70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. Your House Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at their desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Christopher Devron, a Jesuit who is the... with the Christ the King Jesuit College Preparatory School in Chicago, Illinois. Reverend Devron is the Representative LaShawn Ford. Members and quests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Father Devron."

"And the people... Would ask... invite everyone to bow their heads, seek the God of your heart who can be found in all things, all faith and all people. Oh mighty God of love and mercy, we adore You for Your goodness; we thank You for Your gifts and we ask for Your blessing on these women and men who serve the people of this great State of Illinois. Bestow upon these lawmakers Your wisdom and Your courage so that they may avoid the temptation of narrow self-interest and instead strive to find the greater and the common good, a good that seeks to protect the vulnerable, feed the hungry, clothe the naked, care for the sick, educate the young, respect the elderly and create opportunity for the jobless. Give these women and men the spirit of Your servant, Abraham Lincoln, son of Illinois, who did not waiver in his belief that all women and men are children of God, created in Your image and worthy of Your love. As You bless these women and men who are servants of Your people, we humbly ask that You lift up their Leaders, Speaker Madigan and Leader Cross, so they may work together

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

for the people of this great state. Finally, Almighty God, we pray for the families of Illinois especially the families of the women and men who stand here before You this morning for we know that they, too, share in the sacrifice of service. Bless them, unite them in safety as we end this legislative season and give them Your grace and Your peace and an early adjournment. For all these prayers, let us say, Amen."

- Speaker Lyons: "Jil Tracy, would you lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Tracy et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Barbara Flynn Currie, status on the Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Howard is excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Michael Bost, how's the GOP?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Rose is excused this morning, first thing."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Rose, Sosnowski. Is Joe here? Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 116 Members answering the call. We have a quorum. We're prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Report. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1518."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Joint Resolution 38, offered by Representative Currie.
 - HOUSE OF RESOLVED, BY THEREPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses adjourn on Tuesday, May 31, 2011, the House Representatives stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, 2011, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 25, 2011, at 12:00 noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, 2011, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 25, 2011, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lyons: "Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, on page 7 of the Calendar, Representative Biss has Senate Bill 107. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 107 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 107, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biss on Senate Bill 107."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Biss: Technology Development Account is a program that authorizes the State Treasurer to invest up to one percent of his portfolio in Illinois-based venture capital companies thus filling a gaping need in our economic climate in Illinois. The program is by all accounts successful, so far. It has returned the taxpayer a strong return on the investment and it has created, by the most conservative estimate, over 1200 jobs, almost all of which are high-skilled, high-wage jobs in the State of Illinois. Unfortunately, the program has so far now reached its cap of one percent and has therefore, stalled. Senate Bill 107 does two things: first of all, it increases the cap from one to three percent so that we can continue this important and successful program and second of all, it mandates that for every dollar the Treasurer invests, going forward, at least two dollars will be invested by the private sector in the Illinois economy to make sure that there's not leakage of this program outside our state's borders. There is no opposition that I know of to this Bill whatsoever. It will not only cost no money but return the state a good return on its investment and it will certainly create high-paying jobs. I'm happy to take any questions, but first I want to extend extremely, extremely warm thank you to my good friend on the other side of the aisle, a freshman like me, Chris Nybo without whose extremely hard work on this Bill I'm quite

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

certainly wouldn't be doing this... this morning. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nybo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Let me likewise extend a compliment to Representative Biss. He's done a wonderful job championing this Bill. It's a very important Bill to us as a state and as I was catching up on my newspapers this morning, all you would have had to do was go to the Chicago Tribune on Sunday and there's an article in... in last Sunday's Chicago Tribune. I'll just read the title of it, Chicago short on hands when it comes dealmakers in the technology sector according to professor's study. More movers shakers needed. And let me just... let me read the first sentence, two sentences of this to give you some context as to why this Bill is important. 'Ted Zeller admits being unfamiliar with Chicago, but he is confident he has diagnosed a problem within its tech community, a shortage of dealmakers. Chicago trails Austin, Salt Lake City, Denver Minneapolis in the ratio of dealmakers per capita.' Now, would it... let me break this down a little bit. What this Bill does is this Bill will provide support for our venture capital community. It'll provide additional dollars that they can leverage in the private market to get additional money that we can then use to support growing companies in this state. This Bill will support business. It will grow business. This Bill will create jobs. It's a great Bill. Mr. Speaker, there are two things I'd like also to say about this Bill. First of all, I would like to extend my

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

sincere thank you to my Leader, Leader Cross and our caucus, they've let me take a leadership position on this Bill. Leader Cross has supported this Bill the last three times it's been before this chamber. Finally, we're at a point where we can bring it for a vote. We understand, on this side, how important this Bill is to our business community, how important this Bill is to creating jobs in this state. And so, I'd like to thank Leader Cross for letting me work on this and giving me the opportunity to work with Representative Biss on this Bill. Mr. Speaker, here's the other thing I'd like to say today. This Bill is going to help our business community. This Bill will help create jobs and save jobs in this state. I hope it's not the last Bill that we're able to vote on today that will be a big boost to our business community and that will save and create jobs. And Mr. Speaker, I hope that when we have another opportunity to vote on a very important Bill that could be coming to us again today that we do so in a manner that we've worked on this Bill. This is a bipartisan Bill where we've worked together, where we listened to each other, where we cooperated and we can stand here together in a cooperative manner and say this Bill is good for business, this will create jobs, this is the right thing to do. So, I hope I have a chance to vote on another pro-jobs, pro-business Bill today, but I hope I do so in a way that this Bill has been presented to us. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill and to thank him for his persistence in

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

moving this to this point. I'd also like to thank Mr. Nybo for his assistance in this process. This is an issue that I've been working on a little, but I'm glad these Gentlemen have taken it to Third Reading and are ready to move it forward. In helping the Venture Capital Companies in Illinois, with the requirement that they help Illinois business, will grow jobs in this state. Yesterday I worked very hard and you helped me pass a Bill that will create jobs in the Gaming Industry. This is an expansive measure that will enable the State of Illinois to use the power of its own investments to help business grow other business in Illinois. As we grow business, we grow jobs. As we do that, we improve the economics of our state at a time that we sorely need it. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biss."

Biss: "I simply ask for an 'aye' vote on this important measure to help create high-paying, stable jobs in our high tech economy in Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biss and Representative Nybo move for the passage of Senate Bill 107. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady and Brauer. Jerry Mitchell, back row. Jerry Mitchell, like to be recorded, Jer? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading on the bottom of page 7, Representative

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Bradley has Senate Bill 540. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 540's been read a second time, previously. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. Floor Amendments 3, 4, and 5, offered by Representative Bradley, have all been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley on Amendment... Floor Amendment #3."
- Bradley: "This is the TIF reform package. I would ask that we move it to... to adopt the Amendment and then debate it, if needed, on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4."

Speaker Lyons: "Bradley on Floor Amendment #4."

Bradley: "I would ask the same for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #5."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Ask for the adoption of Amendment #5 as well."

Speaker Lyons: "All... all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #5 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.
And the Amendment's adopted. Another further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 540, a Bill for an Act concerning Local Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know we have a busy day, so Bradley: I'll try to speak quickly. This was a bipartisan effort. Representative Harris and myself have been working on this issue for a while. It's a TIF reform package. There are significant reforms included in here. Ιt has unanimous support from various groups around the state. Basically it involves more accounting, more reporting, more transparency, more accountability. It clears up some inconsistencies and some unclarities in the law and I think it strengthens our TIF programs and at the same time protects the people of the State of Illinois and the taxing districts, which are affected by these programs. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote, and happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Minority Spokesman on Revenue, the chairman did indicate that this is a bipartisan Bill. There are some elements which might concern some Members. In particular, there is a fee structure in here. The fee structure, however, was requested by the Comptroller for the additional reports that she's going to have to maintain

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and keep track of that are going to have to be filed. The objective here though is to get openness to find out whether or not these TIFs are really doing what they are supposed to be doing. There's one other small element that had a concern of the... of the Homebuilder's Association that there's a limit as to how much residential housing can be put into a TIF. We don't think that's a significant concern because the limit would only apply to 2 of the 1100 TIFs that are already in existence and those TIFs are grandfathered in, so it's only moving forward. So, as the speak... as the... as the chairman said, it is a bipartisan Bill. We spent a lot of time and effort trying to get everyone involved. I don't know of opposition. So, I would ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, just... I know you put a lot of time and effort into this. The Amendments that you adopted today I think one of them had to do with the vote on the final package being three-fifths."

Bradley: "Hey, Jeff... Jeff, can you... Jeff..."

Eddy: "Being a three-fifths vote."

Bradley: "Correct."

Eddy: "Well, what's the idea behind that?"

Bradley: "Consistent with the Veto requirements here. We're trying to be... have a consistency. So, it's really a Veto power. And so, to make it consistent with the Veto power of the General Assembly."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. And... and the idea would be that there being not just a simple Majority but a more..."

Bradley: "Three-fifths."

Eddy: "...more than that."

Bradley: "Three-fifths, yes."

Eddy: "Yeah. That... You really can say this was a solid vote, something that more than just, you know, was okay."

Bradley: "We want to give..."

Eddy: "It was really good."

Bradley: "Yeah. We want to give taxing districts the ability to contest when appropriate, but we also want to provide some level of certainty to the program so that people that are involved in it know that it's not something that can just be easily overturned."

Eddy: "Now, Homebuilders mentioned an issue related to the percentage of low-income housing in a residential TIF and I... I'm not sure exactly what that opposition was. I know Representative Harris mentioned it. Can you explain that and why..."

Bradley: "We have a difference in the reading of the Bill. There's a 25 percent limit on residential TIFs that's excluding low-income housing from that number. We had a different reading of that, but nonetheless, you're only talking about two districts which are TI... already grandfathered in out of 1100 in the state. So, it's a minor issue at best."

Eddy: "So, for future residential TIFs, does that standard apply? Will there be a requirement that there be 25 percent low-income housing?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bradley: "No, no. There's... it would be that that would be a cap and low-income housing is excluded to be a cap, but the... of the total TIF could be 25 percent residential."

Eddy: "Okay. I got it. So, it's not a minimum. It's the maximum..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Eddy: "...amount of low-income housing that could be part..."

Bradley: "No. It's the maximum residential. It's the 25 percent in a TIF district. It could be up to 25 percent residential excluding low-income housing."

Eddy: "So, you don't count the..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Eddy: "...the low-income housing against the cap?"

Bradley: "Correct, correct."

