would be nice to know whether or not these funds are protected because the purpose of creating this or... or adding to this fund for probation services I think, is to allow salaries to be paid, and they can't be paid if, in this age of... of raiding funds and trying to reduce local government distributed funds and some of those other ideas, these local officials are counting on this money and all of a sudden it's gone... and...

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

and you're not sure whether or not this fund is protected. Representative, let me ask you a question, 'cause I'd... I'd like... I'd like to vote for this, but I don't think I want to vote for it if I don't know that the money is protected. Can you get us an answer? Take the Bill out of the record so we know what we're voting on; bring it back in a few minutes when you know the answer to that question?"

Cassidy: "I don't believe that's necessary. These funds have existed. This is a technical change to this, and they have not been swept. I believe they are protected."

Eddy: "Representative, our analysis show that this fund is created by this Act. Representative, in your Bill, the bottom of page 2, it reads as follows: with respect to the fee imposed and collected under subsection 1, each clerk shall transfer all fees monthly to the county treasurer for deposit into the probation and court services fund crated... created under this Act. It appears as if that's a local fund. It's trans... is this the treasurer? It says county treasurer. So, is that locally controlled, and then are those funds restricted to an intended purpose?"

Cassidy: "This does not create the fund. These funds have existed, and you're correct under what you're pointing out, it is... it is locally controlled."

Eddy: "Representative, with all due respect, the word created is in your Bill. It says, deposit into the probation and court services fund created..."

Cassidy: "Under Section 15.1..."

Eddy: "So, what you're saying..."

Cassidy: "...which this does not create."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Eddy: "...is 15.1..."

Cassidy: "That was already created."

Eddy: "...of the Probation Act, already created this fund..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Eddy: "...that this Bill doesn't create it."

Cassidy: "Exactly."

Eddy: "And it's local fund..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Eddy: "...the local treasurer takes care of this, and it can't be swept in any way by the state."

Cassidy: "It... it cannot be swept. No, Sir."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I simply commend the Lady for her work on this Bill, and in answer to some of the questions that Representative Eddy had, no, the fund is there. It can be the \$10 can be imposed in those areas that currently impose it for the court aut... automation fee and, basically, it allows it to be used for the for probation services which have been massively cut in the past few years. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Brauer, Crespo, McAuliffe, Mitchell, Poe, Saviano. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Poe. Mr. Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the order of Kelly Cassidy, Senate Bill 1701. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1701, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law, which may be referred to as the Emergency Medical Services Access Law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I want to thank Representative Howard, who's carried this Bill for several years. I also want to thank Ann Williams, and Senators Millner and Silverstein who led this Bill to a unanimous vote in the Senate. The Emergency Medical Services Access Act provides protection in... in the cases. Accidental drug overdoses are too high in every area of the state, and among people of every race and ethnicity. often friends and family are present when someone overdoses, but they're afraid to call 911 to save a life because they fear of being arrested for drug possession. In almost every case, the life of someone who overdoses can be saved with fast, medical assistance, but too many people are dumped in alleys or left alone to die when they overdose. Today, we in the General Assembly have a decision to make. A law in the books in Illinois causes fear and leads to needless, senseless deaths. It's time we change that law to encourage people to protect each other's and stay alive. I want to stress that enforcement is neutral on this Bill. They're neutral because we've had... we have worked very hard to address

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

their concerns. The Bill will not interfere with their ability to put drug dealers behind bars, but it will help them to do one of their most important jobs, keeps citizens alive. In fact, the M... EMS Access Act will help the police do their jobs better. The person who overdosed will still Police can ask where he or she obtained their drugs, and follow up on that lead. You cannot get that information from a corpse. The State Police, Association of Chiefs of Police, and the Sheriffs' Association are all The Illinois State's Attorneys Association is neutral. neutral. We've made significant changes in the Bill from last year to address law enforcement's concerns. amount of drug an individual can posses and be protected from a arrest or prosecution has been... re... reduced by 80 percent. For example, with heroin, it's from 15 grams to 3 grams. The Bill does not interfere with law enforcement's ability to arrest and prosecute a criminal for sale or delivery of drugs, a drug induced homicide, or any other crime. Serious criminals will not escape prosecution, but someone's son or daughter might stay alive. Immunity will not be offered if law enforcement has reasonable suspicion or probable cause to detain, arrest or search for criminal activity. Some of you may have met retired Captain John Roberts of the Chicago Police Department, who was down here a few weeks ago to support this Bill. His teenage son, Billy, after struggling with heroin addiction, died of a drug overdose two years ago. John speaks passionately of the pain Billy's addiction caused their family. He said he supports this Bill because it might have given Billy the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

chance to stay alive one more day, and have one more chance at recovery. I ask for your favorable vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

- Eddy: "Representative, I understand what you're trying to do here, and... and I... I just... I want to make sure we understand what the restrictions are. It... it looks like, to me, that we're dealing with some limited immunity with possession of what... what would be considered less than those amounts that someone might be distributing, that the drug that... that they're probably possessing less than, what, three grams of heroin, cocaine, or... or morphine. So, is that... well, how... how did you come to those limitations?"
- Cassidy: "The... the levels were established in consultation with law enforcement in addressing their concerns about the amounts that were considered reasonable in terms of individual use versus possession with intent to distribute."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, this covers a myriad of different drugs in...
 including LSD, PCP. I mean, some pretty dangerous drugs.
 What... what your legislation intends to do then is in those situations where there's an overdose and there's fear that there won't be a report because they'll be some kind of criminal penalty enhancement, to... to just simply take away that fear?"
- Cassidy: "Yes, Representative. This will send a clear message that calling 911 to save someone's life is not going to put

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

you at rest... at risk of arrest and prosecution. There have been numerous studies in other jurisdictions and over a hundred... a hundred college campuses that have implemented these policies, where overdose deaths have dropped dramatically calls for medical assistance have increased dramatically as a result of policies such as this, lives will be saved, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. So, probably, these individuals... well, they obviously have some type of an issue or a problem. The fact that they're using this type of a narcotic and you're... you're kind of aiming this away from prosecution for their addiction or their use and attempting to provide them with an opportunity, maybe, for their life to be saved. But what would... are they still... are they still going to be prosecuted or will there be some type of requirement that that use be, in any way, addressed?"

Cassidy: "The opportune..."

Eddy: "I mean, is the..."

Cassidy: "Go ahead. I'm sorry."

Eddy: "Is it... is it just total immunity?"

Cassidy: "Under this, a person who is overdosing and receives emergen... emergency medical treatment will be offered opportunities via the health care system but not the Criminal Justice System."

Eddy: "Offered opportunities for..."

Cassidy: "For treatment. That... that would be the responsibility of the medical provider at that point."

Eddy: "So..."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Cassidy: "They would not be subject to criminal prosecution under this... under this Bill."

Eddy: "But they're also not subject to required treatment."

Cassidy: "Since there is no arrest or prosecution, that wouldn't be... that would not be a possibility under this."

Eddy: "Okay. So..."

Cassidy: "There are other opportunities, for example, in Cook

County low level possession cases are... are pretty,

automatically offered..."

Eddy: "Okay. I get that..."

Cassidy: "...mandated treatment."

Eddy: "...and I understand the treatment, but what will compel a person to receive the treatment 'cause that to me would be the most important part of this. What compels them to... how many times can an individual be provided this type of immunity?"

Cassidy: "More times than they could if they were... if they were dead..."

Eddy: "I understand that."

Cassidy: "...which is what this is about..."

Eddy: "And I understand that."

Cassidy: "...that if they do not get this treatment, if they do not get medical treatment, they will die."

Eddy: "But... but if someone uses multiple times and multiple times 911 is called, where is the... where is the I... I guess, point at which the individual is no longer immune but they continue to use this, as what might become a safe harbor for the use, because there's not going to be a prosecution."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Cassidy: "As... as I said, under... under this, there... there are no criminal penalties. You're absolutely correct. When an individual is... overdoses and is hospitalized, the hospital offers refer... referrals to substance abuse treatment, including free or low-cost treatment. That would not be an option if someone was not afforded medical care. They're not going to be arrested either. They're going to be dead."
- Eddy: "Well, I understand... and no one wants that. I would like to see something done that they would... would get help. But my question is, what in this legislation pushes them toward that help, rather than allows them a place to go in order to get immunity and enable them to continue to use narcotics in a way that's dangerous where, someday, someone may not be around to call 911 and they would be? What are we doing for the person here by providing them with the immunity, without requiring them to seek treatment?"
- Cassidy: "We are offering them the opportunity to stay alive and be offered treatment through their medical provider, through the hospital that responds to that call for medical treatment."
- Eddy: "And then, you... you and I can hope that that's what they do. I certainly would like to see these types of situations addressed where the individual cannot continue to use and then every time 911 is called, because of the amount they're using, they would be immune from treatment, at least as an alternative to some type of prosecution. There is nothing in this that, besides the 'may', they have to choose that really pushes them toward what they really

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

need or requires them to go what... toward that need. I want to listen to the rest of the debate. I want to help people, but I'm not sure enabling them helps them in this situation. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, you... you came from the Cook County State's Attorneys Office. Were you a prosecutor there?"

Cassidy: "No, Sir, I'm not."

Reboletti: "What was... were... did you work for... in the Cook County at the State's Attorney's Office?"

Cassidy: "Yes, I did. I've been with... I was with Cook County State's Attorneys Office for the last 14 years, managing many of our programs aimed at drug treatment, alternative sentencing, and... and programs... specific prosecution programs."

Reboletti: "And I can greatly appreciate that, because before I came here, I was at the Will County State's Attorneys Office where I prosecuted for eight years and about half of those years were narcotics prosecutions, where I probably dealt with hundreds of possession cases, and hundreds of actual drug dealing and trafficking cases. Can you talk to me and the Body about how many doses or hits of heroin this Bill would make the… a person immune from? It's…"

Cassidy: "Under this Bill, they... they may only have three grams of heroin..."

Reboletti: "Right. And..."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Cassidy: "...less than three gams... three grams."

Reboletti: "...and how many doses or hits would that be?"

Cassidy: "I don't know."

Reboletti: "Usually, Representative, they're sold in tenth of a gram. So, that's 30 different individual doses. That's quite a bit. If there were 10 people using at a house, and one of them called, would they all get immunity?"

Cassidy: "No, they would not."

Reboletti: "That... I believe that's in the Bill that everybody there would get immunity."

Cassidy: "No, Sir."

Reboletti: "So..."

Cassidy: "The... the 911 caller gets immunity. I would... I would expect that the other 9 people would be long gone."

Reboletti: "Well, I'm not sure if we can assume that to be the case because 1 of those 9 people, I would assume, would have to make the phone call. Is that right?"

Cassidy: "I... I mean the pers... the other people who did not make the call. So, I guess the other 8 people. We've got the person who is overdosing and the person who made the call."

Reboletti: "My understanding was everybody in the room got immunity because the... the point of the matter was to encourage the other people that weren't overdosing so that they would call."

Cassidy: "One person."

Reboletti: "Because obviously, the person can't call for themselves."

Cassidy: "The... the 911 caller is the person who is immune from prosecution."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Reboletti: "Okay. And then the person who was overdosing would be immune from prosecution also, right?"

Cassidy: "Provided they survived, yes."

Reboletti: "Okay. And I can tell you that I've seen the scourge of heroin in Will County where deaths have increased over the years. I've seen it in my own hometown of Elmhurst and in DuPage County. What does this do to force somebody who has hit the ultimate rock bottom, when they're flatlining, to force them into treatment? What forces them to get the treatment that they need? A piece of paper from a doctor?"

Cassidy: "The... the fundamental problem, Representative Reboletti, and I do understand your point, we do want everyone with a substance abuse problem to enter treatment. But if someone is dead, they cannot get into treatment. We need..."

Reboletti: "And I can appreciate that, and... and I don't want anybody to die from a heroin overdose. And I've talked to Captain John Roberts, who I have had long conversations with, who lost his son. And I understand that 'cause I've seen many people die from overdoses. All I have asked in this Bill with... from the advocates, who I've worked over a year on this Bill with, is that we require treatment because if I was to charge one of these people, in my former life, I can guarantee you that the disposition, Representative, would have some form of mandatory treatment. And so, therefore, we, the court and the Criminal Justice System, the people of the State of Illinois would say you need help. You need to go into

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

treatment. But this Bill says that here's a piece of paper, you can go to treatment if you think you should go there, and now you're at rock bottom. We leave the families without any options because maybe this is the point where they can confront their loved one and say, you do need treatment. And that person, after being revived, can say I don't want to, and go right back into the same behavior. What stops that from happening again?"

Cassidy: "I... I do appreciate your point. In... in 2002, a study was released showing that in 50 per... 56 percent of the cases, 911 was not called because of a fear of prosecution. This is about those cases."

Reboletti: "Well, and I can appreciate that, too, that we don't want anybody to overdose, and I also would think, and I know that when people are using they don't think straight, but their first concern should not be their own status of losing their liberty and going to jail for the night it should be about their friend who is turning blue. prosecuted these cases of drug induced homicide. I've seen what happened when people checked on their friends and they're not breathing, and then they wheel them to a hospital or leave them in their car. I don't want to see that happen. I've seen that happen too many times. All I have asked before of the previous Sponsor, of all the advocates who have worked on this Bill to save lives, and I agree, is to require treatment. Would you consider an Amendment that would require the person to seek professional help to avoid criminal prosecution?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Cassidy: "That would fundamentally change the perception of the Bill. That would require criminal penalties to be on... on the table. This is about removing the perception of criminal penalties if you call 911. And under... you... you brought up drug induced homicide. If that remains an option, this is not about those cases. This is about someone not calling 911 and leaving their friend to die."
- Reboletti: "Well, there should still be some consequence. You can't be ... totally walk away from the situation because you're using, or that you're using with other people. My whole point is it doesn't change anything. All we're saying is that if you overdose that you... you need help and if you want to avoid criminal prosecution, seek treatment. That's all the Amendment would say. And if you said no, I don't want to seek treatment, leave it to the discretion of the narcotics prosecutor to decide if they want to bring the charges. I don't think how... well, how does that change the Bill? that from a marketing prospective is how you would adver... do the advertising campaign? Is that what you're looking at it from?"
- Cassidy: "This is not about marketing, and there is a consequence, the ultimate one. This is about people... people's lives and... and whether or not someone receives life saving treatment or not."