Eddy: "Okay, okay. And I'm not sure that was fully understood, but..."

Bradley: "No, it wasn't and I'm glad we cleared that up."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. Thank you, Representative. Again, this is something I think we've worked very hard on. There's been a lot of concern over the years related to certain issues related to TIF and this does a lot to... to answer some of those concerns. I also agree that the Comptroller's request for some additional funds to... to handle the oversight of these districts is important. The fees are very minimal and I think very reasonable in here. And it kind of goes along with our attitude this Spring and that is if we're going to somehow create a cost, we're going to work into the legislation a way to pay for it."

Bradley: "Correct."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "And that's what you've done here."

Bradley: "Correct."

Eddy: "And I think what we're doing here is responsible. I know some people are concerned about fees, but I think this is more of a claim that we're being responsible and making sure we pay for what we're proposing. I also recommend an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sandy Cole."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to draw attention to although there's many good things on this legislation it also includes extension of two TIF districts for Moline and Hoffman Estates. I vote against those and so I will be voting 'no' to the Bill based on that. In addition, I was kind of hoping within the TIF rewrite that when these extensions occur there would be an additional public hearing. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to the Sponsor and to the other Representative Harris, I would like to say thank you for putting this Bill forward. Up in the City of Chicago there have been a large number of debates and concerns regarding how TIFs are implemented and how the funding is utilized. This provides increased transparency. It provides much needed limitations on the program and it makes sure that public input can be more meaningful. I thank you very much for your hard work on this important project."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley to close."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bradley: "Just a point of housekeeping. Amendments 4 and 5 that were added to the Bill look very similar. Just for the purpose of legislative intent, 5 is the Amendment which is controlling. Five is the Amendment which is controlling. Let me just say once again that I want to compliment Representative Harris. I want to compliment the Republican and Democratic Members of the House Revenue & Finance Committee. This has been an ongoing project that we've been working on all year. This is a significant TIF reform proposal. This is going to make our TIF program in the State of Illinois more accountable, more transparent and more sustainable. And so, I think this will turn out to be something that we'll look back on and say that we did something good. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 540 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Representative Brady, Kay, Dan Reitz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 6
Members voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Burke, on Senate Bills—Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 675. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 675's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #1."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would replace everything after the enacting clause and would amend the Illinois Funeral and Burial Funds Act. Provides that each preneed contract entered into shall be registered on online database State Comptroller. Provides maintained by the information to be included in the database shall include, but not be limited to the name of the licensee, purchaser, date of contract, amount of the contract and disposition of and must registered into the funds be Comptroller's online database within 45 days after the date the preneed contract and provides that а established under the Act must be maintained with a corporate fiduciary as defined the Corporate Fiduciary Act or with a foreign corporate fiduciary recognized by the Corporate Fiduciary Act, provides an aggregated financial penalty if the licensee fails to submit an annual report to the Comptroller and also provides that every license issued under the Act shall be renewed every five years for a renewal fee of \$100. It would make corresponding changes in the Cemetery Oversight Act in the Illinois Preneed Cemetery Sales Act. And it would be effective immediately. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, I kind of remember the original Bill.

There were concerns about the increase in fees and maybe some of the penalties contained within the Bill. I think

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

one of the more realistic concerns was the security of the, I think, what a lot of people would agree as sensitive information that would have to be placed on the online database. And I know individuals from the Comptroller's Office were looking at some of those concerns. Have you heard anything regarding those concerns especially security?"

Burke, D.: "Well, I certainly recall the discussion in committee and the issue with respect to private information being not secured. I was comfortable with the Comptroller's response that there are other databases that contain far greater, far more information on individuals. And of course, this is a situation where these individuals have deceased. So, I didn't have any particular difficulty with the secure nature of this database."

Eddy: "What about the changes that Floor Amendment 1 make? They did not address any of those concerns. They didn't change the fee or any of the reporting requirements?"

Burke, D.: "Not that I'm aware of, no."

Eddy: "Okay. So, Floor Amendment #1 just simply adds to the Bill, doesn't change any of those issues related to fee or those security concerns. It's just adds the requirement the preneed funeral and cemetery contracts be registered on this online database and that the Comptroller... it makes it clear that that's the... the purpose?"

Burke, D.: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay, Representative, thank you for the explanation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke to close."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen.

 You've heard the discussion. I'd ask for your favorable consideration on this matter."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor
 Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say
 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The
 Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, a note request...

 a Fiscal Note request has been made and not yet received."
- Speaker Lyons: "A Fiscal Note's been requested. We'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Kevin McCarthy, on page 9 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 1672. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1672's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was referred to the House Rules Committee and has not yet been reported out."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1653, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1852 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1914."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- McCarthy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've never adopted Amendment #2, so is it necessary to table it or just go forward without it?"
- Speaker Lyons: "It's your choice, Representative. Would you like to just leave the Amendment in committee... in Rules and move the Bill as it is?"
- McCarthy: "I think that'd be satisfactory. So, we'll just leave it Rules and go forward as it is. So..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, the status on Senate Bill 1672."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1672 has been read a second time, previously. The Commit... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading of Senate Bill 1672, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1672, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kevin McCarthy, Senate Bill 1672."
- McCarthy: "Thank you. With the memo withdrawn, there's no opposition to the Bill whatsoever. And the Bill simply says that the... all the Articles of the Illinois Pension Code should come into compliance with the Heroes Earnings Assistance and Relief Tax Act of 2008. This is a Federal Tax Act that was able to give some relief to our veterans. And I'd ask for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "Could... could the Clerk give us an idea of where we are on this. Amendment 3, we did... is in Rules. Did we adopt Amendment 2?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Amendment #1 was adopted. Floor Amendment #2 is in Rules. There is no Floor Amendment #3."
- Eddy: "All right. Thank you very much for checking on that.

 Representative, could you just quickly again state, as the Bill is presented, what the effect of this change is?"
- McCarthy: "Simply, this Bill was going to be used for other things, we've decided not to do that. So, the Bill is just Amendment #1, I did not withdraw Amendment #2 because it was never ever attached to the Bill. But as is, the Bill simply amends the General Articles of the Pension Code so that they will come in compliance with the Heroes Earning Assistance and Relief Tax Act. So, if any of our veterans or our current service members can get some relief, they will get it under that. So, our Pension Codes will be in compliance with that Act. It's a Federal Act."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, the underlying Bill, as it was introduced, just simply stated that... I think on the... Chi... the Chicago Firefighter Articles of the Pension Code that beginning in calendar year '11 and then every odd-numbered year the board has to prepare a report to include in its annual audit that specifies the cost of duty disability."
- McCarthy: "Right. That was not agreed, so we gutted it with Amendment #1. That's all gone and just this hard Act as a Federal Act, we used this vehicle to pass that."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. So, that's... that's out of the Bill and Amendment #1, according to our analysis, just requires that pension funds in retirement systems that are subject to the Code comply with the Federal Heroes Earnings Assistance Relief... Relief Act. That's all."

McCarthy: "Absolutely. Thank you. You did a better job than I did on that, so thank you."

Eddy: "No, that's it, right? I mean, that's..."

McCarthy: "That is it, that is it."

Eddy: "...that's all it does and it's a federal compliance requirement. So, we're just basically saying that our systems are going to be in compliance with Federal Law."

McCarthy: "Absolutely."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

McCarthy: "Thank you, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

McCarthy: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, is Chicago the only one that has to abide by this or do all communities now?"

McCarthy: "They all will, yes."

Mulligan: "So, Chicago was the only one that wasn't?"

McCarthy: "Excuse me?"

Mulligan: "Chicago was the only one that wasn't before this Bill?"

McCarthy: "We think that all of them have been complying with this, but this would just bring it into the statutes. So, what they're doing already we will codify."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mulligan: "All right. So, then they will continue... they will have to put that money away for tho... that personnel?"

McCarthy: "Absolutely."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

McCarthy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy to close."

McCarthy: "Thank you. I think this is a... an Act the Federal Government put forward to show some relief to our veterans and our service people. So, I'd ask for a positive vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McCarthy moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1672. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Hays, Smith. Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Karen May, on the Order of Third Readings, on page 6 of the Calendar under Senate Bills, you have Senate Bill 1831. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading."

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

May: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an important package reform Bill for the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Pension. Three Bills that passed unanimously, previously, my 3474, 3253 and 1956 with Representative Nekritz, they were initiatives of IMRF

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

giving more transparency, more anti-spiking, adding reforms to our IMRF pension system. All three passed unanimously. Only two minor provisions were added in this Bill and it's very important to note because I know many of us, both sides of the aisle, were concerned. It does not affect any local pension boards for police and fire that are switching funds, so just to make that very clear. The major portions of the Bill are good reforms that have passed unanimously."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very quickly, to the Bill. I want to thank Representative May for the change made to the Bill that removes the opposition and... and as she noted, these are all incorporation of Bills that passed this House unanimously. They are changes that everyone agrees need to be made to reform the systems and at this point with the inclusion of the change, Floor Amendment #3, the opposition for the... of the police and fire funds has been removed. And we also urge an 'aye' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 1831 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brauer and Poe. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 9 of the Calendar, Leader Cross has Senate Bill 1651. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1651's been read a second time, previously. No Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1651, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Tim Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is... 1651 is trailer legislation resulting from a Bill that was passed last year regarding the Condo Homeowner's Associations and it has some specific definitions that were requested after the Bill was passed. It's cleanup language at this point."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of 16... Senate Bill 1651 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, Robyn Gabel. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Jim."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a staffer who used to work for the House Republicans is now with Comptroller Topinka's Office and next week he will take off for the Escape from Alcatraz Triathlon which will be a mile and a half swimming in shark-infested

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- waters, an eight… eight-mile run and eighteen mile bike ride. So, let's give it up for Jason Rudis."
- Speaker Lyons: "Hey, congratulations. Good luck. Congratulations, our friend. Good luck to you. Representative Ron Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Stephens: "Well, I hope the gentleman understands why several of us are rooting for the sharks."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris, personal privilege? Please proceed."
- Harris, D.: "Yes. And Mr. Speaker, I thought working in this General Assembly he was already in shark-infested waters."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Lou Lang has Senate Bill 1782. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1782, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill would allow a person that is licensed as a manufacturer of beer to be permitted one retailer's license on their premises so long as they're only selling the beer they manufacture on the premises. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 1782 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? Biss, Dunkin, Pihos. Rita, Senger, would you like to be

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, in the middle of page 10, Representative Currie has Senate Bill 1918. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1918 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was tabled. Committee Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1918, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This measure deals with several of the tourism funds that are sent to lots of groups across the state. This deals specifically with those going to McCormick Place and to a degree, to Rosemont. There's the International Tourism Fund and the General Tourism Fund and what this measure proposes is that dollars in those funds go directly to an account in McCormick Place. There's apparently been a problem with slow applications at the Department of Commerce Economic Opportunity, so that would take care of... this will take care of that problem. Secondly, the incentive grants that go to Rosemont and to McCormick Place, the way it works today is Rosemont gets the full amount it is due and then does a reconciliation at the end of each year. McCormick Place is on a reimbursement schedule. Starting

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

next year McCormick Place will be on the same schedule as Rosemont, that is, they will be given the money upfront and then they will be required to reconcile through the... through the Comptroller's Office and the Treasurer. I would be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support for this Bill that is meant to make for more efficient operations especially at McCormick Place but also to a degree at Rosemont."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would Leader Currie yield for a question?"