Reboletti: "And... and I..."

Cassidy: "This is... this is about whether or not there is a perception among these users that they will... that they will be immune from prosecution."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Reboletti: "That's right. It goes to perception, which is how do you go out and tell the community that's using that they would not face criminal charges 'cause you would say it's... you get immunity and all we're saying is, if they find out later that they had to do treatment, okay. I've talked to health care providers that believe that they need this treatment and that this should be required in the Bill. Why don't we think that the person who overdoses, who's flatlining, who's turning blue, doesn't need help? Why wouldn't we require them, as this Body should, to get the help that they need?"
- Cassidy: "I would look forward to working with you in the future to fully fund drug treatment programs throughout the state."
- Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate that, but the point of the matter is if it... many time... how many times do... do prosecutors actually follow up on these cases and file charges, Representative? Do you have those numbers?"
- Cassidy: "You and I both know that it is not very often charged, but perception in the community is that they are going to jail."

Reboletti: "And what..."

- Cassidy: "We need to remove that perception in order to encourage folks to call 911 and save their friends' lives."
- Reboletti: "Representative, I... I appreciate what you're trying to do with this Bill. I think you and I agree that treatment is needed. I support treatment. I always have on this House Floor. We'll continue to do so long after I'm not here. I've seen what happens to people afflicted

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

with the disease. I've seen what happens to their families. This is not going to stop the chaos and trauma for that individual. It's not going to stop what happens to the family. This is only going to prolong the disease. That... if you can't agree with me that rock bottom isn't hit when you're dying from an overdose then I don't know what we could agree on. The fact of the matter is that these people need help. This might be the only time that family and friends can intervene, have an intervention and push them into treatment, but if we lose that opportunity, they may be right back in that same situation of overdosing. And your Bill would allow them to, again, overdose, right, and they would again call 911. Can they call and be immune numerous times?"

Cassidy: "The Bill does not address the number of times. And with all due respect, the ultimate opportunity is if they're still alive."

Reboletti: "And..."

Cassidy: "And that's what this Bill will provide the opportunity for..."

Reboletti: "And I apprec..."

Cassidy: "...for that... that young man or young woman, someone's son or daughter, to still be alive for that family to do the intervention that you talk about."

Reboletti: "Well, to the Bill. And thank you, Mr. Speaker, for... if I can just finish up my... my remarks briefly. And I appreciate what the Sponsor's trying to do, and I've worked with the advocates on this Bill for over a year. Last year at this time, this Bill gave immunity to almost anybody for

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

anything. And while I appreciate the diligence of all the advocates bringing this in and reining it in to a much smaller population, at the end of the day, these individuals need help. This is of no consequence of no moment to force them into the treatment that they need, and I would urge the Body to vote 'no', or to vote 'present'; that we add an Amendment that would require some level of treatment so that they would be immune from prosecution that will go a long way to continue to save that person's life and to end all the heartache and suffering of not only that person, but of their family and friends. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, the... in this type of situation, it is still going to require the police and a prosecution investigation to determine whether or not this immunity defense kicks in or is triggered. Correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Durkin: "This is not a get out of jail free card, which will be present at the scene where someone has overdosed.

Correct?"

Cassidy: "Correct."

Durkin: "All right. Now, I'm not going to mention the previous speaker's name, but both of us have similar backgrounds. I have tried, investigated and charged every imaginable

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

narcotics case, served three years as a narcotics prosecutor with the Cook County State's Attorneys Office, and I previously have opposed this Bill. But I really have looked very hard and tried to think of every possible scenario whether... to see whether or not a person who is a drug dealer, or a person who is a distributor, or a person who possesses narcotics with the intent to distribute would be able to escape liability under this Bill. That was my previously opposition. That was previously my opposition. But I've really looked at this hard and I am very, very confident, or feel fairly confident that that is not going to be the case with this legislation. So, I'm going to support this Bill. I think that the proponents have gone a long way to satisfy my thoughts and concerns, but I also think that treatment is important as well. But we also know that the Legislature's not going to go on a 10-year sabbatical. We'll be back here next year, and I think that there can be some recommendations how we can force treatment from these individuals, and there... you know... you know, there's a lot of creative minds here that can reach that goal. And I will work with the previous speaker, the person preceding me with his comments, to achieve that But I think that, you know, when we look at this, people are going to say this is soft on crime, but let's balance out what's at stake. We have people who make mistakes, and we do have a history, and the facts are the facts. People die because people are afraid to make these phone calls. And we have a very limited scope of... of immunity that's being allowed in these types of situations.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

So, I think that the right thing to do on this is to vote 'yes', and I appreciate the work you've done."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Patti Bellock."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I just wanted to go over a couple of the questions again to make sure that... the Rep... what Representative Reboletti asked regarding the individual and who would get the immunity. It is just the individual that calls in..."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Bellock: "...and the individual that has overdosed?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Bellock: "Not like the group of people that are there."

Cassidy: "Not a... not a whole shooting gallery full of... of people right."

Bellock: "Right. And does this law offer any immunity to drug sellers?"

Cassidy: "No. The amounts are... have been reduced to the level that that would not be an op... an opportunity for the dealer, at all."

Bellock: "Okay. And are the law groups, law enforcement groups, where are they standing in this now?"

Cassidy: "All law enforcement is neutral on this."

Bellock: "Okay."

Cassidy: "They do not have a problem with it."

Bellock: "Okay. Great. Thank you very much. To the Bill. I think that some of the other issues, especially that Representative Durkin brought out, are extremely important

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

to this issue, because what this Bill is about is others may look at it as being soft on crime, but I think what a lot of... the rest of us look at it as saving lives. kids do make mistakes, but in this, what we've talked about recently, especially, in... with regard to marijuana, but especially the heroin explosion, which is happening in my county and especially in the other northern counties in Illinois. We have 100 to 150 percent increase in heroin usage. Just one mistake is a death. And in this case, if one kid will call in and save one of those people's lives and get immunity, that is worth it, I think. huge explosion happening and not much drug education in our schools to inform kids, especially on an overdose of heroin, that can be your first time usage of that drug. And I had this happen in my district, and there was a group of kids and they were afraid to call in. And that was a girl that was an A student at one of our local schools, and overdosed, the first time of this usage. If they had called in, that life would've been saved, and that's where I know there are concerns on this Bill, but I think the overriding importance of saving a child's life, that maybe has made a mistake for the first time in their lives. I would ask you to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Ann Williams."

Williams: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Williams: "A lot of the discussion has been whether this Bill actually will... if there's evidence that shows that this

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Bill will save lives, so I want to just run a couple questions by you. Is there any evidence that the fear of prosecution does stop people, in fact, from calling 911 in these situations?"

Cassidy: "Yes. There have been numerous journal... journal reports who... that... that quantify the numbers that... that individuals do fail to call 911 for fear of police involvement. A 2002 report found that 50 per... 56 percent in... in 56 percent of the cases where emergency services were not called and the... the drug user did not retain consciousness, they did not call because of fear of police."

Williams: "I believe the State of Florida actually recently passed similar legislation and, of course, we don't have the benefit from their experience quite yet, but I understand a lot of colleges and universities have informally adopted this policy. Is that true, and... and does that prove that people are encouraged to call 911 in these situations or how does that..."

Cassidy: "Yes. Close to a hundred colleges and universities have adopted limited immunity policies, such as this one. And a study by Cornell University found that twice as many students called 911 in a drug or alcohol emergency after the 2002 adoption of that school's policy, while substance abuse levels remained constant. But the… "

Williams: "Okay. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Williams: "To the Bill. This Bill is not about criminal penalties. This is not about failing to prosecute drug

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

dealers, drug traffickers. This is about one thing and that's saving lives. I think the stat is... it's pretty staggering. In Cook County alone, last year, there were over 830 deaths from drug overdoses. And as one of the previous speakers mentioned, it's... it's just a staggering number. This Bill... there's evidence that this Bill would prevent some of those deaths, and I think that's good enough for me. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Chris Nybo."

Nybo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in support as well, and I want to explain why I'm supporting this Before I had the honor of serving with you all out here, I served for four years on the Elmhurst City Council. And for a couple years before then, I served on the Board of Police and Fire Commissioners in the City of Elmhurst. And in those capacities, I had the privilege of developing a real good relationship, and a strong relationship, with our Police Chief Steve Neubauer. And when I saw this Bill, I... I had some of the concerns that have been expressed on the floor. On the other hand, I also saw some of the positive benefits from this legislation and so, I shared the Bill. With Chief Neubauer and I asked for his thoughts on this Bill, and his thoughts were that, while... while he does have some concerns, on balance, he sees the need for this Bill and is supportive of this Bill. And so, my perspective is that if this Bill is good enough for Police Chief Steve Neubauer and the City of Elmhurst, and if he thinks this is a helpful step in the right direction, then

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

I will defer to his judgment. I think it's a good step, as well, and I will support it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Stephens: "Do you know if the... those baked beans that we were eating? Do they stain the carpet if they..."

Speaker Lyons: "I... I'll wait for you to figure that out,

Representative. If you get the answer, let me know."

Stephens: "Well, I... Will the Lady yield for a question?"

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

Stephens: "Under the... the premise for your Bill... I'm trying to understand how this works in a... in a practical world. there's some teenagers and they... first-time users, they all gather in a party, let's say, and... and one of them ingests some heroin, and becomes physiologically... to the point where they're physiologically affected that it classify as a... an overdose. Is the purpose of your Bill to tell... to let their friends know that if they make a call and they happen to be dumb enough to still have paraphernalia or less than a gram of that substance on their person, and... and an emergency response is made and that part of that emergency response is a police officer, and he sees that this person wasn't smart enough to know that the ambulance was coming with maybe the police with them, and kept the heroin in his pocket. They... if they said, look, I was the one that called, it'll be okay. that right?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Cassidy: "It is to encourage the person with the… the person experiencing the overdose, should make the call and not fear prosecution as a result of it. Yes, Sir."

Stephens: "Do you honestly believe that sitting around and your friend overdoses on heroin, that the first thought is, well, we can't call 911 because I have drugs on me. I... is that what people are telling you?"

Cassidy: "In... in numerous studies, it has been established..."

Stephens: "What... what is the..."

Cassidy: "...that the failure to...

Stephens: "How do you... how do you..."

Cassidy: "...for medical assistance..."

Stephens: "How do you study..."

Cassidy: "...frequently is based on a fear of police. Yes."

Stephens: "How do you study that group of party people? How did they make themselves known to you?"

Cassidy: "I don't have the methodology available. The... the study..."

Stephens: "You're quoting a study that you..."

Cassidy: "...was based on the... the..."

Stephens: "...don't understand the methodology."

Cassidy: "I don't have all of the methodology available. My...
my apologies."

Stephens: "Explain to me how they came..."

Cassidy: "Yeah, in..."

Stephens: "...up with the group, that's all."

Cassidy: "...in the cases where consciousness was not regained, so where someone died, the people that were with that

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

person reported in 56 percent of the cases that the reason they did not call was fear of police."

Stephens: "I'm sure they were scrambling for answers to, because of their irresponsibility, to explain the death of their, 'friend'. But I'm interested, did they interview the people at the party, or just the person that came with that person to the, what, to the morgue? Where... how did that person wind up with the dead body? How did they get identified if they didn't make themselves known?"

Cassidy: "In this study, it was people who self reported as friends who... who had friends die of overdoses."

Stephens: "Okay. So, it wasn't really a study, Ladies and Gentlemen, it was a poll of people who made themselves known after their friend died. Representative Reboletti made the point which is the ... the essence. I don't know about the fel... my fellow Members. I don't know about everyone else in this chamber, but I've been in drug treatment. I am an addict, and I am in recovery. And I can tell you that the most important issue, one that you should be addressing rather than something that looks politically correct is, are we going to get treatment? And you're not going to get it by telling a bunch of idiots, who helped their friend overdose, that if they show up at the hospital with drugs in their pockets, it's okay. What we need to do is make sure that people that are on drugs are encouraged to get treatment. Representative Reboletti is correct, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is about helping people help themselves, not about helping people skirt prosecution. I rise in strong opposition on behalf of

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

millions of Illinoisans who are prompt, who are probable drug users, and for that percentage, about 14 percent of them, they cannot help themselves. They will become addicts without treatment. Treatment is the way, not skirting prosecution."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative JoAnn Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative Reboletti."

Speaker Lyons: "His name was used in debate two or three times in the last minute, so, Dennis, go ahead."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've talked to my states attorney, Bob Berlin, about this Bill, who spent numerous hours with me in meetings discussing enforcement strategy as to what would be best for the person who has overdosed. And we talked about them minimal amount of times, if ever, that they have charged cases where the people have overdosed. And while I appreciate one of the previous speakers talking about our hometown, and our police chief, who I've talked to about the scourge that's plaguing the community, we still have to look at, how do we save people? How do we drive them into treatment? The state's attorneys will tell you that the fear of prosecution itself can help a family get that loved one into treatment. And while I can appreciate other speakers and their concerns, I support the premise of the Bill. We don't want anymore people to die at the hands of heroin dealers, of the gang members who profit and pillage neighborhoods at the expense of their own people, their own neighborhoods, their own communities, like my community,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

but if we take the discretion away, there is nothing in this Bill to bring treatment to the person who needs it most. Most law enforcement is neutral on the Bill because many of them I... agree with the concept. Many of them will tell you that treatment is the answer, and they would tell you that it needs to be in here. I don't know what trailer Bill will come. I've talked to the advocates about how do we work treatment into this. And I've tried to work with them to find some type of solution, but we have not been able to come to an agreement because that would still mean that they'd have to go and get into treatment at some point in time. And while I can appreciate that they may not be people of means, and they may be on a wait list, it could be two months from the date of the overdose, but I don't think that we should just hand somebody a piece of paper and tell them these are some providers in your community, and we can call it a day. I don't understand why we... we had to have some modicum of some type of other push or consequence to force these people to the treatment that they need. So, with that, again, I appreciate the Body's attention and would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Monique Davis, and then Representative Cassidy to close. Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to say that the saddest picture that one can ever see is a mother hoovering over... or hovering over the lifeless body of her child, regardless of the color, regardless of the ethnicity. The last one I saw was a mother from downstate.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

She had five children and she had worked very hard to get that oldest one through col... in college. An 18-year-old who experiments, as Patti Bellock stated, first-time experimentation and all of a sudden it's considered an overdose, or maybe they had taken something else with that but the friends are afraid to call 911 because they fear their own arrest. Just think, this life could be saved. This life could be preserved, if someone just picks up the phone and dials 911. Or your friends put you in a car, drive you and drop you off dying on the road because they're simply afraid to call 911. I just think these lives are much more precious. We don't want anyone to use drugs, but their lives are very precious. If a person is selling drugs or continuing to use, they will be caught. And those who continue to say, where's the treatment, where's the treatment, the first thing they would say is where's the money for the treatment. You bring a treatment Bill and they're going to say where's the money. Plus, they have an option to do that. Representative Bellock is absolutely correct. We cannot continue to let children lose their lives because someone is afraid of an arrest. Mr. Nybo was correct. We've all made some mistakes, maybe not as big... maybe not as big, but that kid who overdosing deserves a chance to live, and someone should not have fear of calling 911. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "I appreciate the debate. I appreciate the concerns from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I look forward to working with you in the future on smart criminal

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

justice answers to treatment, addiction, and... and drug use. This is... this Bill is supported by all of the major treatment providers in the state. There is no opposition. The bottom line is you cannot treat a corpse for addiction. This Bill will save lives. And I urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cassidy moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1701. Those if favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Biss, Will Davis, La Shawn Ford, Tom Holbrook, Debbie Mell, Art Turner. Would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 55 Members voting 'yes', 57 Members voting 'no'. Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Can I put this on Postponed Consideration, please?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady requests, and the Clerk, we will honor her request and put it on Postponed Consideration.