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

Eddy: "Representative, there were some questions that I had brought to me related to whether the percentages are changing at all. Is the same amount..."

Currie: "Thank you for asking that question. There is no change in the formula for distribution of the tourism dollars."

Eddy: "Okay. So..."

Currie: "Everybody gets exactly what they are entitled to under current law."

Eddy: "We're... we're just making it more efficient..."

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "...the... the time period. Okay. Thank you very much for clearing that up. There were those concerns and I think that as far as efficiency and allowing them to get the money, this will speed it up and certainly support the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Jack Franks."

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

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "She yields."

Franks: "Thank you. What problem are we trying to fix?"

Currie: "Apparently, there's a very cumbersome application process so that there's a big delay, not just because the state is slow in paying its bills, but because the process for getting the money from DCEO to McCormick Place has been extremely cumbersome. So, they have come to us along with the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau and they have said can we do it this way so that we'll have faster access to the dollars that we are owed and we are accommodating that request."

Franks: "So, this would take it out of DCEO..."

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "...and give it to CMS?"

Currie: "It would give it to them. There would be a special fund created that the money would go directly to and there would be a reconciliation between the Comptroller's Office and the Treasurer and the opportunity to direct an audit in case there are any questions about how the money, in fact, is spent."

Franks: "So, who would actually disburse it? Would it be... would it be the Comptroller instead of DCEO?"

Currie: "Yes."

Franks: "Well, I think anything you can get away from DCEO is probably good."

Currie: "I thought you'd think so."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1918. All those in favor signify by

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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 Moffitt, Keith Sommer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Roger."

Eddy: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could have your attention for just a second. I think we... we just took the correct action on a Bill that would make it more efficient for funds promised to the Metropolitan Authority to get there quicker and easier. I'm very, very troubled today and you should be, too, by the fact that the Governor has instructed, just recently, the State Board of Education to not voucher the fourth quarter transportation payment to school districts in the state. At the end of the school year, when the buses have been put away, the work has been done, the costs have been incurred, our understanding is that the Governor has decided that he's going to reserve \$52 million of the transportation payment due to schools this year. After the school year's over, after the money's been spent, after an original reserve on that line item that cut the reimbursement anyway. I hope that you will join me in letting the Governor's Office now that this type of action is not acceptable. Last year, this Body gave this Governor extraordinary powers related to the budget. In other words, he was given the trust of this Body to make

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

changes to the budget and reserves where he thought they were appropriate. And last August, he made a very, very tough cut to transportation. Schools had to adjust, but now this is an absolute abuse of that authority. To wait until the end of the fiscal year and to cut \$52 million in additional reserves to the school transportation budget line item is absolutely unconscionable. We've had to delay payments to school districts for years. We had to extend the lapse period spending last year to six months, but schools eventually got their money. This action by this Governor eliminates the opportunity for schools to even get that money. We need to stand together on this. We need your help. Everyone needs to let the Governor's Office know that the powers that we gave him last year are not to be abused in this manner. He's asking for those powers again I'm sure, but he's demonstrating to us that he doesn't deserve those powers with this kind of cut this late in the game. Please join me in letting the Governor's Office know that we're not going to tolerate this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Renée Kosel."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Renée."

Kosel: "This is absolutely outrageous. This is the second time within a year that transportation has been cut. Please, please, listen to what Representative Eddy has to say. These are expenses that school districts already have spent. This is the end of their fiscal year. We have 30 days 'til they close out their books and to have this kind

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- of cut happen again a second time is absolutely outrageous. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar, Representative Currie has Senate Bill 266. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 266 has been read a second time, previously. Committee Amendment #1 was tabled. Committee Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Madigan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie, Floor Amendment 3."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. This is the Amendment that would provide that we retain our per diem at \$111 a day, that we reduce our mileage to 39 cents a mile, that we forego along with the other Constitutional Officers and directors of code agencies the cost-of-living increase that otherwise was scheduled for the current year and that we take 12 furlough days this year as we did last and finally, in response to an audit finding, there is a change in the way non-Session travel is calculated. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I would appreciate your support for the Amendment and the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act concerning

State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you. This is exactly the Amendment I described. This would say to us we are doing our part to make sure that Illinois State Government is on solid financial footing. We will forego the COLA for the coming year along with the other Constitutional Officers and the heads of the code agencies. We will make sure that our per diem is not as high as it used to be. It'll be \$111. We are reducing our travel expenses to 39 cents a mile and we are taking 12 furlough days. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'm sure you will all join me in making sure that we are showing our constituents that we are taking a hit in these difficult financial times."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in strong support of the Bill. I think that if we're in a mode in the state where we're having to make cuts to programs for the disabled, programs for education, these are tough decisions. This is an easy decision. This is one that we should all support because when we ask people to make sacrifices, the first sacrifice we should make should be to our own budget issues, and that's what this does. Leader Currie has brought forth really what I would consider to be the first requirement in any attempts to make sure that spending is under control in this state and that we start here, that we support this. We hope it

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

sends the message that we are serious about the budget crisis we face and that we are going to make the necessary cuts and we're going to start with ourselves. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie moves for the passage of Senate Bill 266. 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 Cole, Monique Davis. Representative Jefferson, Chuck. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 270?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 270 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was tabled. Committee Amendment #2 was adopted. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie, Floor Amendment #3."

Currie: "Thank you. I move for the adoption of Amendment 3.

This represents agreement between the Senate President and the Governor's Office with respect to the operation of the State Lottery. The... the contract currently in place would stay in place, but the salary for the... the outside operator would be set by statute. There will be new management at the Lottery. The Governor will decide who is working in the Lottery and the Lottery itself will be separated from the Department of Revenue. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the measure."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 270, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is what I just described with one exception. I made a mistake. The salary set by statute is for the Director of the Lottery not for the outside operator. So, I'd appreciate your support for passage of Senate Bill 270."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Leader Currie, I'm trying to catch up with this on the system. It's not showing up on our analysis right away. If you could walk... walk us through this one more time, the underlying Bill and the effect of the Amendment, what it is that..."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "...we're trying to do with the Lottery system."

Currie: "The idea was to separate the Lottery from the Department of Revenue, make it its own department and the underlying Bill does that. There were negotiations between the Governor's Office and the office of the Senate President on some further changes and one of those changes is to specify in statute the salary the new director will

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

have. Will it... give the Governor the authority to assign employees that might have been doing Lottery work within the Department of Revenue into the Department of the Lottery, would make some... some changes in respect to incumbency in the near future and just as I say, generally separate out the functions of the Lottery operations from the Department of Revenue."

Eddy: "What... what is the salary of the superintendent of the Lottery set at according to the Amendment?"

Currie: "One hundred, forty-two thousand. And actually, the...

most of the changes will not take effect until the middle

of October to give both the Governor and the people

involved in the Lottery time to respond to these changes."

Eddy: "Okay. And there's a provision in this, I think, that limits the amount of time that someone can even be designated as the Acting Superintendent."

Currie: "I believe that is right."

Eddy: "So, it would kind of force the Governor to make a replacement rather than something he's seen with..."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

Eddy: "...we've seen with regularity which is..."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

Eddy: "Okay. Was there any opposition to this?"

Currie: "Well, there hasn't been so far. There's, I say, was some opposition that was described by the Governor's Office, but my understanding is that there were fruitful discussions between the Governor's Office and the Office of the Senate President and those discussion resulted in Amendment 3 which we just adopted to the Bill."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. And Amendment 1 and 2, the part of the Bill that dealt with the veteran employment training, the research project expansion for that and also the irrevocable and continuing appropriation, is that still in the Bill?"

Currie: "That's... that's no longer part of this measure."

Eddy: "This Amend... Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "She awaits your questions."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, how is this being utilized now? Is this with the new contract that we have with the private operator of the Lottery?"

Currie: "I believe that has already been signed. It is in place and this measure will not undercut the current contract."

Franks: "'Cause I'm not sure why we need this. If we have a Lottery Superintendent, I see we're paying someone \$142 thousand. That's on top of the hundreds of millions of dollars that we're paying the private Lottery group. What exactly does a Lottery Superintendent need to do when we're paying others hundreds of millions of dollars?"

Currie: "Supervises the private manager and he'll... I think, I believe that we've also beefed up the qualifications for the Lottery Superintendent in this Bill to make sure that that kind of management is effective, appropriate, that we're getting our money's worth."

Franks: "Well, here's my... here's my concern. When we had to go out, over my objection... when we went out and had to frankly hire someone else to run the Lottery because we've done

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

such a poor job of it and now we're saying the person who did such a poor job of it, who we had to hire somebody else to do, is going to be the one to supervise them."

Currie: "No, it'll be somebody brand new with meeting particular qualifications, management qualifications, experience and so forth."

"Okay. Well, I appreciate that and I appreciate what Franks: the Majority Leader's trying to do. My concern is I think the public policy here is all wrong. I don't think that the State of Illinois should ever have given up the profits of the Lottery. If we had run... we had hearings here, we had a Committee of the Whole on this, if we had run the Lottery like other states had done it, like Georgia had done it or Massachusetts, the amounts that we would receive on a per capita basis would have been over \$600 million more a year, minimum, up to \$2 billion a year. But instead of keeping that upside for us to pay back our bills, what we've done is we've given the upside to an outside... a outside private group who are going to make the profit instead of the money being here. Instead of holding those accountable that did not manage the Lottery appropriately, we should have cleaned house, we should have fired these folks which apparently we're doing now, but we should have fired them before. We should have put new management in and we should have kept the profit. This is closing the barn door after the cows have already escaped. It's a rotten public policy.

I'm sorry we're in this position."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt."

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

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Leader Currie, you've mentioned the salary and where it's putting it in statute. It has not been in statute before. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Correct."

Moffitt: "And is this the same amount or is this an increase?"

Currie: "It is a small increase, but again, we are beefing up the qualifications that an individual must have in order to perform that role, in order to be appointed the Superintendent of the Lottery."

Moffitt: "Just one more..."

Currie: "And it is... it is important because there is a private manager and we want to make sure that we are getting our full share of the profits from that operation. We want to make sure we have somebody who has experience in management, in finance so as to be able to make sure we're getting every penny we can from the operation of the Lottery."

Moffitt: "And did you say or do you know how much that increase is?"

Currie: "Yeah. It is about 40 thousand, but again, the commensurate responsibility for meeting the educational and the background requirements means if you're going to try to find someone who's got them, you're going to have to pay a little more than we're paying today."

Moffitt: "And the amount was how much?"

Currie: "Hundred forty-two thousand."

Moffitt: "Forty-two..."

Currie: "One... one forty-two thousand."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Moffitt: "What will the increase?"

Currie: "It's about 40."

Moffitt: "Forty, okay. And then did this Amendment remove all opposition or is there still opposition?"

Currie: "Well, my understanding is that the Governor's Office...
the disagreement had been between the Office of the Senate
President and Office of the Governor. And my understanding
is that the negotiations between those two offices that
resulted in Amendment 3 have made for a happy go forward, a
Kumbyah moment in Illinois State Government."

Moffitt: "We have those every now and then."

Currie: "And I hope you will join me in supporting that negotiation."

Moffitt: "Okay. And I thought Church Action Council was opposed at one time. You don't know if they've..."

Currie: "Oh, right, right. Right. The Church Action Council opposes the Lottery, so they oppose anything having to do with the Lottery, but this does not make a change in the operation of the Lottery except that it makes changes in how the Department of the Lottery operates with respect to the Department of Revenue."

Moffitt: "Thank you. I appreciate that... those answers."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may ask the Sponsor a question? The Section that..."

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

Harris, G.: "The Section that deals with the confidentiality provision for the Chief Procurement Officer in Amendment 3.

Can you explain the need for that?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "So... so, what we're doing here is making sure that the Chief Procurement Officer has full access to the contract and all that it entails. At the same time, we don't want... there's no requirement like that in the statute today. At the same time, some of the information in the contract may well be proprietary, may well actually be the kind of thing that's like a trade secret, something that the individual would not need to disclose to the outside world. So, while the Chief Procurement Officer will have full access to the contract and all the details, there is a prohibition on that individual releasing information that might fall under a trade secrets Act or a proprietary... information that deals with how the operator manages the... the program. So, there will be disclosure but not to the outside world."

Harris, G.: "But other… other than the trade secrets and proprietary information, other aspects of the contract would be available to the public…"

Currie: "Yes."

Harris, G.: "...and to the Legislature to review."

Currie: "Yes. They would be."

Harris, G.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Barbara to close."

Currie: "I appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 270 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Connelly, Hays, Saviano, Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 70 Members voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 1

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Second Readings, is Senate Bill 675. What's the status on the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 675 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill. All notes have been filed. No further Amendments."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 675, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Burke."

Burke, D.: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry. Have we adopted House Amendment #1?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #1 was adopted to the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke."

Burke, D.: "...Sir. That was a... as we discussed this a few moments ago, Representative Eddy was inquiring as to the database and certainly Representative Brady on the committee had reservations about this particular collection of data being included. And this Amendment would remove that provision that data be collected and held in a database under the Comptroller's supervision. And the Bill is rather lengthy and detailed in respect to how the Comptroller will administer these funds. But I'd be happy to answer any specific question."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill... Representative Brady."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, oftentimes because of my background many of you have asked me my opinion on things when it pertains to the funeral industry or cemetery industry or the death industry and I appreciate that and I try not to steer any of you the wrong way and lean on my education and my experience. The Comptroller's Office and I see this matter differently, but in negotiations and out of fairness, the Comptroller's Office agreed to take out a portion of this particular piece of legislation that troubled me greatly and that was an electronic database dealing with preneed contracts and system information that I felt could be very compromising for families and had the potential for fraud. They didn't see it that way, but they granted my request. There's other areas of this Bill that cause me concern and I will, as we all from time to time have to do, acknowledge that, move forward and look for another day maybe when we could bring cleanup legislation. I'd indicated t.o some the Comptroller's Office even though there are fees in this Bill that concern me, increase in licensure fee, they did do what I asked and so, therefore, I will vote 'yes' with the hope and agreement that we will work to have maybe a cleanup of this, but we all have to do things here where we compromise and why I didn't get exactly everything, I got a fair portion of things that were a priority of what concerned me. So, out of compromise, I will vote 'yes', but

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I would ask you to take a serious look at the Bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke to close."

"Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Burke, D.: I certainly appreciate the Gentlemen. remarks of Representative Brady and I, for one, having known Comptroller Topinka for 20 years, I'm very confident that her expertise in managing our dollars is quite evident. I think she's going to do a very fine job with this and I'm, again, appreciative to Representative Brady for removing his concerns and having been a Gentleman negotiation process. And I would simply ask for the Body's favorable consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke moves for the passage of Senate Bill 675. 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 66 Members voting 'yes', 49 Members voting 'no'. This Member... this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1940... correction... Senate Bill 1914: on the Order of Concurrence, recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to House Bill 1698."

70th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 5 of the Calendar, Representative Mayfield has Senate Bill 745. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 745, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Rita Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "This Bill would provide for video gaming in establishments in Hamilton County where there is no alcohol sold. I'd ask... request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 745 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 70 Members voting 'yes', 44 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, Representative Dennis Reboletti has Senate Bill 1228. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1228, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the Body. Senate Bill 1228 is a continuation of the CLEAR Commission's recommendations for the rewrite of our Criminal Code.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senate Bill 1228 deals with the rewrite of the theft Article. It takes many of the offenses, makes sure that it removes the unconstitutional provisions, put things in the appropriate Code so they weren't spread out throughout the entire book, makes it easier to find and made some of the penalties more consistent. I'd like to thank all of the staff, attorneys and everyone associated with the CLEAR Commission for their hard work on this. And I'm prepared to answer any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 1228 should 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to suspend the posting requirements on Senate Joint Resolution 30 so it might be heard in committee."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman'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' have it. And the Motion is... carries. Mr. Clerk, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Jehan Gordon has Senate Bill 2168. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

70th Legislative Day

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2168's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #2 has... offered by Representative Gordon, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Gordon on Floor Amendment #2."
- Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move for the adoption of Floor Amendment 2 and debate it on Third."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2168, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Peoria, Representative Jehan Gordon."
- Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2186... excuse me... 2168 it adds Peoria to the River's Edge Redevelopment Zone. It provides that the historic preservation credit for properties in the River's Edge Development would... it provides them with a hard sunset for January of 2017. And I'm open for any questions. I'd like to also... before I do that, I'd like to also thank Representative Leitch, Representative Chuck Jefferson and Representative Sosnowski for their bipartisan cosponsorship and assistance with this piece of legislation. I'm open, at this point, for any questions."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2168 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? Kay Hatcher, Tom Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', Bill, voting 'no'. This having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 8 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, Sara Feigenholtz has Senate Bill 673. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 673's been read a second time, previously. No Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 673, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sara Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 673 amends the Insurance Code. It... it asks that group health insurance plans offer information about the coverage of optional reimbursement of tobacco cessation programs. It's not a mandate. I'd be glad to ask... answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 673 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Durkin, Sullivan, would you like

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Mike Bost has Senate Bill 1852. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1852 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Bost, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost on Floor Amendment #3."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could go ahead and move this to Third and then discuss it on Third."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1852, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does with the Amendment it basically puts in place the regulations that are uniform between farmer market from county to county. And it's a request of the Farm Bureau and others that are involved with that particular issue."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senate Bill 1852 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? Dunkin. Representative Mulligan, would you like to be recorded. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, on the top of page 11, Representative Ann Williams has Senate Bill 2138. What's the status on the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2138's been read a second time, previously."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, out of the record. Mr. Clerk, on page 15 of the Calendar, we have the Order of Concurrences, so Members, I'll be running down the list of concurrences starting on page 15. We have House Bill 78, Representative Jakobsson. Again, we're working on concurrences starting on page 15. Representative Jakobsson on House Bill 78."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the Body concur with House Bill 78 with the Amendments that are put forward by the Senate."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson moves for the passage of... for the... The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 with House Bill 78?' 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?

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Representative Beaubien, Representative Hays. Beaubien, Nybo. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 117 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 78. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Reitz, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 143. Representative Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you. House Bill 143 deals with... we've passed this earlier. They just made some changes to it. It's for military reenacting groups, it allows them to carry their rifles and their reproductions to their events. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions? Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our anal... we don't have the analysis on our system here at this time on this Senate Bill. Would that... I was wondering if the..."

Speaker Lyons: "It's a House Bill, Representative. It's a House Bill on concurrence on page 15 of the Calendar."

Franks: "But... but there was a Senate Amendment which we don't...
if it... that it be concurred with we would need to know what
the Senate Amendment is and we don't have that analysis.
Can we take this out of the record for a moment then maybe
it could be updated?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Sure."

Speaker Lyons: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk..."

Franks: "Do you have it?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Reitz: "No, I don't have the analysis. I have the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "...'til we get an answer for Representative Franks. Representative Dugan, on page... on the concurrences on page 15, you have House Bill 147. Representative Lisa Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you very much. The Senate Amendment 1 what it did was just clarify that we used the federal cutoff standards for drug testing. This was the Bill from the Secretary of State about testing of bus drivers. And of course, it passed unanimously out of here. It just kind of clarifies, so it's a technical. So, I'd like 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 147?' 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? Chapa LaVia, McAuliffe, and Pihos, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 147. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Eddy, you have House Bill 190. Read the Bill, Mr..."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 190. They made a minor change in the intent of the Bill. And I'd appreciate the support of the Body."