Representative Jim Sacia, for a point of personal privilege."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we just observed from two very interesting dynamics on this floor. One of our colleagues, who every year, provides us with some of the finest chicken anybody could ever experience had that available to us for the past hour. We just debated a highly, highly, highly significant Bill, but we are caught in a quandary in the Illinois House of Representatives, not in the Illinois Senate. Where in the Illinois Senate, if you're hungry and somebody provides chicken, you bring it

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

in to your place and you sit down and you eat it like the grown adults each and every one of us is. This is not a partisan issue. A hundred and eighteen of us worked hard to get here. We all walk into the finest restaurants, and they don't stuff us into a little room in the back and tell us, sit down and eat. This is a shame, Mr. Speaker, when one non-elected person makes the rest of us act like children who can't even handle a spork and dribble out of both sides of our mouth. This is a shame. It's time to change. We have a beautiful chamber. We're adults. We should be allowed to eat in here, and this Bill is a classic example. Miss Cassidy, I think you lost because half of them are back there eating, but I would not have supported your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Mr. Sacia yield again?"

Speaker Lyons: "You brought a smell to his face. You've calmed him down, Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Well, to answer a previous question of Representative Stephens, yes, the baked beans will stain the carpet. So, I think you should be the only that has to go in the back because I agree with Representative Sacia, that we should have the privilege, the right, to be here and... and listen to this. And at this time, I would also like to take the opportunity... this chamber is filled with many traditions. We certainly have seen a few this week, but, certainly, one of my favorites is the fact that Representative Poe, here,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

provided us all with chicken, and I think we should show an appropriate round of applause to him."

Speaker Lyons: "Raymond, from all 117 of us, God love you for doing it. It's a great treat. Re..."

Brauer: "Al... also, the I... IMA and Phil Gonet sponsored it, so they need the appropriate thank you, too. So... Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Cassidy: "I've enjoyed a very warm welcome to... to the chamber, and I would like to introduce my delightful and fabulous sons: Joshua, and Ethan, and Daniel, and my dear friend, Karen Love, who brought them here to be with us this... this weekend. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect the rest of the day, the ab... excused absence of Representative Tim Schmitz, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. The Clerk will so note. The Gentleman from Dorito, Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to take a second and thank my good friend, La Shawn Ford, for putting me on the path to nutrition, good health, and many, many more years of Doritos. I do... I do appreciate the... the fact that even after his Bill failed miserably, I think as he stated in the Senate, the trans fat Bill did some good. Because Representative, this package of Doritos has 0 trans fat, and I appreciate it that you looked out for me, and... I'm... I'm just not sure if I can eat these on the House floor. I

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

think... I think, at least, if something is trans fat free, it should be exempted from the rules."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Well, I... I'm glad we can be bipartisan in this chamber."

Speaker Lyons: "Now, for something completely different called legislation on the Illinois House Floor. Mr. Clerk, on page 6 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 1773. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1773, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Bob Pritchard."

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Speaker. Ladies and Pritchard: Gentlemen of the House, when we passed House Bill 3700, which was funding for higher education, that Bill had a provision that we, this year, immediately, not fund the for-profit private university MAP grants, the Monetary Assistant Program grants. Upon reflection, after that vote, and it passed out of this chamber with 98 positive votes, but after we passed it out of this Bill, a number of us have been lobbied by and received dif... different pieces information about the hardship that an effective immediate date would have upon the college students already making plans to attend a for-profit private university. So, we have introduced a fourth Amendment to House Bill 17... or Senate Bill 1773 that makes this an effective date of July 1, of 2012, next year. So, the policy choice that this Body embraced of not funding the for-profit private universities at the expense of taking money away from our

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

public colleges and universities would be a policy that we im... implement, but simply do it in a later date. I would ask your support for this policy shift. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand the intent of the Bill.

My question is, what's the cost?"

Pritchard: "So, what we're doing is saying that about \$25 million, next year, will go to four... will go to the public universities through students that choose to enroll in that program, rather than investing that money in for-profit private institutions. When we started the policy of giving public funds to private, for-profit institutions back in about 1997, there was less than a thousand students impacted at less than \$2 million. That diversion of public funds to the for-profits has grown to, this year, somewhere around \$25 million. So, this program has greatly grown over the years, and what we're saying is let's use public money for the public universities."

Franks: "I get that, but what the analysis indicates is that what you're trying to do, if the analysis is correct, and I guess... was House Amendment #4 adopted, Mr. Pritchard?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill in committee. Committee Amendment #2 was tabled. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have both been adopted."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Franks: "Okay. So, Amendment #4 has been adopted, and it's my understanding, with that Amendment is that the MAP awards that were to be given to proprietary institutions, for students attending proprietary institutions, who have already received estimated award notices from those forprofit proprietary institutions, for the 2011-2012 academic year, would actually then receive the moneys that were promised to them. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "That is correct that those notices have gone out.

That's why we have Amendment 4, which makes the effective date next year."

Franks: "That... okay. But did... we just passed a law, as part of our budgeting for outcomes when we were dealing with all these different agencies, and in one of them there was a \$17 million cut to those individuals who are receiving MAP grants for proprietary institutions. Isn't that correct?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. So, my question is, 'cause you're trying to reinstate those for those folks who had already received an award notice, is that correct?"

Pritchard: "Incorrect."

Franks: "That's incorrect?"

Pritchard: "Well... well, let's put it this way... I... I'm sorry.

Yes. I misunderstood your question. So, what we're doing is allowing those grants to be funded that have already been awarded."

Franks: "Then... that... that goes back to my initial question.

How much does it cost?"

Pritchard: "Seventee million."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Franks: "So, the \$17 million cut that we did last week, you're trying to undo?"

Pritchard: "No."

Franks: "Okay. Explain it to me."

Pritchard: "We... we now have a \$17 million hole that, in these negotiations, we're going to have to deal with or else, as currently stands, the MAP grants will be reduced by \$17 million."

Franks: "I'm just not sure how it's going to be funded. Where is this \$17 million coming from? I thought we passed a budget with line items here last week. Where is this \$17 million coming from?"

Pritchard: "That is part of what this negot... budget negotiation with the Senate is going to have to deal with. The budget that we have approved has in it the \$17 million reduction that we intended to come out of the for-profits. That is not going to happen, so we're going to have to move the dollars from somewhere else."

Franks: "Do we know where that's going to be because I... I know that the... the budget has already passed for next year, and this is what we're talking about."

Pritchard: "The House budget has passed."

Franks: "Correct."

Pritchard: "There's negotiations going on with the Senate as we speak."

Franks: "But we cannot... so, you're saying it would be moved from one line item to another because we cannot..."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Franks: "...increase our revenue prof..."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "No."

Franks: "Okay. But, do we know where they wish to move this money from? Would it still be in education, or could it be taken from human services?"

Pritchard: "No. No. We're talking education..."

Franks: "All right."

Pritchard: "...and... and the way we passed the Bill out of this chamber was with a reduction of \$17 million in the MAP grant funding."

Franks: "So, what would this Bill then accomplish?"

Pritchard: "It's a change of policy to say beginning next July we will use public funding to support MAP grants for public institutions."

Franks: "But not for proprietary."

Pritchard: "Not for for-profit proprietary."

Franks: "Okay. So, this is basically codifying what we had passed..."

Pritchard: "This codifies what this chamber, and certainly the Appropriation Committee has approved."

Franks: "I apologize because I was unclear on the concept, but you've now explained it, so thank you."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mary Flowers."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman awaits your questions, Ma'am."

Flowers: "So, Representative, let me understand what we're doing here. We are saying to the students who qualify for MAP that they cannot take their MAP money to the school

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

that they've been accepted to only because it's for-profit.

Am I correct?"

Pritchard: "That's incorrect, because we are not talking about students that have been aw... accepted and grants that have been issued."

Flowers: "Representative, let me restate the question. If a student, not this year, not next year, but year after next, who qualified for MAP money want to take that grant to Roosevelt University, can they do so?"

Pritchard: "Roosevelt University is not a for-profit private institution."

Flowers: "Can they take the money to Roosevelt University?

It's a private school."

Pritchard: "It's my understanding they can."

Flowers: "Okay. Can they take the money to the University of Illinois?"

Pritchard: "That is a public institution, yes."

Flowers: "Okay. Can... so, Roosevelt is a private institution, it's not-for-profit. They can take their money to Roosevelt."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Flowers: "University of Illinois is a public institution, they can take their MAP money there."

Pritchard: "Correct. And... and to the 40 public..."

Flowers: "Now, what if the school..."

Pritchard: "...colleges, as well."

Flowers: "That... okay. Now, my question to you, what if this... these students want to take their mon... this... their MAP money to a school like DeVry. Can they do so?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "Not if this policy is adopted."

Flowers: "Okay. And the reason why."

Pritchard: "Because we're taking..."

Flowers: "Tell me the reason why the student, who wants to go, not to the U of I, not to Roosevelt, but to DeVry to get a certain type of training, technical training, why can't that student take their MAP money to DeVry?"

Pritchard: "Because the Legislature is setting policy about distributing limited public resources, and we place a higher priority on public and not-for-profit private institutions than we do for-profit private institutions."

Flowers: "May I ask another question, please? Is Sears a forprofit institution? Representative, is Sears a for-profit institution?"

Pritchard: "Excuse me. Sears?"

Flowers: "Yes. The company Sears. Is it a for-profit institution?"

Pritchard: "Well, I don't know if they're for-profit this year."

Flowers: "Is Mitsubishi a for-profit institution?"

Pritchard: "I would assume any business is trying to make some profit, yes."

Flowers: "So, my point to you, Sir, what is the difference? The state gives the same money, we just call this pot of money MAP money, but the state give grants to private businesses every day. So, what is it about a student who wants to go to a private school that he or she would be denied to do so, but yet, the… the same state can give the same money to private businesses?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "So, the difference is that in a... when we give money to a for-profit business, we generally are expecting the creation of jobs, an economic return to our society. When we give money to a for-profit private university, that's not the same case."

"Well, I beg the difference, Sir, because we've had ... all the schools that come before our committee. Northern came before our committee, and they told of how many students they graduated and how much money those students were making, as a result of their graduation. University of Illinois came before our committee. They talked about how many students there graduated and what their income level is. DeVry... DeVry did the same thing. They talked about how many students that they've graduated, and how many students are now taxpayers here in the State of Illinois and do give a return to the dollar. They are making an investment. They are quitting... creating jobs. So, they're doing the same thing that the private businesses are doing. DeVry is a private business. Mitsubishi is a private business, and any other business that gets state funds, they are all private and they're supposed to give a return. But some businesses that we give moneys to, Sir, they take our money and they run with no returns at all. This money belong to the student. They should be able to take it to any school they so choose to. If the University of Illinois deny this particular student, Northern deny this particular student, and all other schools except for DeVry or school like DeVry, accept the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

student, what is a student to do, not be educated because these other schools deny he or she."

Pritchard: "You're asking a hypothetical question."

Flowers: "I'm asking a question."

Pritchard: "I can't answer for every particular student."

Flowers: "What is the student to do? What is the student to do?"

Pritchard: "We have dozens and dozens of opportunities for students to get higher education."

Flowers: "That's not what the student want. Remember, this is the student money. This is the money that the student qualified for. This is the taxpayer of that student's parents."

Pritchard: "But this Body..."

Flowers: "This is that..."

Pritchard: "Representative, this Body sets policy that discriminates against individuals every day."

Flowers: "Well, you know what, Representative, and that's what I'm about sick of, and it's time for us to stop. These are the young people that are entitled to make their own decision as to the types of schools that they would like to attend, and we do not make decisions as to what type of businesses get state funds, someone else. We don't vote on that. So, my point to you, why are we picking on the children?"

Pritchard: "We're not picking on the children, Representative.

We're being selective about where we use public funds.

Sixteen other states have already enacted legislation affecting for-profit colleges. The Attorney Generals of

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Kentucky, Florida, Iowa, and Illinois are investigating for-profit colleges after the U.S. Government probe, released in August, found evidence of misleading recruitment practices."

Flowers: "And..."

Pritchard: "What we find is that public for-profit students are graduating with a higher debt than students that graduate from for-profit... or excuse me, from public colleges and universities, something like \$31 thousand of debt versus 7 or 8 thousand dollars of debt."

Flowers: "Very few students, Sir, are graduating with 7 or 8 thousand dollars in debt, and chances are, when they do have their degree, a lot of those students cannot find a job. But from vocational and trade schools, they are able to create their own jobs and become tax contributors, as opposed to a burden. So, I'm asking you, please, to take this Bill out of the record until such time that there's a thorough investigation as to the schools that this should be applicable to, and then let's bar them. Let's take away their opportunity to get it, or do business in the State of Illinois. Quite frankly, they should not be doing business if they're using deceptive practice. And I urge a 'no' vote for this..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative... Representative Lang. Representative Pritchard."

Lang: "Thank..."

Pritchard: "I'll take this out of the record because it's the preference of 98 Representatives here to adopt this kind of

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

policy. I'm simply delaying the effective date of that policy."

Speaker Lyon: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to make sure I understand what you're doing here, and what you're doing is saying that no longer with the proprietary schools, the for-profit schools, be able to have their students participate in the MAP grant program, is that correct?"

Pritchard: "Correct. Beginning January 1 of 2012."

Lang: "And what is the public policy behind that?"

Pritchard: "It was the discussion in the Appropriation-Higher Education Committee and of this Body when we passed House Bill 3700, that there are limited public dollars available and we want those public dollars to go for students attending public universities or not-for-profit private institutions."

Lang: "Well, what would the difference be between a private university and a for-profit university in terms of your public policy statement? Why are students at private universities entitled to this help, but not at the for-profits?"

Pritchard: "I... I can't speak for the Members of this Body.

That was our discussion, and that was our vote."

Lang: "It's your Bill, Sir. Why do you think this is a good idea?"

Pritchard: "For the same reason that I've iterated already, that we have limited dollars and we ought to be investing

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

those dollars in public universities and colleges, and notfor-profit where the dollars have been more effectively spent on the student's education rather than to a corporation's bottom line."

- Lang: "Well, then, why does this Bill not take out the ability of private universities to access these dollars for their students? Why don't we just make it public only?"
- Pritchard: "If you would like to make that as an Amendment,
 I'll entertain it."
- Lang: "No. I'm not for that anymore than I'm for your Bill. I was just wondering what... I have yet to hear a public policy reason why we would do this to the... to these students. What I'm hearing is it's simply a cost saving measure. Is that the case?"
- Pritchard: "I wouldn't say it's a cost savings measure. It's a pri... priority on where we invest our dollars."
- Lang: "All right, but it's all about money. Is that correct?"

 Pritchard: "It's generally about money."
- Lang: "Would you acknowledge that the students who will not be able to access the MAP grants, if this Bill passes, are being hurt by this Bill."
- Pritchard: "Let's say they don't have a... this source of revenue, I don't know if they're being hurt. You know, there are a lot of students in this same financial situation that go to out-of-state institutions. They can't access this money either, and yet they're citizens and they paid money into the State Treasury."
- Lang: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I rise in very strong opposition to this Bill. I'm a very

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

strong supporter of our public universities, and our private universities, but I don't support them just because they're buildings. I support them because of the students that go to those universities. I support them because, we, in this chamber, we, in this Capital City, have decided over the years that we want to help kids go to college. We've had this debate in an ongoing way about whether we should have the legislative scholarships, and I've been opposed to those because I think the universities ought to decide who gets to get that money. But this Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is misguided. It's an effort to say, well, we didn't have all the money we wanted in the legis... in the appropriation process, so let's take one group of students... who aren't bothering anybody, all they want to do is go to college... let's take one group of students and single them out because they go to certain kinds of universities and say, you're out. We're not going to help you. This is a very bad idea. There are several of these for-profit universities, and we all know the names of them well, who are turning our excellent students, who have students that need this help. In fact, there's a high percentage of students at these not-for-profits that need this help. And so for us to take these students and push them aside and say to some of them, you won't be able to go to college, I think is misguided. Now, someone would say, well, if we take \$17 million out of this line item and spread it around, there will be other kids that won't be able to go to college, and I guess that's true. But why we would set aside one group of universities, one group of students for

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

this kind of practice is beyond me. No one in this Body supports our public universities better than I do. strongly support them, but they can much more afford, much more afford to spread this around and help all students in Illinois of all groups going to all universities than to single out one small group of universities and say to the students that want to go to those universities, you're out, sorry, we have a budget problem, maybe you ought to go to the U of I. Maybe you ought to go to Northern. Maybe if you get into one of those universities, this money will be available to you. But if you choose, because you live in the neighborhood, that you want to go to DeVry or some other university like that, sorry, we have no room for you. I think this is very poor public policy. The Sponsor himself, a man I have great respect for, says there's really no public policy reason for drawing the line where he draws it in the Bill. The only reason it's drawn there is dollars and cents. And speaking of sense, this Bill makes no sense. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have seven speakers.

I'm going to implement the five minute mark here, and I'll

be... certainly be generous with this, if you need another

minute, just to try to get this thing focused. We have

seven people to speak. Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Pritchard, are you aware that some of our community colleges have dropped their nursing programs; they no longer teach nursing?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "I know that the universities and colleges make decisions every year about what programs to offer."

Davis, M.: "Are nurses needed in the State of Illinois?"

Pritchard: "Excuse me."

Davis, M.: "Nurses are needed in the State of Illinois."

Pritchard: "Certainly."

Davis, M.: "But two of our community colleges have removed it from their program. Representative, are you aware that cosmetology and cosmetology schools are so-called proprietary schools?"

Pritchard: "I don't know if they're a for-profit proprietary."

Davis, M.: "Well, you know, all the schools that are private or proprietary are for-profit."

Pritchard: "Not necessarily."

Davis, M.: "But... but... Representative, are you aware that the State of Illinois and the state board does not certify any of these schools?"

Pritchard: "We have legislation to change that."

Davis, M.: "Well, don't you think your Bill would be better after we had changed that?"

Pritchard: "I don't control the order of our Bill discussion."

Davis, M.: "Well, I think before we put a Bill up and we know something is needed prior to that, we should wait. But to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "...to the Bill."

Davis, M.: "I talked to Representative Cunningham earlier, and he had an excellent suggestion. His suggestion is that the State Board of Education certify proprietary schools. Those that are state certified can get MAP grants. Those

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

that are not can't get them. But to immediately, and I don't care if it's this year or the next year, but to deny these students who are not accepted at the University of Illinois, or Eastern, or Western, or Northern, to deny them an opportunity to get a skill, to continue with their learning is just is just unreasonable. This Bill was talked about in Higher Ed-Approp, but the concern was we didn't have any statistics. We don't know... we haven't gotten a lot of complaints. DeVry is an excellent school. We said we were going to hold hearings over the summer. We said... Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We said there were going to be hearings held over the summer or over a year. going to bring these universities in. We're going to seek and look at their results: how many degrees are you actually offering; how many people are dropping out; how many are still owing money and don't have degrees; and how many are successful, like DeVry putting people to work in technology programs and engineering programs. The question I have before this Body is, do we really want to cut off educational opportunities for the people in the State of Illinois when we really don't have all the Cosmetology schools graduate people who do the hair, the nails, massaging; do we really want to cut those kids off? That's not taught at any... in Chicago. That's not taught at any community college, or any other institution. before we do this, we should actually know what the results of this will be. As a Legislator, it is my responsibility to increase opportunities for learning, to increase the opportunities to prepare people for work. So, for me to

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

cut that off, I would really be doing a disservice to the State of Illinois. This should be a big 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative..."

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Jakobsson: "Representative, first of all, I believe we all understand in here that the state has limited funds. Is that true?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Jakobsson: "Is it true that if we don't pass this Bill we'll have to make cuts somewhere else in our Higher Education budget?"

Pritchard: "We'll have to make cut, probably next year."

Jakobsson: "Probably next year. And one of the things that we did this year and, you know, we can't always say what we're going to do next year but we tried very hard to not cut the funding for our community colleges. Is that true?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Jakobsson: "If we don't pass this Bill, do you believe that we might have to cut funding to our community colleges?"

Pritchard: "With the same type of revenue that we have this year in our budget constraints, we will have to make those tough choices."

Jakobsson: "Those kinds of tough choices. And there are community colleges all over this state. I would think that maybe all of us have a community college in our district or very close to our district, and so I think we should keep in mind the kinds of cuts that might have to be made if

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

this isn't passed. If it's not community colleges, it might be our four year institutions, and they already haven't been paid so we would just be punishing them even more. So, to the Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lisa Hernandez."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Hernandez: "Representative, would the funding to these... to the for-profit educational institutions be permanently omitted with this legislation?"

Pritchard: "With this legislation, yes. It sets a priority."

Hernandez: "Representative, would students who enter public universities have to... well, they have to currently meet academic requirements that the universities set? For instance, they... besides their high school diploma that they earned, they have to have a good ACT score, a good GPA score in order to enter the university. Correct?"

Pritchard: "The universities set their own entrance exams.

Yes, they set it on that basis. Our public colleges are meant to be an open access type of higher education."

Hernandez: "Many times, some of our students don't meet those requirements or they're turned away, they're denied, and they have to look elsewhere. They have to find other options. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Hernandez: "Wouldn't this limit those students to look elsewhere, especially those students who are in need of economic help?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Pritchard: "So, when you say the students, you were talking about un... students that didn't meet the entrance requirements of public universities. So this doesn't change that. What it is saying is that we want to use limited public dollars for public universities and not-for-profits. If you look at those pro... for-profit private universities, they have other options. They can use our federal grant, college grant programs. They can use some of their own profits to incentivize students coming to those institutions. So, students do have other financial opportunities."

Hernandez: "But wouldn't you say that students who are eligible for these MAP grants are then limited on the options that they're not accepted to a public university?"

Pritchard: "So, yeah. Students that don't economically qualify for MAP grants are often struggling to pay for the education in their higher education institution."

Hernandez: "Speaker, to the Bill. MAP was established to support students in pursuit of their educational programs that best serve their needs and enhances their opportunity to educational success. MAP reduces student debt burden, especially for students who are otherwise, may not have the means to fund their education. Demographic shifts have increased the need for multiple educational opportunities in our state. Students who receive MAP grant assistance are not wealthy and do not have the wide range of financial support. They count of their MAP award. MAP recipients all demonstrate financial need. MAP recipients are diverse and often enroll in programs in high demand fields like

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

nursing, computer information systems, network systems, and administration and business administration. I encourage the… the Assembly to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biss."

Biss: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is a budget year and this chamber had a lot difficult difficult decisions to make about how to even approach the budgetary questions we face. We began, I'm pleased to say, deciding unlike in previous years, to limit the amount of money we were going to spend to what we thought was available. And then the next choice that we had in our committees was would we then make the painful cuts needed to be made across the board without considering the public policy merits the different options, or would we instead carefully look at the different options and analysis their merits one at a time. And I'm pleased to say the Higher Education- Appropriation Committee decided on the latter option, to carefully analyze the options and evaluate their impact, their outcomes, as was our directive. There is a very clear public policy reason for this Bill, for this and that reason is that the structure of universities that are affected is fundamentally different than other universities. They are for-profit institutions, which means they have a much different set of options regarding advertisement, regarding marketing, certainly regarding the disbursement of funds which come in to their bank account, and most importantly, they have a completely different responsibility. These are, in some publicly traded companies with the fiduciary responsibility

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

to maximize the bottom line for their shareholders. That's simply not the reality that either public or private notfor-profit universities are experiencing. And that means that they have much greater flexibility about what to do with any cut that they're faced with. They have greater options about how to raise outside money to... to minimize the impact of those cuts, and those are options not available to either public or private not-for-profit institutions. For that reason, this seems to me... it's a It's a painful cut. It will have painful for sure, like every consequences, other cut important program, but by putting the cut on these institutions, we are minimizing the impact for students. We are minimizing the impact for students because we're putting the cut in a place where it can be otherwise addressed by the institution of where the moneys that would otherwise be sent from the state to the institutions would necessarily, in legal... in following the responsibilities, of for-profit company, wind up in part in the pockets of the investors. In a time that we have so little funds to support our extraordinarily great higher education needs, this to me seems to clearly be the most painless way for students to decrease their spending. And so, I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Morthland."

Morthland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask some questions of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lyons: "He awaits your questions, Sir."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Morthland: "Representative Pritchard, ballpark, how many private for-profit higher education institutions exist in the State of Illinois? Just... just give me a rough number."

Pritchard: "The ones that we're talking about in this discussion is 12."

Morthland: "Yeah. Well, you... But I mean, of... how many... there are hundreds and hundreds of private for-profit higher education institutions in the State of Illinois. Is that not correct?"

Pritchard: "I don't know that number."

Morthland: "But it is hundreds. And... and the total list of schools that will not be MAP eligible now because of this, is how many?"

Pritchard: "Twelve."

Morthland: "Are cosmetology schools currently MAP eligible?"

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

Morthland: "Cosmetology schools."

Pritchard: "So, the list..."

Morthland: "No. Are cosmetology schools currently MAP eligible? The answer is no."

Pritchard: "They are not a part of this list of 10..."

Morthland: "Exactly."

Pritchard: "...private for-profit."

Morthland: "Exactly. This is a very small number of schools, is it not?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Morthland: "To the Bill, Sir. This, as has previously been mentioned by other speakers, is a very difficult choice that we have made after a long deliberation and a

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

collaborative effort. I admire everyone who was on the committee. This is good public policy and a smart move. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Chapin Rose."