70th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 190?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting... 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... Representative Connelly and Dugan, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Amend... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 190. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Connelly, are you seeking recognition, Sir?"
- Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the previous Bill, I wish to vote 'yes'. My switch isn't working."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request. Leader Lou Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Under the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 143, Mr. Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, the only change that came is just to change the order of what you need to have the license. And that's the only change that the Senate made on this Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."
- Franks: "I wanted... just wanted to thank the Sponsor for taking the Bill out of the record and explaining what it did and there's no objection. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bost, Mr. Connelly, Mr. Sommer. It's closing day, Ladies and Gentlemen, vote your switches. Mr. Bost, Mr. Connelly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Bill, House Bill 143. And this having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 243, Mr. Leitch. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. That's House Bill 242."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All this Amendment does is enable townships to go from 10 to 20 years to finance capital projects. It enables them to save money on the interest rates now. I'd ask for your approval."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 242. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Cunningham, Davis, Pihos, Sosnowski, Sullivan, Zalewski. Pihos, Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 242. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 263, Mr. Reboletti. Is that your only speed, Sir? Mr. Reboletti."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the Body. The Amendment #4 became the Bill, which is known as Andrea's Law. And it made some changes that I promised the House regarding registration of murderers and it amends the Sex Offender Registration Act. It amends the Child Murder Registration Act. It would be considered now the Murderer and Violent Offender Against Youth Registration Act. It'd be 10 year registration for a First Degree Murder of an people who Ιt exempts were released incarceration 10 years prior to the effective date. It made some other changes so that the min... there'd be a very minimal cost for the Illinois State Police to implement the system. And I will be available for any questions on the changes."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 263. 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? Mr. Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 263. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Beaubien is excused for the remainder of the day."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The next Bill is House Bill 277, Mr. Cunningham."

70th Legislative Day

- Cunningham: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with House Bill 77 (sic-277). The Senate Amendment is very technical. It does not change the Bill at all. It merely moves the legislation from the Sex Offender Act to the Criminal Code. I ask for the Chamber's support."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for... the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 277. 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? Mr. Connelly, Representative Gordon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 277. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 299, Mr. Ford."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to double down.

 I move to concur on the Senate Amendment, Leader Christine
 Radogno. The only thing that the concurrence does is
 delete a process until the Department of Public Health is
 available to provide the medical records."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 299. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cunningham, Reboletti, Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 299. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

70th Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 653, Greg Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 These are Amendments to Paul's Law which were done in response to the terrible tragedies at the Graywood Group Homes in Central Illinois. Senator Althoff has worked with the interested parties..."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris. We'll... let's get the board straight.

 This is House Bill 653, Mr. Clerk. Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

 Please proceed, Mr. Harris."
- Harris, G.: "In short, Mr. Speaker, the Senate Sponsor, Senator Althoff, has worked with all interested parties to make some changes in the Bill which are agreeable with everyone. And again, I want to thank Mrs. McCann and Mrs. Slovik, Paul's mom and sister, for their courage and perseverance in seeing this Bill through. I would request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 653. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Connelly, Smith. Mr. Brady. Mr. Brady. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 653. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1518, Leader Currie."

70th Legislative Day

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. The Senate adopted Amendment 1 to House Bill 1518 and it provides that in the case of a railroad that is primarily in the business of hauling freight, should there be track improvements... that are really about the provision... the opportunity to bring high-speed rail to the State of Illinois... and that railroad does not see an increase in income because of those or other improvements then there will not be any additional property tax paid by that railroad. I'd be happy to answer your questions. This has the support, not only of the railroad folks but also of the State Department of Revenue."
- Speaker Lang: "Just for the Members edification, Representative, the board had originally said this is a Motion to Nonconcur, but this is a Motion to Concur. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Yeah. And this has been approved by the Revenue Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1518. 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 Monique Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1518. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1069, Mr. Reboletti. Please proceed, Sir."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill was amended over in the Senate, it deals with Homicide Investigators. And the Senate Amendment allows for people to get waivers if they qualify. One from the director of the Illinois State Police... for the State Police and then again for the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board to allow them to be exempted from having to go through homicide investigative training when many of them would qualify for having been on the force for 20 years and investigated a number of homicides. I move for its passage."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1069. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Harris, Mr. Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1069. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3005, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3005. Senator Delgado made a couple of changes, two of which are technical. The most substantive change is, with regard to this, is that third parties will be allowed to motion the court on behalf of the person whose parentage is in question to help the court find it in the best interest of the child to deem the offender as they're a parent under

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the juvenile court proceedings. These changes that were made have made... have allowed for there to be no opposition to the Bill. Some are neutral and others are now in support. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the House to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3005. 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? Connelly, Franks. Mr. Connelly. Mr. Connelly, just wave. How do you want to vote? Mr. Connelly would like to vote 'aye'. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3005. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 880, Mr. Colvin."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which passed out of the House chamber with 91 votes two months ago. This is, again, dealing with a fund set up and administered through the Automobile Dealers Association of Illinois, the Attorney General and the Secretary of State. The Senate Amendment made three small changes. It did give... the first to have changed in the Bill is the exempt auto dealers who sell under 25 vehicles or fewer per year, primarily new car dealers who... who sell high-end, exotic automobiles. The second change in the Bill is that there would be a... an opportunity for both used car dealers and new car dealers to go between the two for the third position on the board where the Automobile Dealers Association has an appointment to the board that it would

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

alternate between a new car dealer and a used car dealer. And the third change simply le... changes the number of times they would meet to at least quarterly as opposed to biannually... biennially on a yearly basis. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions on the changes in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

Williams: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Williams: "I just have a couple questions for purposes of legislative intent."

Colvin: "Yes."

Williams: "Would House Bill 18... or 880 create a board to oversee the fund created by the Bill?"

Colvin: "Yes, it will, Representative."

Williams: "And who would be on the board?"

Colvin: "House Bill 88 (sic-880) would create a board consisting of the Attorney General's Office, Secretary of State, one person representing the Illinois Automobile Association selected collectively by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State."

Williams: "And who would administer the fund created by House Bill 880?"

Colvin: "The board would actually appoint a fund administrator."

Williams: "Is it your understanding that the AG's Office and the Secretary of State as board members intend to appoint

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

either a State Dealer Trade Association or an entity created by the State Dealer Trade Association to administer the fund?"

Colvin: "Yes. That is my understanding. The Attorney General's Office and the Secretary of State, as board members, intend to appoint either a State Dealer Trade Association or an entity created by a State Dealer Trade Association to administer the fund."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this is a Bill that creates a fund, a dealer recovery trust fund. Is that correct?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And revenue or fees that are charged to... Is this for new or used automobile dealers?"

Colvin: "These are for dealers who sell new cars and used cars."

Eddy: "New or used. Okay. So, any auto..."

Colvin: "New or used car."

Eddy: "...automobile dealer that we have who's licensed in the State of Illinois will have to pay a fee into this fund?

All... all dealers?"

Colvin: "That's correct. And that was the crux of the underlying Bill that passed out..."

Eddy: "And that remains. That remains."

Colvin: "That passed out of here..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Colvin: "...with 91 votes."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "So, how much is that fee?"

Colvin: "That fee is..."

Eddy: "Is it still \$500 for the first..."

Colvin: "It is \$500."

Eddy: "And then \$50 for every additional place of business."

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. And now if... Is this annual? Is this an annual fee or a onetime fee?"

Colvin: "This is an annual fee. Every time they renew on..."

Eddy: "Okay. Every time they renew their license."

Colvin: "But once the fund reaches 3.5 million, the fee is suspended."

Eddy: "Okay. And what is the purpose of the collection of the fee? Where does the money... what's the intended use of the funds?"

Colvin: "The intended use of the fund is to make those individuals whole who have traded in vehicles where new and used car dealers have agreed to pay off those outstanding liens on automobiles. When an automobile dealer closes, what we have found is they do not always pay off those outstanding liens and so the consumers are stuck with essentially two car payments because the dealer, who has gone out of business, has failed to pay off the lien on that car that they traded in. So, this is a way to keep dealers whole. This was negotiated with the automobile dealers, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General."

Eddy: "Who... who holds the funds? Is it a state fund?"

Colvin: "This is held outside of the state fund and the fund would be..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Who administers it then? Who administers the fund? The Attorney General?"

Colvin: "The board would administer it. The designee of the Attorney General, Secretary of State, and the Automobile Dealers."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and basically it's set up for those cases where the dealership no longer exists for whatever reason and there's money available to pay off the notes or the liens?"

Colvin: "That's... that's exactly right, that's..."

Eddy: "Okay. Final... final question."

Colvin: "...that's the only pur... sole purpose of the fund."

Eddy: "So, when it went to the Senate, there was an adjustment made for dealers who sell 25 vehicles or less per calendar year?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "And the fee does not apply to them?"

Colvin: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Is there still opposition to the Bill?"

Colvin: "Not that we know of."

Eddy: "So, the final... one... one additional question. The rocket scientist has asked me to add something and I never turn down a rocket scientist's request because it comes..."

Colvin: "Nor should you."

Eddy: "...back to bite you. Is this fund... can it be swept?"

Colvin: "Can it be... No. It is... it cannot... it is outside the state board. It's outside the purview of State Government."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Sullivan."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill comes to us to solve a problem and that is if you are a person that buys a car and you have money that is left over on your note, you typically expect the car dealer to pay that off. What has happened is certain car dealerships have gone under and have failed to pay that note and so the bank is coming back to the original owner of the note which would be you. And so, what we're trying to accomplish, with the help of the car dealers, this is an agreed upon Bill, is set up a fund so we will make people whole that have these instances take place. This is a pro-consumer Bill to take care of a very specific problem that has been agreed upon by all parties to... to form this. So, once again, it is a proconsumer Bill. Please vote 'ave'"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Colvin to close."

Colvin: "Representative Sullivan said it all. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Connelly, still with a problem. Mr. Connelly votes 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 880. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee announcements. Meeting immediately upon recess is the Executive Committee in Room 118,

70th Legislative Day

- Elections & Campaign Reform in Room 115, Elementary & Secondary Education in Room 114, Appropriations-Human Services in Room C-1 and Housing in Room D-1 immediately upon recess."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will stand in recess 'til the hour of 12:20. So, move to committees expeditiously, Members and return to the floor at 12:20. The House will be in order. On page 16 of the Calendar, under Concurrence, appears House Bill 1153. Mr. Bradley."
- Bradley: "This is the transfer on death fee. They passed out of here, I believe, unanimously. There was a technical Amendment made in the Senate. It came back. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1153. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Eddy: "Representative, when this Bill went to the Senate there was just a little bit of opposition. I think the Chicago Title Land Trust Company opposed. Was the technical Amendment enough to remove their opposition?"
- Bradley: "What I was told was it lessened it. I don't want to make the statement that it completely eliminated it 'cause I don't know."
- Eddy: "Okay. I see it came back over from the Senate on a unanimous vote."
- Bradley: "It was an attempt to try to address one of their concerns, a couple of their concerns."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Bradley: "It's a very... this is a very complicated Bill."