Rose: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think the previous speaker hit on something. There's been a number or red herrings out here today, not the least of which, is this would impact cosmetology schools, because they're not eligible to begin with anyway. But this was part of the committee on the budget, agreement was to cut it for current year... for current year for for-profits. Now, I'll come to a policy rationale in a second, but the agreement was to cut for the current year. After folks on the other side of the aisle, as well as my side of the aisle said, you know what, it really isn't fair to do that to the current kids. We added an Amendment to this, Amendment 4, that puts it on July 1, of 2012, so it doesn't impact the current kids. responded to the Amendment request from your side of the aisle despite the fact that the original agreement was for current year. By the way... now, the policy rationale. have a fiduciary obligation to our in-state public schools first. We owe every university, four-year university in the State of Illinois, money from last year that we haven't paid them. We have a fiduciary obligation to our community colleges first. Additionally, for the non-for-profit colleges, they're eligible for MAP, they're not affected by this. So, the practical affect of a 'no' vote, and to tell kids in your districts... they're going to Eastern Illinois University, Western, Northern, Chicago State, Northeastern,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

your community colleges, your community colleges, that their MAP grants are less important, that keeping tuition low for them is less important than putting money in some private investor's pocket. That's your choice. want to put money in private investors' pockets, private investors' pockets... take the taxpayers' money and put it in private investors' pockets, or do you want to get real about solving our state budget crisis and starting to pay our bills on time in a way that's responsible and fair to the students attending community colleges in Illinois? And those community colleges are all over every one of our districts. And those students go from all... from every one of our districts to our four-year publics, and those students come from every one of our districts, and in a non-for-profit private schools. The original budget agreement was eminently fair, it increased MAP, increased MAP by \$8 million for the students at publics, community colleges, and non-for-profit privates all while keeping the cuts to the community colleges and four-years' budgets extremely low, which, of course, the more you cut there, the higher the tuition goes on those kids. So, if you want to defend for-profit owners of companies that are taking \$25 million of the taxpayers' money, then go ahead and vote 'yes'. Go and vote 'no', I mean. Go and vote 'no'. If on the other hand, you want to get some fiscal budgeting, and integrity, and soundness together, vote 'yes' on this Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Ken Dunkin, and then Representative Pritchard to close. Representative Dunkin."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I chair Appropriations for Higher Education. I'm actually one of the... the individuals... the first individual present in front of the Higher Education Committee, of private, speaking to this issue public It was in a... the context forproprietary schools. community service, of those individuals receiving these dollars. We had a very active debate and discussion in that committee. Part of that discussion led to some of the distinction in terms of how dollars, state dollars, were spent in those various institutions, private, for-profit public schools, and what I understand and our agreement was that we were going to have an active discussion over the summer and throughout the fall. We not only discussed it in a Higher Education Committee, but we also discussed it in the committee that I chair. And so, I am not only taken aback, but I am appalled that this Bill is on this floor given that commitments were broken and we're off on our own tangent, with myself and even the Minority Leader of the Appropriation Committee, discussed several days ago of us not calling this Bill. And so, to see this Bill on the floor is wrong, it's disingenuous, and I'm appalled that this Bill is on the floor given the ... the commitment that we had talking one on one in the room with myself and your Minority spokesperson on my committee. So, this Bill, Representative Pritchard, should be taken out of the record, and the commitment that we discussed should be honored now. What Representative Monique Davis, what Representative Lou Lang pointed out was absolutely on the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

And it's unfortunate we are looking at this particular legislation in a regional prism. There's not one Member here who feels a certain way about a for-profit anything. That's not our job. We know emphatically that the state universities are a part of our jurisdiction, a part of our responsibility, but the fact of the matter is a disproportionate number of students live above I-80 that benefit from their choice. If they want to go to a public school, a private school, a proprietary school, because every school is not alike. They don't do the exact same things, and it's our goal to try to raise people's livelihood to the best ability that we can, and by the way, the people who are at these proprietary schools, they also pay taxes to us down here. Why not continue to give them the choices that they've always had? It's not against the law to go to the school of your choice. And what we wanted to do and what I thought was under the clearest, distinct understanding, was that we were going to discuss this further over the summer and in the fall and here it is, honoring we're running this legislation, not our commitment. So, I'm going to not only encourage Members here to vote 'no', but to really think about Members when they say or give their word to something of what they're going to do and what they're not going to do. I am taken aback completely with this Bill being run and knowing damn well that we were supposed to have a further discussion and have a... an open and transparent public hearing throughout our districts and throughout the state on this very matter. Now, if you want me to run the committee like this Bill is

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

being run, and in... in a disrespectful, disingenuous way of breaking a complete commitment, that's how I'll run the committee. But I've been fair to every single Member in that committee, and now this Bill runs. And you know this is what we... we did not discuss. I'm... I'm surprised and appalled. Vote 'hell no', 'hell no'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair announced that Dunkin would be the last speaker. Representative Pritchard to close. Representative Pritchard to close. Representative Pritchard to close. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives. Representatives, please, let's bring down the noise, please. Bring down the noise. Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the previous speaker's comment. We're mixing what I have here, apples and tangerines. The agreement that we talked about in committee dealt with studying the issue of MAP grant service time. It didn't have anything to do with funding, because the Bill that came out of the committee said we are going to cut, immediately, funding to for-profit private universities. This Bill gives us some breathing time, gives students some breathing time to look at their funding options and where they choose to go to universities. Ladies and Gentlemen, all but one of the speakers that spoke against this Bill today voted for the policy that said we will cut funding immediately. This Bill gives us more time, gives students more times. It deals with the public choice of spending limited dollars on public institutions and private institutions instead of for-profit

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

private institutions. We spent some 2... \$8 billion... \$8 million this... or excuse me, \$24 million this year on those for-profit institutions. That's a lot of dollars that aren't going to students attending our public universities and... and community colleges. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill implements the policy that we voted to do. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1773 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, Dugan, Gordon. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 Members voting 'yes', 46 Members voting 'no', 4 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rose."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Proceed."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I wanted to say one thing and Representative Pritchard said it in his close. The original agreement in committee... the original agreement in committee was to cut this for this year. For this year because it's irresponsible to take the taxpayers' money and put it in the hands of for-profit schools when we can't... hang on... when we can't pay our bills on time. That was the agreement in committee. We agreed to do a 'bimp' Bill, a 'bimp' Bill, which would be an immediate effective date. Now, several Members on both sides of the aisle asked, and I agreed, that it wasn't real fair to pull the rug out from

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

under kids next year, so we changed that, Floor Amendment 4 to a July 1, 2012 date at the request of many people, most of them on the other side of the aisle. Now, that was the original agreement. If you want to do the original agreement, let's go back and do it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Eddv: House, let's consider the climate and the atmosphere in which this budget is being put together. Those of us who have been assigned the responsibility of looking at budgets went through a very, very painstaking and difficult process of trying to find out how we could craft something, keep it under a number we were given, and that resulted in a lot of very difficult negotiations. And there are different interests in this state in a lot of ways dependent upon what part of the state you're from because different formulas affect different parts of the state differently. It was not easy, it was difficult, and during those negotiations and those discussions, were was some changes that had to be made in the way we prioritize by statute funding. They weren't easy. They're very difficult. I think the discussion that takes place on any of the implementation language is going to be very, very passionate because people feel very strongly about a certain part of the budget. That's okay. That's why we're We're here to... to defend that. But I don't think it's helpful to this process where so many hours have been put in by so many individuals for accusations to be hurled

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

on the House Floor as to whether or not a person is acting with what an agreement was or wasn't. Those issues... those comments aren't helpful. This is difficult. This process this year, from the very beginning, we knew was going to be difficult and it was not for the faint of heart. It's easy to sit back and throw stones to criticize. It's easy to... to be against any component of any of these five budgets that you don't like because it may hurt your district. That's okay. Make your statement, but don't insult the integrity of people who have worked on this by questioning whether they have gone back on a deal or... now, if there's a misunderstanding, that's... we have 118 people here who do not intend to misrepresent. To stand up and to accuse someone of that is pretty serious. I think we all need to be careful about these next few days. No one is here... no one is here in any way to do something that is dishonest, disingenuous, or goes back on their word. And that's not ... and that's not why we worked on the budget, to have those kind of stones thrown later. We should be thanking those people who were willing to sit down and do that hard work and put their neck out. It's real easy... it's real easy to hurl insults, throw stones. It's real hard to make the cuts. Let's work together. We got a few days left. Let's tone down the rhetoric and get our job done. It's time to tone down the accusations, work together, disagree in a manner that's respectable, and get our job done."

Speaker Lyons: "Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Member of the Higher Ed-Appropriation Committee, the promise was to hold

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

hearings and to see what schools of the proprietary nature were doing a good job and those that were not doing a good I know that some of us here represent area... excuse me, Sir. Excuse me. Excuse me. Some of us here represent districts that have colleges in our district, or we teach at a university. Some of us here have colleges in our district with watered-down programs. There no You can't get a vocational programs. degree in cosmetology, so therefore, you've got to go to a so-called proprietary school. Where do people learn to cut hair? understanding is in the downstate schools, it's in their junior colleges or community colleges. It's not in our community colleges. That's where people go to proprietary school to learn to cut hair, to learn to be a cosmetologist. So, I can understand people protecting their turf and trying to bring all the money over to their side, but it's not fair to all the citizens in the State of Illinois. All these kids deserve the right to go to African Americans are 14 school. percent of the population. At the University of Illinois, there're 8 percent. They don't let them in. So, if you're not allowed to go to some schools, where do you go? Do you just stop learning, or do you go to DeVry? Do you go where some place you feel you can get a degree and become a working citizen in the State of Illinois? partial... partial... what shall I say, distribution of funds is just not going to work because I do believe Governor Quinn will see through these schemes. It's a scheme to pretend that there's proprietary money. There's no money

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

labeled proprietary money. Kids get in line and apply for a MAP grant. This kid may want to go to Chicago State. This kid may want to go to DePaul. This kid may want to go to DeVry, but all of the money is coming from the same pot. It is not separated for proprietary public and private, but that pretense was pushed through some of committee Members. Now, I am determined, as a State Legislator, to not allow anybody to continue to cut the opportunities of the kids in my district. You're not going to cut those kids from getting an education because you think you deserve all the money. And anybody on this side of the aisle... anybody on this side of the aisle who agrees with them, it's really too bad. MAP money should go to people wherever they choose to go to school. degree... the committee that met decided to hold hearings, not pass a piece of legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mine is just on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative. Thank you."

Bellock: "Thank you. I'd like to ask the chamber to welcome one of my superintendents of schools, who's been there 38 year, in Woodridge, Jerry Brendel, who wanted to come down today and Page for the State of Illinois. So, I'd ask you all to give him a welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, if the record could reflect, Representative Pihos will be excused for the rest of the day, and I don't blame her."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lyons: "So noted, and the Clerk will make appropriate notation. Representative Golar."

Golar: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Yes, Ma'am. You're recognized. You're being recognized."

Golar: "Yes. I would like the record to... the record to reflect Senate Bill 1773. I would like to be voted as a 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request."

Golar: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Ken Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've been in the Body since December 3 of '02. You can say a whole lot of things about myself, but you can never call me a liar. You can never have me or cite where I've accused someone else of being a liar on this... in this chamber. I am extremely perturbed that an agreement was broken. Maybe they said it in a... in a language that I couldn't understand, whereas a Bill like that was going to run, but I respect every single colleague here in this Body and what we thrive off of, and what most of us really stand for and try to strive for is our word, is our level of integrity. Now, as a chairman of a committee that deals with allocation of moneys of Higher Education, don't you think I would be extremely clear on an agreement to stop funding or to end funding over a period of time? Even me, in my most rational state or irrational state, can understand that, but you know, games are played here on this... on this floor, I guess. And I'm not insinuating anything but exactly what transpired and what occurred. I was... I was having the active discussion on

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

this subject matter on a active basis with Members, and it just befuddles me to no end of how it is things got so contorted with a... a gross level of misunderstanding on this particular subject matter. Somehow, this was unclear. Somehow, there was a misunderstanding. Somehow, this Bill hit the floor in spite of what we talked about, what we were going to do in the summer and in the fall. I've never broken my word to anybody here in this chamber, or the other chamber for that matter. But you know what, what I've learned about this here, Mr. Speaker and I... and I'm going to conclude, in this business here, what goes around comes around. I've been fair on that committee. I've been extremely fair in the committee. There was no big guys or little anybodies, and here we are in a situation where somehow, someway, there was а gross level miscommunication, misunderstanding, and this Bill comes out the way it kind of came out. So there's no purpose for us to meet over the summer. There's no purpose for us to meet in the fall. There is... but, the other question is, is there still a reason to be fair on the committee as a chairman? That's the question that I'm grappling with in my head. Should I continue to be free and fair to That's the question. I'm perplexed at this everybody? point."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Ford: "I think the future of the State of Illinois is in great because we got a Tyler Morrison. He's already chosen the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Democratic Party to be a part of, and we welcome him. He's a great kid, and he's over here, and I believe he's the son of Thomas Morrison, and he's doing just fine. He told me that I have to go and talk to some more Democrats, and he's gone, so we thank you for Tyler."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Ford. That's the best thing we've heard in the last few seconds... few minutes. Representative Karen May, you have a report for us?"

May: "Yes. A point of personal privilege, also."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed."

May: "I have Tyler Morrison, age four, and he stopped me to say you guys are doing a good job. And when I asked him to say it into the microphone, he said I've got more people to talk to. So, Tyler's talking to everyone and telling us we've got to get along. We've got to tone it down. He's going to talk to people. He also said his dad, while he makes decisions, his daddy makes more decisions. So, let's tone it down. Let's make good decisions for Tyler. And Tyler, thank you so much for telling us we're doing a good job."

Speaker Lyons: "Tyler, you've got a bright future in politics, pal. You want to come over here and preside? You're welcome to go for it. Yes, Representative Morrison, are you looking for someone?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Morrison: "That if... if we bring this young Representative over here and ask him what he thinks about Democrats, should we...

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- what he really thinks about Democrats. Something about that Democrats take peoples' money."
- Speaker Lyons: "Just when we were getting along a little bit, Tom, you had to throw that out there, huh?"
- Morrison: "Record... just to clear the record, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Morthland."
- Morthland: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise on point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Morthland: "Just let me very... state very clearly so that we have the facts correct. The oft mentioned agreement in committee was to do the cut of the MAP funding for the private for-profit immediately, and this... and this Bill simply delayed that. There was no broken agreement."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hays. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was debated thoroughly. My side did not prevail. Why don't we move on?"
- Speaker Lyons: "On page 6 of the Calendar... not necessarily, Lou, 'cause you asked me to. Oh, by the way, the lights were out, so don't flatter yourself that you had the final word. Representative Chapa LaVia, you have Senate Bill 1799. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the chamber.

 I... I present Senate Bill 1799. I did go over some of the Amendments yesterday, but I want to hit on some salient

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

points. The 19... 1799 would make changes in certification and educator preparation programs by rewriting the existing provision in the certification article, Article 21 in the School Code. ISBE, Illinois State Board of Education, has received \$4 million from the Federal Government that will pay for the changes to all electronic systems that will be done as a result of these changes. The major changes in the Bill include consolidating type of educators' licenses and re... and requirement, strengthening alternative routes to educators' licenses, increasing application endorsements and renewal fees, restructuring incentive funds for the Illinois Educator Excellence Program. And I will take any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Jerry Mitchell."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative, could you go over the fee increases in that Bill, please?"

Chapa LaVia: "Absolutely. Thank you for asking, Representative Mitchell. Current... the current \$30 fee for application endorsement has been in place since July, 1994. Prior to '94, the application fee had been \$20 since 1964, and the endorsement fee only had been around since 1986, which was \$20. The increase for in-state applicants from \$30 to \$75 isn't a dramat... isn't dramatic as it sounds. Currently, a teacher gets an initial teaching certification. In high school math, for example, for \$30 is valid for four years.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

At five years, teacher gets a standard teaching certificate for high school math and pays another 30. So, as long as individual as is in the teaching profession for a maximum of five years, he or she has paid in a total of \$60 for the two certificates. Under the proposed, an individual would get a professional educator license and pay \$75. He or she would never have to change their license because we're removing the graduated license system that is... currently in place where you have to move from initial to a standard ISBE staff took a look at the license certification. certification fee for teachers in other states as well as other professions in Illinois. Example: dietitians is \$100; dental hygienists is \$100; massage therapist, 175; physical therapist, 100; speech language pathologist or audiologist is \$90. When we are current... changed current educators over from their current certification and the new license are under this system, this will be automatically and will not be charged a fee at that time. in a current case, certification fees would be As... deposited into... as it currently is... I'm sorry, this case, certification fees will be deposited in the Teachers Certification Revolving Fund and be used to maintain the Teachers Certification Information System, the Educators Certification System and the Illinois Administrators Academy Management System and support agency teachers certification personnel costs equipped to link Regional Office to Education... Regional Office of Education Illinois State Board of Education teacher's certification data bank and updates the technologies used in the process

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

of the certifications and the endorsements. Proposed change for the dollars is \$75 for license, currently, it's \$30. Application for out-of-state educators would be \$150. Currently, it's 30. Applications for additional endorsements or approvals is 50. It's... in this Bill would raise it to 50; it currently is \$30. And registration fee per year, this fee would go to the ROEs, proposed is 10, and currently it's 5."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you. Representative, is it... it is your understanding that this is the Bill what's needed to get us mostly out from under the supervision of the Corey H. case and Judge Gettleman."

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. Well, no, it... it isn't. This just changes the licensures' standards and fees."

Mitchell, J.: "Right, but this is... this is the direction that the court has held... told us to go several years ago."

Chapa LaVia: "The Amendment 3..."

Mitchell, J.: "Yeah."

Chapa LaVia: "...if we're talking about that, yes."

Mitchell, J.: "Right. Ladies and Gentlemen, this..."

Chapa LaVia: "It's..."

Mitchell, J.: "...this Bill will allow us to get underneath... get out from underneath the supervision of the court monitor that is... was selected by Judge Gettleman in the Corey H. case, all except for certification. Certification of special education teachers will remain open and will remain under the supervision of the court monitor until the case itself is dismissed. But this goes a long way toward

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

getting us out from underneath all the restrictions that were in Corey H. originally some 10 to 13 years ago. So, I recommend it; it's a good Bill. The Representative was very good to work with us, offer Amendments that made it even more palatable."

Chapa LaVia: "And this complements 1790... of being comp... complicates. It compliments 1794."

Mitchell, J.: "Well, actually, 1794..."

Chapa LaVia: "Three?"

Mitchell, J.: "...was created to complements your Bill..."

Chapa LaVia: "Hell, I love you."

Mitchell, J.: "...which was the majority of the case. I'm still not sure 1794 does what we think, what some think it does, but this is a good Bill. I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I would just appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1799 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Monique Davis, Karen May, would you like to be recorded? Jim Watson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 76 Members voting 'yes', 36 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie for a Motion."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 1883 can be heard in the appropriate committee."

Speaker Lyons: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any objection? Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Yeah. I'm not sure we heard the Bill number clearly, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Barb, the Bill number."

Currie: "It's Senate Bill 1883. And the appropriate committee is Higher Education."

Eddy: "Can we just very... give us a second, if we could."

Speaker Lyons: "Fine, Representative. We'll wait."

Eddy: "Thank..."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Seeing no objection, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' it. The Motion carries. Representative Rose on a Motion? Chapin. Representative Rose."

Rose: "372..."

Speaker Lyons: "I believe the number..."

Rose: "House Resolution 372."

Speaker Lyons: "...you're looking for is 372, Representative."

Rose: "Yeah. House Resolution 372, to suspend the posting requirements..."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's..."

Rose: "...on House Resolution 372."

Speaker Lyons: "...Motion to suspend the posting. Seeing no objection, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries. Representative Chuck Jefferson, what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."
- Jefferson: "I just want to recognize two young men who are here today, who are Paging through my office: Coy Pugh, Jr. and Justice Pugh. Two fine young men that are working their way through school. Coy's put them to work. These are Coy Pugh's two sons, and support them with your tips when they come to wait on you. Welcome to Springfield, gentlemen."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, gentlemen. Glad to have you at your Capitol. Representative Bob Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 177...
 1799, I'd like to be recorded as a 'yes'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your intentions, Representative. Representative Jakobsson, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 1943. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1943, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1943 amends the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act and the provisions concerning warning statements. It makes changes to the definitions of... of jewelry and children's products. Makes changes concerning

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

the required content of the warning statement, and it provides that the warning statement is not required if the component parts of the item containing... or... I think that was changed. It adds the phrase 'complies with federal standards' to the required contents of the warning statement. It restores current law with regard to the warning statement concerning lead bearing substances, in particular, for children's products."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Al Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, what's the reason for the Department of Public Health's opposition to this Bill? I see this other organization Lead Safe Illinois; I'm not familiar with them, but what's... what's their opposition about?"

Jakobsson: "I am not sure. They didn't speak to me a lot about this, but I think they are not happy with the warning statement."

Riley: "With the what?"

Jakobsson: "I think it might be the warning statement, but I'm not positive about that."

Riley: "Okay."

Jakobsson: "I don't know what they're against, no."

Riley: "Well, let's assume that maybe, let's say, I mean, I don't know who they are, so I... I don't want to speak to them, but they may be an organization of con... you know, that might represent people who are in that business. But...

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

but we do know about the IDPH. They never spoke to you about what their opposition to the Bill is?"

Jakobsson: "No."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1943. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McCarthy. Kevin McCarthy, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 111 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Nekritz, on page 11 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 22... Senate Bill 2288. Representative Elaine Nekritz, Second Reading, Senate Bill 20... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz on Senate Bill 2288."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2288 changes the definition of... of municipal waste so that it would be possible for an entity in this state to take safe munic... the... you know, the compostable and the safe... safe municipal garbage and turn it into a product that then can be burned as an energy source to generate electricity. It... it creates two paths in order to be able to qualify for this. One is through... if the Federal Government approves this... of this process, then someone could come into Illinois and do this. And the second path would be to go before the pollution control board and get approval to... to... in order to implement this process."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Elaine Nekritz moves for the passage of Senate Bill 2288. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jefferson. Bob Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brady, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Brady: "A point of personal privilege, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Brady: "Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you would give a nice House of Representatives welcome, behind me in the gallery is a trade mission group of sorts from Europe. In the gallery are members of the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Danish based Agriculture Society executives from Europe visiting our Capitol today. They spent yesterday in St. Louis, and may be visiting Cargill at some point during their visit here, and as well as other spots throughout the State of Illinois. Most of the ladies and gentlemen are bankers dealing with agricultural business issues, and most of these business men and ladies are American Government political buffs. And in fact, the chief fiscal officer that is with them, and I believe it is Mr. Borstein, is a Lincoln expert. So, please give a nice House of Representatives welcome to our contingent from Danish."

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations and welcome to your Capitol.

We're proud to have you. And now for something completely different. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Concurrences, we're going to be going through some of the concurrences starting on page 14. Not all of them have been approved from Rules, but we'll go through what has been. So, page 14 of the Calendar. The first Order of Concurrence Bill will be House Bill 180. Representative Kay Hatcher on House Bill 180. Proceed, Representative."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. House Bill 180 had first passed both the House and the Senate unanimously with some changes to come back. This is the Bill that protects the privacy of those among us who want to spend their last few moments with a loved one at a burial site without the intrusion next to them of protestors. It continues to preserve the rights of everyone to protest, but it also puts a perimeter of protection around those who are grieving. I would urge,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- especially as this is the Memorial Day weekend, I would urge your consent and a vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "...the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 180?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jakobsson, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 180. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Bost."
- Bost: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Coladipietro will be excused for the rest of the afternoon."
- Speaker Lyons: "So noted, Representative. The Clerk will so note. The Chair recognizes Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please also excuse Representative du Buclet for the remainder of the afternoon."
- Speaker Lyons: "So noted, Representative. The Clerk will make the appropriate notations. On the top of page 15, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 200. Out of the record. House Bill 220, Representative Jack Franks. Concurrences, Jack."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that passed out unanimously in the House and the Senate. This is the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

one dealing with taking away licenses of doctors who abuse their patients. Representative Burns had filed a similar Bill. That had also passed. And I think this is our belt with our suspenders to see which one the Governor's going to sign. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to... Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 220?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Rosemary. Mike Bost. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill This Bill, having received the Constitutional 220. Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 233. Out of the record. 237. Out of the record. Representative May, you have House Bill 248. Representative May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in changes that were made in the Senate, simply clarifying and adding further restrictions for some comments that were suggested, making clear that any of the water that's sold shall be subject to orders of the Pollution Control Board."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Bill... in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 248?' This is final action. All those in favor

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, David Harris, Hernandez, McAuliffe, Pritchard, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 82 Members voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 248. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mary Flowers, on the Order of Concurrences, on page 15 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 279. Representative Flowers."

- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 279 dealing with the patients' right to act. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions in regards to the Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Representative, this was for Amendment #2.

 Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 279."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, can you take this out of the record for a minute?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Out of the record. Representative Connie Howard, on the bottom of page 15, you have House Bill 297 on the Order of Concurrences. Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which extends reporting deadlines as passed in the House. The report deadline of employment restrictions would no longer be... would be no later, that

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

is, than November 2011. The report deadline of the impact of these employment restrictions would be no later than February 2012. And the task force's report to the Governor and General Assembly would be presented no later than September 1, 2012."

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

Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Ford and I have disposed of the Doritos in a bipartisan manner."

Speaker Lyons: "I stand corrected. The... the Representative from Crawford..."

Eddy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "...Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Representative Howard, this went over unanimously, and I noticed that, for whatever reason in the Senate committee, there was one vote against it. What... what's the change here? For those who voted 'yes', what... how did the Senate change this? What are you concurring with if you agree?"

Howard: "Everything has to do with changing of dates. Just delaying the dates of the reporting. As you see, there are three different dates that have been established, and to get more time, each of those dates is extended to a... a further time."

Eddy: "Okay. Nothing changes as far as the construct..."

Howard: "As far... nothing else has changed..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Howard: "...just the dates..."

Eddy: "Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Howard: "...the deadlines."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 297?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 297. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flowers, Mary, are you ready on House Bill 279. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2, and it would require the Department of Human Rights to be added to the Department of Public Health and to make sure to show patients how to file grievances in regards to discrimination. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 279?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brauer. Jack Franks. Camille Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 279. This Bill, having

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Nekritz, on the middle of page 16, under Concurrences, you have House Bill 1091. Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1091 is the Nekritz: authorizing legislation for public-private partnerships in The Senate... and I move to concur on Senate the state. First, the Amendment would remove the Amendment #3. language allowing airport authorities to enter into publicprivate partnerships. It would add... the second thing it does is add language allowing the Toll Highway Authority to operate... or provide the operation services on... on highways developed or financed through a public-private partner agreement with another public entity. And finally, it add... adds language allowing IDOT and the Toll Highway Authority to establish rules and procedures for the procurement of a public-private agreement under the... under the legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, the... there were several opponents to the legislation when it left the House, and I'm not sure exactly what the Senate changes were. I guess the... the question is, did... did the changes in the Senate result in the removal of any of the opposition?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I don't know about... about what your staff analysis showed, but actually the... the legislation that... as it passed had a number of opponents

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

listed, and on our analysis, they were incorrect. And so, that..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Nekritz: "...if... if there's been changes from that 'til now, it's not because of the Senate Amendment. It's because we corrected that with staff."

Eddy: "Well, okay. Let's... let's be more specific then, because I think it's important that people understand as... as it stands now, this is final action, who... who may be opposed. What about the SEIU, or AFSCME, AFL-CIO, and the Associated Builders & Contractors?"

Nekritz: "Well, I've... on... with regard of the first three,

AFSCME and SEIU are neutral. What was the third one?"

Eddy: "The Associated Builders & Contractors."

Nekritz: "I... I don't know on that one."

Eddy: "AFL-CIO?"

Nekritz: "I believe they are supportive."

Eddy: "And the Laborers Midwest?"

Nekritz: "The laborers are definitely supportive."

Eddy: "And, what about the Illinois Chamber of Commerce?"

Nekritz: "I... well, they... I believe they were opposed in committee, but I don't think that they ever... that... that there was nothing we did to remove that opposition."

Eddy: "Okay. Okay. So, just as a caution as these come over, obviously Members take a look. Sometimes, these change very little. Sometimes, it does remove opposition. And I think it's important that at least we have that opportunity to... to determine. Now, could... could you just very briefly explain again what the theory here is because I think the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

theory has a lot of support that, somehow, you can put together these partnerships."

Nekritz: "The theory, Representative, from... is that the Federal Highway Trust Fund is about to be out of money and we are no longer going to be able to finance transportation projects in the way that we have historically done in this country. So we are going to have to look to alternatives. Public-private partnerships are going to be a way of building those major infrastructure projects moving forward."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the concern is that with those funds depleting, this is a way to continue projects."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Eddy: "And... and it is my understanding that all the labor groups have backed off and there's no opposition among those groups, so."

Nekritz: "I... I don't believe there's... among the labor groups,
I'm not aware of any opposition."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the... the time and consideration to my questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, one of the Amendments that, don't know which one, but removed airport authorities from entering into public-private partnerships. Is that true?"