Eddy: "Well, and I... and I just want to make sure that as people come back and there's a lot going on right now, we have Members coming back from committees, that at least those who did not support the Bill before it went to the other chamber had a chance to take a look at the..."

Bradley: "Sure."

Eddy: "...at the Roll Call on this."

Bradley: "Sure."

Eddy: "I appreciate your indulgence and the answer the question. Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bost, Brauer, Leitch, McAuliffe, Mitchell, Poe, Saviano. They all seem to be on the Republican side of the aisle. Mr. Bost. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1153. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1193, Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1193 is the issue of resur... insurance recoupment. If you recall, I said we were going to continue to work on an agreement in the Senate on a definition of 'misrepresentation'. It did not rise to the level of adjudicated fraud. We have done that and that is what is contained in this Amendment. And I would ask an 'aye' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1193. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, what change was made specifically to the definition that you worked on?"

Harris, G.: "And this talks about a limitation on recoupments or offset of up to 18 months which was agreed coming out of this chamber and then we worked on a Amendment that would allow independent third party arbitrators who make an informal adjudication. This did not rise to the level of court adjudication to be included along with if there has been a payment to a third party or a payment under CHIP. Those would be exceptions where there could still be a recoupment made. The concern in the insurance industry was that there may be claims that were small enough that they would not be worth taking to court but, there still might be a misrepresentation and we have come to an agreement on this language."

Eddy: "Well, I think... yeah. And specifically, if the independent third party arbitrator make... makes or has made a formal finding rather than just an adjudication. Isn't that really the language? A formal findings a much higher level?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and a material..."

Harris, G.: "And it must be... it must be a material misrepresentation."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Right. Okay. All right. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to, again, kind of bring your attention to a Bill that changed between the House and the Senate. The State Chamber, IRMA, the Life Insurance Council, Blue Cross Blue Shield, Humana opposed this as it passed in the House with Senate Amendment #1 changed their position to neutral on the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion 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, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1193. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1095, Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, House Members. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2. This is the Bill about the flame safeguard controls in nonresidential structures. We did address the issue brought up to make sure that it did not affect the agriculture facilities. So, Senate Amendment #1 exempts structures used for production agriculture. And Senate Amendment #2 addresses the issue that if there is a certified rebuilt flame safeguard we wanted to make sure that they could still use it. So, Senate Amendment #2 does say that if it is labeled as rebuilt by a nationally recognized testing certifying company then they can use it otherwise they'll be prohibited. So, I'd like an 'aye' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the a... for... that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1095. There being no debate, those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brauer. Please take the record. On this question, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1095. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1197, Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to commend Barbara Currie, our Leader and also Rep... Senator Lightford on the hard work they did on Senate Bill 7. And as you know, both of them promised a trailer Bill so Amendments 1 and 2 are the trailer Bills to House Bill 1197. Amendment #2 removes the city colleges from the requirement that there be an extension of the school day, that was to apply only to Chicago Public Schools and not the city colleges. Amendment #1 is the one that takes care of the Educational Labor Relations Act and it removes those members who are fair share members of the Teachers Union or the paraprofessionals from being considered members to vote on a strike. And what that does it allows fair share members to work if a strike is called and it also allows the paraprofessionals to go in. So, it reduces the number of people who will be available to vote for a strike in case such. And I think that clarifies ever comes to Amendments 1 and 2."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1197. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Eddy: "Representative, this is basically the trailer Bill to Senate Bill 7? The..."

Davis, M.: "This is the trailer Bill."

Eddy: "...the Education Reform Bill."

Davis, M.: "Yes, it is."

Eddy: "And the miscommunication or misunderstanding related to the labor issues is how... is really how this Bill came to be?"

Davis, M.: "The misunderstanding in reference to the Educational Labor Board was in reference to who would have voting ability. You know..."

Eddy: "I think that was for a strike. What..."

Davis, M.: "That was the purpose of..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Davis, M.: "...some people, our fair share members."

Eddy: "Right."

Davis, M.: "But they're not, you know. So, they shouldn't have to vote for a strike or be involved in that. So, it..."

Eddy: "So, this cleared... this cleared that up so that everybody..."

Davis, M.: "It clarified that up. That's..."

Eddy: "...understood who the 75 percent were and everybody's in agreement to this now."

Davis, M.: "Everybody's in agreement. And I think that the Leaders did a wonderful job on carving out this Section of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the Bill. This was probably the hardest to get done, but I admire them for getting it complete."

Eddy: "Yeah. Well, I... very quickly to the Motion. I stand in support of the Motion. I think that this is obviously the final piece to a lot of hard work by a lot of people. It kind of brings together all of the parties, again, on the remaining issues and hopefully this will aid in the implementation of the entire reform package by bringing about that kind of collaborative agreement. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on the concurrence as well."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion 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, 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1197. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1218, Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1218."

Speaker Lang: "Can you explain it, Sir?"

Zalewski: "The Bill... we did a tax sale Bill in the spring that modernized and offered more transparency in property tax sales. There were concerns from some of the smaller counties, namely Senator Johnson who has extensive experience with regard to tax sales as a former county treasurer, that we were being a little overburdensome and they wanted some reforms in the public notices Section, the... what information can be on the website and whether

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

smaller counties can use videotaping instead of the automated system. So, we were able to accommodate those concerns. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with the Senate Amendment. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, as the Bill left the House, the opponents were the County Treasurer's Association, Association of County Clerks and the Metro Counties. You mentioned the changes that were made. My question is whether or not those changes removed the opposition."

Zalewski: "My understanding is those entities you just described are now neutral."

Eddy: "So, they're neutral. They're no longer opposed to it."

Zalewski: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I understand. I'm looking at the Senate Amendments on the analysis. It seems that it takes away some of the consumer safeguards that we had put in the original Bill. For instance, the original Bill would require the county collector to post on the website the properties that would be sold to tax sale, but this makes it discretionary. Why would we agree to giving less consumer protections?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Zalewski: "Well, what we were told consistently in the Senate, Representative, is that, I mean, frankly that there are instances where mistakes occur or people just simply... they... the Assessor or the Treasurer makes an error that information goes on to the website and that person is, you know, embarrassed and therefore, they, you know, they call and complain. And so, what we want is like you mentioned, transparency in the process, but we want the, you know, we want the ability to have the Treasurer make those decisions as opposed to manning it in state statute."

Franks: "Well, here's my concern. Because the Amendment also states that the address of the property would not be mandatory, it'd be discretionary, but they would keep PIN numbers. In the real world people don't know their PIN number, but they do know their address. So, I'm not sure if we pass this whether the consumers will know that their property could be going to a tax sale."

Zalewski: "So, what we heard, Representative, and I certainly under... understand your concern, is that the... describing a lot of these parcels in rural and downstate communities by address is simply misleading because the address covers multiple parcels and it could be... thev could intermittently... are dispersed among the address, so the PIN number... or the PIN pursuant to what we were told by the Downstate Treasurers is really the only way to accurately portray what properties are involved in the sale and what properties are not. I understand your concern that's why it was in the original House Bill, but again, we heard this... we heard this persuasive testimony from... from the Senate,

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senator Johnson and those involved in the Senate, that this was, you know, it would overly burden the Downstate Treasurers."

Franks: "But wouldn't a better option simply be that if you have the address that you publish it. And I understand that there may be some instances like you just stated, that they wouldn't have it because there'd be multiple addresses perhaps on one PIN, but in the case where most of us are dealing with, it's your home, you have one PIN number and one address, I believe that the exception unfortunately is creating the rule instead of the other way around. Wouldn't we be better simply stating that if you have the address that you would be required to print it?"

Zalewski: "Your point is well-taken, Representative. What we... again, what we heard from the Downstate Treasurers is that the people that are involved in this process, the... for lack of better word, delinquent taxpayers have been communicated to four, or five, six, seven times by now that their property taxes are now delinquent and there's a tax sale involved. So, it's not as if we are giving them any additional information that they didn't already have and all we're... the argument was all we're really doing is, by this point... I don't agree with this... but all we're really doing, by this point, is embarrassing them. So, understand your concern, but again, the evidence brought forth by the Downstate Treasurers in my... in my case I thought it was persuasive."

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate your... your comments. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1218. Those in favor of the Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kelly Burke, Mr. Jefferson. Please take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 1218. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1586. Mr. Zalewski. Read... Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Thank..."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1586 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Floor
Amendment #1. And I would tell you there's another
Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Let's hold. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Elections & Campaign Reform reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1586. Representative Yarbrough, Chairperson from the Committee on Housing reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 30. Representative Dan

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 42, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1967, Floor Amendment #2 Senate Bill 2172. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2407, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1802. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30th... 31st: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 600."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Returning to Senate Bill 1586, Mr. Zalewski, let's start over. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1586 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1 has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. It becomes the Bill. Procedurally, we still have a technical Amendment oncoming forth."

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

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "Representative, can you briefly outline what the changes are in Amendment 1?"
- Zalewski: "Briefly, Representative, because I expect a more robust debate as we go. It becomes an Election Omnibus Bill that we've been working on all Session to accommodate a number of the concerns related to the election process. So, in effect, it becomes an Election an om... Elections Omnibus Bill."
- Eddy: "Well, I see there's a lot of things that are in the Bill. I'm seeing that it permits the reproduction of absentee ballot applications. I see it shifts the early voting period. It looks like some substantial changes that, again, we're talking about what a lot of people consider to be the most... well, one of our dearest rights and I want full discussion about the changes made so people understand what differences there might be."
- Zalewski: "Would you… would you like me to… you would like me to discuss every… every aspect of the Bill, Representative?"
- Eddy: "Well, I guess we could do that on Third. Are there additional Amendments coming?"
- Zalewski: "One. My understanding is we'll have one additional Amendment."
- Eddy: "Okay. Yeah, I... I think when the time comes, we'll go ahead and then, hopefully, we'll be able to discuss it in detail on Third Reading."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment vote... say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, Notes have been requested and not yet received."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 1802, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1802 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1802 is a Feigenholtz: trailer Bill from the House Human Services Appropriations Committee. We came up with efficiencies and restorations that we need to make statutory outside of the appropriations Bill. We restored Illinois Cares Rx by 50 percent. We implemented some changes in the Hospital Readmission and Specialty Drug Program. We codified that rates with... that affect the Mental Health, Developmentally Disabled, DASA, Community Health and Prevention and DORS rates have to be changed by rule and a litany of many, many other reforms are in this Bill supported by our committee. I'd be glad to answer any question."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill. I want to say thank you very much to Representative

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz for her leadership on the Human Service Committee in all the work that we've done. But especially to all the members of the committee both... on both sides of the aisle that worked so hard with us when we made these recommendations or a lot of them on major reforms to the system because we were asked to cut line item, by line item, and I counted those at one point. It was 242 line items. But what we really needed to do was make some major reforms within the system to provide better access to care, better quality of care, but also to achieve the mission. And in this Bill, I think that all of us, all of us on that committee, agreed with the majority of these reforms. And I just want to say thank you again to all the people on that committee that worked so hard, to the staff, to DHS, to HFS, all the providers, but especially to Representative Feigenholtz who led us down this path and to all the Committee Members who were really consistent with looking at reform. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, I appreciate what you're trying to do.

I applaud it. I understand you'd like this House Floor

Amendment would restore 50 percent of the Illinois Cares Rx

program."

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Franks: "Let me ask... and I also see it's going to reduce the Prompt Payment interest to 12 percent instead of the 24 percent."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz: "It is."

Franks: "Now, am I right to assume that... the restoration of the Illinois Cares Rx is paid for by the savings that you've done in the other part of this Bill."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Franks: "So, there's no net difference to the budget. We're just moving around line items for our priorities."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Franks: "You've done great work on this. Congratulations."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

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

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 is referred to the House Committee on Rules. No Motions filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I would like to commend the Members of the Human Services-Appropriations Committee who have been a delight to work with and have enacted, after this Bill passes, a tremendous Herculean task, painful but necessary, so that we can move forward and pay our bills and balance our budget. I'd be glad to answer any questions and would ask also for an 'aye' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Mulligan: "Representative, where the hospitals have to collect copays, are they going to be able to use that as a business loss if they cannot collect those copays? Do you have any idea?"
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, this is all going to done by administrative rule. And I know that you're a member of JCAR, so we're going to leave it in..."
- Mulligan: "So, I get a second bite of the apple. Yes, I had realized that. But I'm just hopeful that they would take into consideration because normally it's really difficult to collect copays and if they lose out on that, that's, you know, a problem for them. And I've been very worried that we're passing along a lot of different issues. Also..."
- Feigenholtz: "Representative, right now I believe the hospitals also collect copays from private insurance companies and manage their insurance whether it's Medicaid or non-Medicaid anyway. So, I'm hoping that through your... with your leadership and guidance on JCAR that we'll be able to man..."
- Mulligan: "Sara, I'm so glad you're a friend of mine and I know all this baloney from so long... for so many years of doing this, but thank you so much. I always have to be nice to you because you represent the area where the Cubs are, which are my team, so I have to be very careful and my brother lives in your district so. Are there any things

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

that you see... I know some of the things that we changed make a difference in how we normally business and I think a lot of us were concerned about that particularly the changes in Medicaid and so, hopefully, the economy will pick up and maybe in the future we can reinstate some of the things that we've taken away. Is that your hope too?"

Feigenholtz: "It is, Representative. I also want to speak about that we experienced this year something where Department of Human Services made a very quick decision to defund substance abuse and many of us, as we arrived here earlier in Session, were barraged with calls from our substance abuse providers who were very concerned that they were going to, in the very next week, put people out on the street who were in detox programs and in recovery programs. None of us like that type of management, I don't care what side of the aisle you're on. I believe that not-for-profits and our providers operate like businesses in the State of Illinois and at a minimum they should be... they should have a discussion in the legislative process. What we've done in this legislation is we are, from this point forward, not allowing the department to make those decisions by just posting notice. They are going to have to go to JCAR to change the rates and programs for these providers: Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities. The rug will never again be pulled out from under them until JCAR has the final word."

Mulligan: "I was having a discussion the other day with HFS about the blood products for hemophiliacs and how they could do that. And we had come up with an idea that they

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

would manage their own program and be... have a some kind of a contract to do that which I think would be a good idea and I think it should be a performance based contract so that we don't just continually give them the products when sometimes they're not using them. So, I think that... that would be very helpful and I'd like to see that in the future also."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I'd like to respond to that. The committee in enacting this portion of the Amendment, the purpose of this portion of the Amendment is to achieve a savings for some of these drugs through bulk pricing of these specialty drugs that you're referring to and we're not in any way trying to limit access to them, we're just trying to do some cost containment measures. So, I just want to be clear that we've talked to HFS about this. We've been working on it night and day, as you know, and you've been part of the process all the way. And we will look forward to, yet again, having an opportunity to work on this with JCAR. There is a federal waiver that permits us to do bulk purchasing and in order to save money so that we can restore a program like Illinois Cares Rx, we're employing those efficiencies in this legislation."

Mulligan: "Also, I would very much... and I'm not sure, some people I think have seen the Veto Session Map already, but as the Federal Government comes out with things which would be more towards October, I'm hopeful that during Veto Session we can meet and see if we need to make adjustments to some of these programs where we may be either better off or worse off than we were before."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz: "I couldn't agree with you more, Representative. I think that when we meet in the fall or over the summer we're going to begin to address not only the deficiencies of the cuts we made and where we may have to come back with a Supplemental, but we will also give the providers an opportunity to be a little bit more creative with less and work with them. And I, too, am hopeful that they will employ the spirit of the budget... budgeting for outcomes and results legislation and that all of the competitive bidding that's going on in the state will help achieve more efficiency so we can serve more with less."

Mulligan: "I've been doing this for a long time and over the years we've had different ways of negotiating. You and I usually, when you've been the chair, have been in on some of these, but I don't think as many individual members on the committee ever have. And the one good thing I like about it is, when we're standing here voting on the budget, I think there are more people that I feel more assured have some idea of what we're talking about when we're doing these things because they were in those meetings. And I think that's very important because there's going to be a lot to explain when you go home to the public. I mean, you know, the day after I'm walking through the grocery store and I already have providers coming up to me knowing exactly what went on here. So, I think it's good that more of our Members were involved in this process and have some idea of what goes into making a budget particularly in the downturn of this economy."

Feigenholtz: "I agree with you, Representative Mulligan."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mulligan: "Thank you, Sara."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bellock: "I just wanted to make sure, I wanted to reiterate that one question about did this Bill require the Department of Healthcare and Family Services to seek a waiver from the Federal Government to limit pharmacies eligibility to dispense specialty drugs and by rule establish the drugs required to be dispensed in this program?"

Feigenholtz: "The purpose of this language, Representative Bellock, is to achieve savings through bulk pricing of specialty drugs. As you know, the committee is... did not want to, in any way, limit access to these drugs through this legislation."

Bellock: "Great. So, it won't in any way access... limit the access to specialty drugs, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. That is not the intent. It is to bulk...

purchase in bulk pricing after we apply for a waiver."

Bellock: "Great. Thank you very much and Speaker, to the Bill.

I just wanted to reiterate that in this Bill we came forward after the Medicaid reform that we did over Christmas and in this Bill it probably has over 10 other major reforms that we brought about through that committee. So, I just want to say thank you again for moving forward in not just cutting lines, over the 242 line items we had,

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

but actually looking for major reforms to improve the system. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, I'm sorry. Representative Feigenholtz, I know this is a fantastic Bill, but unfortunately I was off the floor. So, would you please explain to me one more time about the access for medication for low-income people because... Is that what the Bill is about?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think you're referring to the Illinois Cares Rx program. Is that correct?"

Flowers: "What... is that what 1802 is?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, there's many, many parts to 1802. It's a 'bimp' Bill essentially or a..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Feigenholtz: "...trailer Bill that's substantive makes...
substantive changes to our committee Bill..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Feigenholtz: "...to our budget."

Flowers: "So, just tell me some of the... some of the good things that we're doing here."

Feigenholtz: "Well, we're restoring Illinois Cares Rx 50 percent and that was... and the... which is... So, it's a \$120 million program. We've restored 50 percent of it, so in order for us to restore it because we had, of course, a number that we had to stay under, we had to employ some efficiencies to come up with savings in other parts of the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- budget and that's what we did. So, we... we have written rules and procedures around specialty drug programs, hospital readmission, what the department of..."
- Flowers: "Can you please elaborate on hospital readmissions, please?"
- Feigenholtz: "Oh, I'm sorry. Staff tells me we took that language out."
- Flowers: "Oh, very good. Thank you. What else?"
- Feigenholtz: "We implemented changes in the specialty drug program which you just heard about. We are requiring DHS to not... we are no longer allow... going to allow them to make cuts just by posting notice for our providers of mental health services, services to the developmentally disabled, people with..."
- Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative. I know I heard you say something to the effect that we will no longer allow..."
- Feigenholtz: "The Department of Human Services, before they shut down a program, has to go to JCAR."
- Flowers: "And so, they will no longer be able to do that. And could you tell me again the reason why? Mr. Speaker, Speaker..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative?"
- Flowers: "...I'm a grandmother now and I can't hear as well as I used to."
- Speaker Lang: "You make a very good point. Members... Members, it's the last day of Session, hopefully, let's hold down the noise. If you have private conversations, move them to the rear of the chamber and let's move forward with the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

business to conclude this General Assembly. Please proceed."

Flowers: "Thank you. Representative, you were saying that we can... that the cuts will no longer be allowed."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Flowers, do you remember when we got here earlier in Session..."

Flowers: "Oh..."

Feigenholtz: "...and many of our substance abuse providers were..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Feigenholtz: "...scrambling?"

Flowers: "Absolutely."

Feigenholtz: "Because the Department of Human Services can... can post notice and they only have to give 24 hours notice. This rule changes that. They will now have to go to JCAR to employ any of those changes forever."

Flowers: "Okay. And there were some more cuts that we made in regards to the Women and Children. Did we restore those as well?"

Feigenholtz: "Well, we eliminated Medicaid reimbursements for over-the-counter drugs. We..."

Flowers: "We've eliminated that?"

Feigenholtz: "We did. We are deterring overuse of emergency rooms for nonemergency reasons by charging a five or ten dollar copay based on income. We are making FamilyCare eligibility requirements consistent with the Federal Health Care Reform Act by changing eligibility to 133 percent beginning in 2014. We're allowing DHS to collect fees on a sliding scale from students at the Illinois School for the Deaf and Illinois School for the Visually Impaired for room

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- and board, meals, driver's ed and the same things that children in public schools in Chicago's families have to pay for. Those are many of the changes that we've made."
- Flowers: "Thank you very much, Representative, for your hard work and dedication. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Phelps, Reitz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' and 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2062."
- Speaker Lang: "The next Bill's on page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2172, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2172's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment would extend the lapse period from August 31, 2011 until December 31, 2011.