Nekritz: "Yes."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Riley: "Okay. So, for example, the south... proposed south suburban airport, they would not be able to enter into a public-private partnership for construction or other purposes?"
- Nekritz: "This... well, they would... they... they would have to seek their own authorizing of... they'd to find some other authorizing ability..."
- Riley: "I'm... I'm sorry. I really can't hear you."
- Nekritz: "They... they would have to find some other mechanism to get authorization to do that other than this legislation."
- Riley: "Well, what would that other... what would that other be?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I'm assuming they would have... they could either come back here, or and I don't... I don't know enough about the... how the authorities are created as to... to know what... what other legal avenues they would have to be able to do that."
- Riley: "Do you know... I'm sorry. I don't have it up on my screen right now. Who is the Senate Sponsor?"
- Nekritz: "Senator Steans."
- Riley: "Okay. Do you know the... the reason why that was taken out?"
- Nekritz: "And I... I apologize, Representative, I don't. And if you'd like me to take the Bill from the record and find out, I can do that."
- Riley: "That's not necessary but, I, you know, I..."
- Nekritz: "Okay."
- Riley: "...I would like... Thank you."
- Nekritz: "Well, then, you know what, then I'll find... then I'll find it out for you and I'll get you that information."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Riley: "All right."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I noticed that... and will the Sponsor yield? I'm sorry."

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Winters: "I noticed that Senate Amendment 1, the provision of that is to remove the ability of public airport authorities to enter into these public-private partnerships. Is that the genesis of why we're trying to concur?"

Nekritz: "I'm... Senate Amendment 1 or 3, you're talking about?"

Winters: "Well, whatever the current one that..."

Nekritz: "Correct. Three."

Winters: "...we're concurring in."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Winters: "Three. Could you explain the reasoning behind the removal of airport authorities? I'm assuming it's man..."

Nekritz: "No. I'm... Representative Riley just asked me the same question and the answer is 'no'. I don't know the reason behind it. I'll be glad to find out."

Winters: "Does it have anything to do with the attempt of the City of Chicago to privatize Midway?"

Nekritz: "No, Representative, 'cause they... they did that through ordinance, and they... so they've... they've done that. I don't think that it... that has... that they're looking for that here."

Winters: "Well, I thought that had stalled and... and that agreement is not going forward."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Nekritz: "I... I think that's right, but I don't think that that...
and it could be, but the City of Chicago did that, the
ordinance. They did not... I don't think they came here to
do that, or maybe they did. But they... they did that
separately. That... so."

Winters: "Okay. I... I was just, you know, curious if this could be construed as a vote in favor of this as being in favor of the City of Chicago. And being a downstater, I'm always worried about ever voting with the City of Chicago."

Nekritz: "I can understand that."

Winters: "No further questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1091?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 65 Members voting 'yes', 40 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1091. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Roth will be excused for the rest of the day on the… Republican side of the aisle."

Speaker Lyons: "So noted, and the Clerk will make the correct notations, Representative. Thank you. Representative Osmond, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 1128. Representative JoAnn Osmond."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment #1. This Bill is the initiative of the Illinois Department of Insurance, and it clarifies some language. What the Amendment does is clarify that the Department of State Police shall charge a fee for conducting the background checks. And I would be happy for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #1... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1128?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Golar, Jackson, Jefferson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amendment #3... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1128. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 178, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. First Read... Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative JoAnn Osmond, you, also on the Order of Concurrences, have House Bill 1129.

 Representative Osmond."
- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It amends the Illinois Insurance

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Code. It just clears up some language for the Dental Service Act. Thank you. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1129. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Kelly Burke, Jackson, Jefferson, David Leitch, Rosemary Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 84 Members voting 'yes', 23 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1129. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Monique Davis, on the Order of Concurrences, Monique, you have House Bill 1195."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1195. What that Amendment does is... or it removes the State Police from under the jurisdiction of the Law Enforcement Training Standards Board because the State Police have equal or superior standards for their training, and this just helps to standardize all the training that the canines receive."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, Representative Davis moves

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

for the... for the House to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1195. This is final action. All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brauer, May, Sosnowski. Rich Brauer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1195. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Linda Chapa LaVia, on the top of Concurrences. Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the chamber.

The… I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It adds a representative from a group representing regional superintendents of schools to the member of the… members of the commission. The member will be appointed by the head of that… that association. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Riley, Bob Rita, would you like to be recorded? Representative Rita, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 106 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

And the House does concur with Amendment #1... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John D'Amico, you have House Bill 1315 on the Order of Concurrences. Representative John D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 1315. And it basically clarifies that this does not apply to a person riding in the back of a pickup truck."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman moves for the pas... to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1315. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment... Amendment #1 to House Bill 1315. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Fred Crespo, you have, on the Order of Concurrences, Fred, House Bill 1317. Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317, which is a page and line Amendment that applies the same

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

requirement for jury administrators and jud... jury commissioners to create or maintain a list of those permanently excluded from a jury list or journal... jury list, that this makes the Act consistent."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. This... Call the roll. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mike Unes, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1317. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Fortner, you have House Bill 1359. Representative Mike Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1359. What this Amendment does, it simply adds clarification to the Bill at the request of the IEPA, making sure that the current law of the EPA Act is applicable to those parts where it is. And just really adds that clarification. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment...

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1359?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1359. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Rep... Representative Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 1458, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Sen... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1458 is a highly technical change that does not affect the substance of the Bill, whatsoever. It was... the chang made at the suggestion of the Environmental Law and Policy Center. It replaces the terms 'biogas' and 'biosal... solids' with the term 'anaerobic digestion'. I asked for the chamber's support."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves Concurrence. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1380, Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1380 was a great
Bill when it went to the Senate. With the Senate
Amendment, it's still a very good Bill. Appreciate an
'aye' vote."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lang: "Excellent explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Governor. I'm sorry. Thank you, Speaker. Is this your last Concurrence?"

Reitz: "Never know."

Chapa LaVia: "I'm sure. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Lyons. Mr. Lyons. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1380. House Bill 1488, Mr. Rose. Out of the record. House Bill 1547, Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept or concur with Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 1547. During our present... presentation of the Bill, there was some concern about the appointments of equal Members, so the Senate has decided, which is very good, that the House and Senate Minority Leaders have equal representation on the committee. And also, it was asked that we have a repeal date, so we have added a repeal date. And I just ask for Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment...

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1547. There being no debate.

Those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ramey, Mr. Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'.

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1547. House Bill 1549, Representative Tracy."

- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to this Bill. What this Amendment does is it... it actually adopted the recommendation of Representative Dan Burke, when we had this Bill originally in the House, to remove AEDs from the Bill and just allow it to apply to those who are trained in CPR. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1549. There being no debate, those in favor say... vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. This question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1549. And this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1558, Representative Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with changes in the Senate. Senate Amendment 1 removed the reimbursement of expenses for members of the Lake Michigan Offshore Wind Energy Advisory Council, and a few other very small changes."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1558. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Eddy: "Representative, could you give us a little more detail on the few other various changes?"

Gabel: "It also, in preparing the report, there was another organ... that it also... it stated 'local, state and federal authorities with permitting, siting, and other approval authority for wind power developments in Lake Michigan'. It also stated that they added the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency as one of the agencies to be involved in this process. And it said that the council shall examine the topics identified in this Act and shall make recommendations to DNR during the preparation of the report to the General Assembly and Governor."

Eddy: "So, is DNR now... what's their position on the Bill?"

Gabel: "They have been working with us and, actually, they wrote the language for this."

Eddy: "Okay. So, they... they are proponents?"

Gabel: "I think..."

Eddy: "Even though the… there's no pay for the individuals that are serving. Correct?"

Gabel: "Correct."

Eddy: "And is that one of the changes that was made, did you state?"

Gabel: "Yes, the changes for the people who are on the council."

Eddy: "They will serve without pay."

Gabel: "As volunteers, yes."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Gabel: "You're welcome."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves please, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mitchell, Reboletti, Rose, Senger. Mr. Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1558. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1651, Mr. Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate... House Bill 1651, the underlying Bill, was an agreement between the banking community and Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. There was one section in there that we moved to the Senate, hoping that it could find language to make it work. They couldn't, so they just deleted the language. That's what the Amendment does. It deletes the language that was contentious, to be worked on at a further date. There was a couple other technical changes. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1651. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1651. And this

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1670, Kelly Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. With the Amendment, this Bill passed the Senate on a 43 to 0 vote. It allows local school board members who participate in open meetings training sponsored by their school board association would comply with the... would comply with the law. And I move for its... to adopt the..."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves..."

Burke, K.: "...Concurrence. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "...to concur in both Senate Amendments. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Did... did this change in any way the requirement? Is it... is it now... they... you said it allows them to."
- Burke, K.: "No. What this... the Illinois State... Illinois
 Association of School Boards provides a training in Open
 Meetings Act as part of its new school board member
 training, and they ask that they would be able to
 substitute that training for the Attorney General on...
 online training in order for their members to satisfy these
 requirements. So, it doesn't change the requirements, it
 just allows the substitution of that training for the
 Attorney General's online."
- Eddy: "Okay. So... so that new training is contained in Senate Bill 7. That... that's the requirement you're talking about?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Burke, K.: "Right. They were concerned with the addition of training requirements in Senate Bill 7 plus this, that it was getting too much. And so I worked with them to allow it to satisfy both of them."
- Eddy: "So... okay. Let me... I want to make sure I get this straight. That new requirement allows for training in four areas in Senate Bill 7. One of those areas is in the Open Meetings Act. If a... a board member receives training through the requirements of 7... Senate Bill 7, they don't have to go on the Attorney General's website and do that training."

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

- Eddy: "How... how is the Attorney General's Office going to know if the school board member opted for the local training for the Open Meetings Act rather than the Attorney General's certification?"
- Burke, K.: "You know the… in the underlying Bill, there is no requirement the Attorney General track who takes this training. If you'll recall that the purpose of the Bill was to encourage people to take advantage of the training through the Attorney General's website and to file their certificates of completion with their local body, so that there is no… there's no penalty provision."
- Eddy: "Okay. So... so, that certificate of completion that was supposed to be filed with the local body..."

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Eddy: "...is that removed? I mean, there's no..."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Burke, K.: "No. The... the school board will give their people a certificate that they've completed the training and it will be filed with the local body."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and is there a penalty?"

Burke, K.: "There is no penalty for anyone, under this Bill."

Eddy: "So, if the individual doesn't avail themselves to this training, they're still required by law, if Senate Bill 7 and when it's signed and goes into effect, they will be required to get that training. So, why do we need this at all?"

Burke, K.: "Because this... this... well, I can't speak to Senate Bill 7, what if... if Open Meetings Act training is one of the areas specified. I... I don't know. You might know better than me, but this was at the request of the Illinois Association..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "...of School Boards."

Eddy: "Yeah. I... I'm trying to find out why this is even necessary if we're going to defer to the training in another Bill. It's something that... if anyone has ever gone online and taken the Attorney General's Open Meetings Act training..."

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Eddy: "Did... did you do that?"

Burke, K.: "I have done that. Yes."

Eddy: "How... how long did it take you to do that?"

Burke, K.: "It takes about 45 minutes..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "...maybe an hour."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Eddy: "Okay. What's your background?"

Burke, K.: "I'm an attorney."

Eddy: "You're an attorney and it takes you 45 minutes. I have school board members who have looked at those training modules that, quite frankly, they really are... have trouble with that. So... I mean, I... I don't know what the intention here is, but if it is to give them minimum training or basic training in the Open Meetings Act... if you're the Open Meetings Act compliance officer for a school district, I can understand the need to have that training. But every district has to designate one person for that. This... that's a tremendous amount of training for a board member who may not understand the legal ease involved with that 45 minute training. I like the idea that this substitution can take place, because I think it's appropriate. I just don't know why this is necessary when we're going to have board members trained anyway."

Burke, K.: "I think the concern was that the school… the Illinois Association of School Boards offers the Open Meetings Training Act as part of their new member or continuing education, but not everyone takes it."

Eddy: "Okay."

Burke, K.: And so, if they choose not to take it as part of the Illinois Association of School Boards, then they should do the Attorney General online training. But if they do do the training with the school boards, then that would suffice to satisfy the requirements of this Act."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Eddy: "Okay. The overall... I mean, they're still going to have the training requirement as of the... this Bill does not remove that requirement, but there is no penalty. That's..."

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "I move for the… to… I move to concur in Amendments 1 and 2, and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. The... those in favor shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Lyons, Mr. Beaubien. Mr. Lyons. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1670. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1689, Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. This is the initiative of the AARP to increase penalties in cases of financial exploitation of the elderly. It increases penalties as well as adding additional restitution requirements. And I urge the support of the Members."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur in the Senate Amendments. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Durkin: "Representative, is there any crime left in the Illinois state's statutes which you have not upgraded to a Class X Felony or to a nonprobationable felony?"

McAsey: "Yes."

Durkin: "I... I didn't hear that. Would you repeat?"

McAsey: "Yes."

Durkin: "So, there is something left that you still have not...
we have not thrown them to the gallows? There's still some
people will be saved? They won't be executed based on your
discretion this Session? All right. That's a more
rhetorical statement. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion shall voted 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1689. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1699, Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur with House Bill 1699, which is a Bill that came before the House Adoption Reform Committee along with 1698 and in its wisdom, the Senate decided to merge the two Bills. The eagle eye of Joe Johnson cleaned up a... a technical error. And I'd be glad to answer any questions and encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the Concurrence with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1699. There being no debate,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Howard, Ramey. Mr. Ramey. Take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill... and the House does concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1699. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1707, Representative Gabel."

- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate changes. Senate Amendment 1 includes information on all vaccine preventable diseases. And previously, the Bill just had influenza and pertussis listed."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur to... with Senate Amendments. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our system hadn't loaded this yet. We just wanted to check it. I appreciate the… the indulgence. Things seem to be running a little bit slow. Have no problems with Bill. Thanks."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion shall vote 'yes', but before we do that, the Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."
- Mulligan: "Would you please explain to me just what shots are included in this?"
- Gabel: "This is just information that's on the DCFS website, and it's just going to include information about all

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

vaccine preventable diseases. So, it includes pertussis and influenza, and it will include things like chicken pox and measles, mumps."

Mulligan: "Will it have any incidence of people who are ill or have had problems, or have sued on any of these?"

Gabel: "Pardon?"

Mulligan: "Would it also show of any problems that people have had with these shots or any lawsuits filed?"

Gabel: "You know, I have not looked at the website. I'm not sure all the information that's on the website. We were just... what's already there, we were just including... right... currently, it was just influenza and we just wanted information on other diseases, as well."

Mulligan: "Well, I'm really curious because I was quite ill this year..."

Gabel: "I know."

Mulligan: "...from getting a shot, a flu shot, and it had the Marisol in it, which we don't give to kids. And it also was the H1N1 flu virus, which... prob... I'm still sick from it. So, I'm real curious because I know we don't give kids the Marisol in shots. I'm really interested in how they're going to do it, and I'd like tracking because there are many law suits that are settled across the country. On the flu shots, I think there's a little more than just tracking them. I'm very interested in expanded information being provided. I would have to take a better look at your Bill. I'm sorry it came up so fast. It's kind of like Representative Lang is calling bingo. We're going boom, boom, boom really quick. So, I'm just curious as to the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

extent of the protection it would be to the children of Illinois. And so, I'm..."

Gabel: "Well, it... it's mainly to encourage people who deal with children to make sure that they have their shots so they don't spread disease and..."

Mulligan: "Well, I know we give medical and exemptions for religious, which you have to get a note. There's always been an argument over it. And I've been one of those people that argued, you know, for everybody to... to be immunized. I probably won't argue that after this year. So, I'm just curious as to exactly what this will do and what... how much it would penalize people or, is it just generally information?"

Gabel: "It's just general information."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, in regards to... on page 7 according to the Amendment, you are changing the specific minimum age from six months to five years. Would you please explain that?"

Gabel: "Let me look, but my understanding it that this is only information on the DCFS website and previously, it just said that there would be information on the website about the benefits of immunization against vaccine preventable diseases, including influenza and pertussis. And previously, it said for children six months of age to five years of age, and that's just taken out. So, it's just... there will simply be just information about this."

Flowers: "Is this Bill only applicable to wards of the state?"

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- Gabel: "No. It's just information on the website."
- Flowers: "Information on the website. So, all... in regards to the... the types of people that is required, it changes the importance of immunizing children, to immunizing children and persons. What is that all about?"
- Gabel: "It's just a description in the Bill of what the information will look like on the website. So, it changes nothing about what the requirements for vaccines or anything about vaccines except for information on the DCFS website."
- Flowers: "But it appears to me that it must make some types of changes in regards to who must have it and when."
- Gabel: "No. No. There is no... there are no changes in that at all. None."
- Flowers: "And so, this is information that's just going to go on DCFS... what's on the website now?"
- Gabel: "That currently does already. It currently does already."
- Flowers: "So why are being dup... why are we duplicating?"
- Gabel: "Well, right now, in the Bill... in the original language of the Bill, it said that the information was just about influenza. And my Bill... my original Bill added pertussis and the Senate changes just added all vaccine preventable diseases."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel to close."
- Gabel: "I ask for Concurrence on this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1.

 Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Biss, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1707. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1825, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment 1.

It simply removes the immediate effective date."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur in the Senate Amendment. The Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Chapa LaVia: "Why are you changing the effective date, Representative Williams?"

Williams: "The Bill, as you may recall, requires parity and costs for cancer drugs, whether they're administered orally or v... the IV treatment. The health insurance companies request that we give them more time to reorganize their benefit pans... plans to comply with the legislation."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Shaw, do you know about this change? Okay. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Davis, Mussman. Please take the record. On this question, there

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

- are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1825. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1908, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. House Bill 1985, Mr. D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with House Bill 1985. Just replaces the word 'false' with 'knowingly false'. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1985. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Biss, Jakobsson, Sosnowski. Mr. Biss. Please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1985. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2084, Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2084. It basically makes this Bill subject to appropriations and repeals the task force at the end of 2019."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2084. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Please

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2084. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2086, Representative Monique Davis. Representative Monique Davis."

- Davis, M.: "Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Some people... this is the Bill that allows expelled and suspended students to attend alternative schools, and the Amendment adds, it is only if the safety of the other people has been taken care of. It involves the safety and so, we ask for your vote on this."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2086. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bost, Mr. Cavaletto, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Bost. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2086. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2362, Mr. Barickman. Out of the record. House Bill 2870, Representative Chapa LaVia. Nice hat."
- Chapa LaVia: "Speaker, as your tenure as Governor, you didn't raise taxes. Everybody was happy. Life was good. This... this Senate Amendment, I move for its Concurrence. What is does, it deletes the requirement that the information collected on a military personnel be reported to the State

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Board of Education through the Student Information System. Is... this is an initiative of ISBE and I agree with it because it would end up costing them \$400 thousand annually. So, they're still going to get the information, but they're just not going to use this system to do it. And I move for its Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2870. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank... thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I think you mentioned this. When it went out of here, this was a unanimous vote. What... there's... there's some 'no' votes over in the Senate. How has this changed that..."

Chapa LaVia: "Well, it... it seems that we didn't... ISBE didn't get... get the fax to us in our committee quick enough about the cost. It was raised in their committee, as far as that. And then also, I think there's one more technical change. Let me look at it really quickly."

Eddy: "So, how... how's the reporting requirement change? It was a voluntary reporting."

Chapa LaVia: "They'll receive it through aggregated enrollment information now. Before, we requested that they put it into the system. Now, they're just going to get it through the enrollment information. So, there has to be something with the systems there. I can get you, you know, after we... it... and it's still voluntary. It's not mandating that each school district do this. It's voluntary, which they want

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

to give us information, whether their parent is a... be in the services."

Eddy: "Okay. So, I think I understand this. In just looking at the analysis, the Student Information System that exists that we report enrollment data on will now have a... a reporting box that you can... you can use when you report enrollment information. Is that..."

Chapa LaVia: "Cor... correct."

Eddy: "...the change?"

Chapa LaVia: "That's... that's... well, it's still going to be reported through that format, but I want to say there's more language than what we're seeing on the screen because before, I think we mandated it. I'm sorry. It was always voluntary, but the... ISBE had stated that if we require them to do the collection of information through the... the Student Information System, it was just going to cost them more because they were saying personnel and other things that would be added to it. So, they already receive enrollment information, so they were just going to put another check-off whether the student had a parent that was in the military."

Eddy: "Okay. So, basically what it does is it removed the easiest way for school districts to provide information, which was the Student Information System."

Chapa LaVia: "Yeah, but... yeah."

Eddy: "Now... now school districts, what they've done effectively is they've shifted the responsibility and the cost for the information from ISBE to the school districts. When this

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Bill was introduced, it was voluntary and you made the report through the Student Information System."

Chapa LaVia: "And it's still voluntary."

- Eddy: "But now, the system that exists that collect data from school from out... from throughout the state isn't going to be the medium that's used. School districts are going to have to do this in a manner that would not be consistent if we just used the Student Information System. I mean, I... I understand the voluntary nature of this, but ISBE has taken their responsibility for providing a forum and removed it. They... there's no... we're not reporting through their SIS now and we were before."
- Chapa LaVia: "You know what, let me pull this off record and let me talk to ISBE and Roger, thanks ."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady removes the Bill from the record. The next Bill is House Bill 2902, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply adds one more member to the Electric Car Task force, and that is the representative of the Illinois Department of Transportation. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2902. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cassidy, Gabel, Jones, Mell, Nekritz. Mell, Nekritz. Vote your switches, Members. Please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2902. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2955, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2955. This is a complicated, technical Bill, a joint work product from the Taxpayers Federation and the Department of Revenue. They failed to list one date accurately that should've been for alternate fuels 2008. Instead, that read 2011, which meant that people would be entitled to it before 2008. That was not the intention. We were trying to bring this provision in-line with the Federal Tax Code, and that's what this technical correction does. I'd appreciate your support for the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2955. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, the... the Senate changes, could you review again the Senate changes? There was a lot of opposition to this originally, but it seems like that some of that opposition might have been removed from... because of the changes."

Currie: "Actually, all this... this is a technical change. It just says that the deduction for alternate fuels or biodiesel applies after December 31, 2008. That's what the Bill should've said, but there was a technical mistake in

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

the Bill as we passed it. This corrects that technical error."

Eddy: "Okay. I... well, I appreciate that, and I wanted to point that out, especially to Members on our side of the aisle. There were, originally, a pretty good number of 'no' votes on this, and I think with the changes that were made in the Senate, it became... unanimous and we should support this at this time."

Currie: "Thank you for your help."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Motion shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2955. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. While Representative... while Representative Currie is doing Bills... Representative Currie. On Supplemental Calendar #1, under Motions in Writing, appears Senate Bill 178, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 178 may be heard in State Government Administration Committee tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Lady's Motion carries. Next Bill on the Calendar is House Bill 2974, Representative Kosel."

67th Legislative Day

- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 of House Bill 2974. It passed out of both chambers unanimously, and just clarifies that counties are included in the… in the notification requirements for cell tower erection."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2974. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brauer. Mr. Brauer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2974. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3025, Representative Kelly Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's a page and line exemption providing an exemption for financial institutions such as credit reporting services who already are covered by a Federal Law regarding the disposal of personal records. And I move to concur in that Senate Amendment and urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3025. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'present'. And the

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3025. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3041, Mr. Nybo."

- Nybo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. The Amendment only provides for an effective... or make it immediately effective. This Bill passed unanimously through both this chamber and through the Senate. I ask for the Concurrence."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3041. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dugan, Holbrook. Representative Dugan. Please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3041. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 20 of the Calendar, House Bill 2870, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 of 2870. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady, again, moves to concur with Senate...

 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2870. And again, the
 Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. I want to thank Representative Chapa LaVia. We did get it cleared up. The state board is going to offer an alternative method of collecting that

67th Legislative Day

- information. It isn't totally removed, so I would... I would urge Members to support the concurrence."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis. The Gentleman does not wish to speak. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Acevedo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2870. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, if the record would... would reflect that I would intend to vote 'no' on House Bill 2955."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. The next Bill is House Bill 3042, Mr. Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to support Senate Amendment #1, which changes the Illinois Controlled Substance Act adding certain cathinone derivatives into the list of controlled substances."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3042. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hays, Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3042. And this

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3255, Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3255. This... this Amendment was added to ensure that the Illinois National Guard is prepared to respond. The Adjutant General would like to prelicense Illinois National Guard medics. There are approximately 300 of them and that we would waive that fee when they are licensed through the Illinois Department of Public Health. The Governor is authorized to call the Illinois National Guard to active duty to respond to state emergencies. And when called to active duty, soldiers, airmen, are considered employees; therefore, when injuries occur, no matter what the severity, it is considered a workers' comp case. And to help mitigate the smaller injuries, to have licensed EMTs there would be a good thing. This waives that fee. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3255. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3255. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3274, Mr. Rosenthal. Please..."

67th Legislative Day

- Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment 1 to 3274, which strictly is a cross-reference."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3274. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon, Mulligan, Pritchard, Sullivan. Mulligan, Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3274. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3403, Mr. Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3403."
- Speaker Lang: "Please tell us what's in the Amendment, Sir."
- Rita: "Basically, it clarifies the... the split-view screen for... what it does is makes it permanent for split-view screens in automobiles."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3403. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis. Will Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3403. And

67th Legislative Day

- this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3620, Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which simply adds a requirement that the design and construction of structural fill. It adds a technical Amendment, adding Illinois's Department of Transportation specifications."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3620. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Joint Resolution 4, Mr. Dunkin. Out of the record. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dan Burke."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect my intention to have voted 'aye' on House Bill 1707."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 431, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 432, offered by Representative McAuliffe. And House Resolution 433, offered by Representative Morrison."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

67th Legislative Day

- And Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Members, listen carefully to these committee announcements, please."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet immediately upon adjournment: Agriculture & Conservation will meet in Room 122B, Consumer Protection will meet in Room C-1, Counties & Townships will meet in Room 115, Elementary & Secondary Education will meet in Room 114, Executive will meet in Room 118; Environmental Health will meet in Room D-1, and Health care Licenses will meet in Room 413."
- Speaker Lang: "Members, by way of reminder, if you look at your committee announcement sheet, you'll see the following; committees at 3, committees at 3:30. Tomorrow, tomorrow, committee's at 3, committees at 3:30. Session at 4:00, and for those on Appropriations Committees, committee's after Session. With that... oh, Representative Eddy, just under the wire."
- Eddy: "Well, actually, the wire hit me right in the neck, but I... I got under it after it hit me. Representa... Mr. Speaker, the... the Calendar that we were handed out... that was handed out yesterday had Monday at 9 a.m. and Tuesday at 9 a.m. Does that continue to be the plan that's not effected by this?"
- Speaker Lang: "That is the current plan, Sir, with... and there's no change to that plan, but stay tuned."
- Eddy: "Well, okay. But... but your suggestion I... would be that for those who have had the opportunity to return to gather articles, to gather articles of appropriate attire through Tuesday just as a precaution, or would you..."

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Speaker Lang: "According to my Calendar, Sir, May 31 is Tuesday."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. It's the same as mine."

Speaker Lang: "You sound disappointed. And now, Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Thank you, Leader Lang. And something near and dear to your heart, but we have the... I have a White Sox tickets for the White Sox Caucus, which will be held on the 25 of July. It's two months after we adjourn, so we're actually glad to see each other again by that point in time. So, anybody who's interested in going to the Sox Caucus, we sell them what we pay for it. There's no money being made on here. But those who would like to meet at Comiskey Park July 25, see me in the next couple of days. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for that really important announcement about the White Sox, Sir. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned until Sunday... Sunday, May 29 at 4 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries, and the House does stand adjourned 'til tomorrow, May 29 at 4 p.m. Have a lovely, lovely evening."

Clerk Bolin: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Dugan, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with a Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2094. Representative Berrios,

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 880. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted a Motion to Concur with Senate #1 to House Bill 3425. Representative Chapa Amendment LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 190, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1571, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2397, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3115. Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: do pass Short Debate fro Senate Bill 83; do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 539, and Senate Bill 1613. Representative May, Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2056, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2903. Representative Reitz, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1973. First Reading of

67th Legislative Day

5/28/2011

Senate Bills. Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act concerning local... Second Reading of Senate Bills to be held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 83, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 539, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1613, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2011: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1069, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3090. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."