 And I would be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 The Chair recognizes Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Sorry. It was a point of personal privilege from before. Shall..."
- Speaker Lang: "Yeah. And I... sorry I missed you. Let's wait 'til this Bill..."
- Bellock: "Yes, that's fine. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "...is concluded. Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Call... read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2172, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Mr. Speaker... thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendment's identical to the Bill. We extend lapse period spending because there's no way we can pay all of our bills by August 31. Bills would have to be into the Comptroller by August 31, but we would allow ourselves a little longer to pay them off and this is exactly what we did last year. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Representative, to be clear, this would allow, for example, school districts that are owed early childhood grant money that may go beyond the normal three monthperiod to, as we did last year, into December, receive those payments?"

Currie: "Precisely."

Eddy: "And probably without some action like this there would be a whole bunch of Court of claims that would be unnecessary?"

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "Okay. I'm a little bit concerned today because of the recent action of the Governor related to an FY11 Appropriation for Transportation where he has indicated that he is going to instruct the State Board not to voucher that payment. Now, I understand that... that the Governor is going to reserve additional money and that comes under a different type of Act, emergency budget powers, but isn't this just the kind of thing that would support the... the initial appropriation so that that payment could be made albeit late?"

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "So, hopefully, we'll be able to do this, reinstate the original amount that the Governor... or actually, after his cut last year promised school districts, they'll get it late and maybe up to six months late, but this action will help in that effort to make sure schools get that full funding."

Currie: "Correct."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. Very quickly, to the Bill. I stand in support of the Bill. We're still trying to work our way out of this fiscal mess. We've worked together on that this year. This is something that's just necessary again to ensure that school districts and others receive full payment albeit a late payment for appropriated funds in FY11. Vote 'yes', please."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, we've pretty much removed the ability for them to collect extra money because we're late, but there was some discussion about arranging for financing for people who could not wait, at least for the first lapse... the first payment when they change over. The first payment will probably be the hardest because it'll be the longest period of time and then it'll go more into a regular period. So..."

Currie: "Speaker, can I ask that this Bill be taken from the record."

Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be removed from the record at this time. Senate Bill 1967, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1967's been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Can we withdraw Amendment 3?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 3 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, Amendment

4. Is that correct?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This Currie: Amendment was approved in the Executive Committee this morning. As you know, the health insurance program for community college retirees is in very desperate straits. And this is an Amendment that, in fact, will help them out although it will do so by causing some pain to current employees and to some of the retirees. What this measure does is provide \$4.3 million in state General Revenue Funds, in the coming budget year, exactly the amount that we spent for this program in this year, but because these are not our employees, that money would phase down so that by year three from now the state would not be contributing. What this means is that the current employees would see some increase in the amount that they pay, but because of this Amendment that program will be able to go on providing health care to these retirees. The Bill would create a fund with eight members: four from management, four employees and their responsibility would be to establish the contributions from the colleges and from the active workers as well as establishing appropriate benefit levels, premiums and copays from the retirees so that for every year they would do a five-year lookout to see whether or not the system could be self-sustaining. If it isn't, then COGFA would say, okay, you can't spend any money. So, their job would be to see to it that the dollars are available

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

over a five-year period to provide for health care for the retirees. There are other measures in the Bill borrowed from some Bills we had earlier seen this Session, example, there will be a three-year tuition freeze so that the colleges do not... not require to reduce tuition when enrollment goes up and services are cut. Secondly, the Community College Board came to us with a proposal for a new formula for providing equalization that would bring perhaps 14 new colleges into the receiving end of that program, they would not have otherwise been entitled. And thirdly, the Chicago... City Colleges of Chicago brought to us a proposal that would bring their procurement policies in line with those with other... other units of government covered by this Procurement Code. This measure also provides that the retirees of the City Colleges of Chicago can participate in the college insurance plan. I know this is not an easy Bill, but I also know that the six thousand retired community colleges teachers in the Illinois without passage of this Bill will have no health care, no access to health care as of July 1, 2011. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I need your support to pass this Amendment and then Senate Bill 1967."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Majority Leader yield?" Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie yields."

Eddy: "Representative Currie, I think you have captured them the seriousness of this, how... however, this is something that we've worked on for several years. We've had meetings.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

We've discussed cost. We've discussed how the community... City Colleges of Chicago would join the Community College Insurance Program and there have been various estimates as to what type of buy-in, how much. I guess my first question has to do with the buy-in amount. It's... it's \$7.8 million toward the cost of those benefits that would be paid by March 30th of 2012. Originally, if my memory serves me correct, the amount was more than that and it was going to be immediate."

Currie: "It was more than that, but that of course was premised on continued substantial participation by the state from state resources into the program. So, as I understand it, the new calculation reflects the diminished state contribution and as I understand it, the other... other community colleges agree that this is now the appropriate number."

Eddy: "So, the \$7.8 million calculation... accor... that at one point that calculation was made, I think, through the Department of Human Services. They also were involved..."

Currie: "It was Healthcare and Family Services."

Eddy: "Health... excuse me... Healthcare and Family Services. Has COGFA also agreed that this is the amount? Have they certified this?"

Currie: "I believe so and in addition, because there will be an increased expenditure, an increased contribution from the active members that means that this... this total dollar amount from the buy-in from the City Colleges could be reduced."

Eddy: "Well..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "So, they're... they're paying at the office, as it were."

Eddy: "Well, my understanding is that... and I'm not sure about the numbers, but there's over three thousand non-Medicare eligible retirees in this plan."

Currie: "Yeah. I'm not sure that I have those numbers. I thought there were a total of about six thousand in the plan. I'd be surprised if half of them were not Medicare eligible."

Eddy: "Well, that's the figures we're being given."

Currie: "Okay."

Eddy: "And I'm wondering what the impact would be on the system and really would obviously like to see these numbers substantiated. The other question I have has to do with the employee and employer contributions to the Community College Health Insurance Security Fund."

Currie: "Under this proposal, they will increase."

Eddy: "From, I believe, .5 to .97."

Currie: "Point five to point nine seven."

Eddy: "And that's an initial increase."

Currie: "That's the initial increase."

Eddy: "And I... as I read this very quickly and we haven't had a lot of time to look at it, but it looks like we're setting up a Community College Fiscal Board..."

Currie: "That's right."

Eddy: "...that would then annually review this?"

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Eddy: "And..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "And it will be their job to establish what the appropriate contribution from the colleges, from the active teachers, what level of premium or copay might be expected of the retirees and to make the determination what benefits are available in the health care program. They will have to do a five-year analysis of the fiscal health of the health insurance program and that must be approved... certified by COGFA in order for them to be able to spend any money at all."

Eddy: "Okay. And that's an eight-member board."

Currie: "It is an eight-member board: four representing management, four representing employees."

Eddy: "And... and as we get specific into who the management representation is and who the employee representation is, I notice that three trustees represent the largest number of community college trustees."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "One trustee is appointed by an organization that represents the largest community college employees. What organization would that be?"

Currie: "That would be the City Colleges."

Eddy: "Okay. And then one trustee appointed by an organization that represents the second-largest number of community college employees and that would be?"

Currie: "You know, I'm not sure if it's the Illinois Federation of Teachers or the Illinois Education Association."

Eddy: "Okay. One that represents community college benefit recipients, so that might be one of those organizations as well? One or the other?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "We... we... I think that would be the Annuitant
Association..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...a representation from the retirees."

Eddy: "And then you have an appointee of the Illinois Community
College Board who's a fiduciary with experience in
collectively bargained retired health plans and one trustee
appointed by the City Colleges of Chicago."

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "So, I guess, my concern is... and I understand the overarching issue here between the funds, both of them, are at some point or another going to be in jeopardy, one much sooner than the other but both will be in jeopardy. I'm just trying to figure out and hopefully, we'll get more information on this, how this affects the existing... and I know you would say it saves it... but how it affects the existing downstate collar county retired health insurance fund to bring in a group that might affect the overall cost in a manner that raises it for members of the other group and then when the review takes place, that group will affect the rates. And annually those can go up. Is there a cap on the increase?"

Currie: "No. In fact, the increase will depend on what the cost is and what the board, the eight-member board with their... that fiduciary responsibility, what they believe it should be in order to provide the level of health care that the board decides is appropriate."

Eddy: "Okay. So, really what we would be voting on is 'carte blanche' to a group of eight people that will decide what

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the rates will be for these members and they could rise substantially and we will have authorized that likely... a pretty large increase. It's initially almost doubling their contribution..."

Currie: "That's correct."

Eddy: "...right?"

Currie: "That's correct and the reality is that this fund is broke and so is the State of Illinois. The state essentially is saying over time this responsibility will rest with community colleges who employ these staffers and with the teachers, active and retired."

Eddy: "And... and part of..."

Currie: "The state is broke. We cannot afford to be the nanny in this situation, recognize that the health insurance system is broken, in fact, and without passage of Senate Bill 1967, these retirees will have no health care available to them next month."

Eddy: "Well, and I think you just alluded to this. It appears as if over a four-year period of time General Revenue support for both these systems will be totally eliminated."

Currie: "That is right and the rationale is that these are not our employees. These are employees of the community colleges themselves, not of the State of Illinois."

Eddy: "Well, let me ask you this question. Why did the state ever get into the business of doing this and how long has the state been providing this?"

Currie: "I think it came in in the '90s and you know what, it beats me. I don't know how we bought the argument that they should be... maybe we were in plusher fiscal times, maybe we

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

had money to burn, but in any case, I do not know the history."

Eddy: "In FY11, the GRF appropriation to CIP is 4.4 million."

Currie: "And that's, I believe, what we're talking about spending this year."

Eddy: "Okay. So..."

Currie: "And I'm sorry, next fiscal year."

Eddy: "Next fiscal year."

Currie: "We're fre... we're freezing..."

Eddy: "So, your contention is..."

Currie: "...freezing from last... from the current fiscal year to the next fiscal year and then there will be a phase down."

Eddy: "So, your contention is the State of Illinois can't afford to provide \$4.4 million in support of the retiree health insurance program for retired community college employees?"

Currie: "Over time, my contention is we cannot. My contention is that we will, in order to make this transition less painful, we will make a commitment to spend as much money in the next fiscal year as we are spending in this fiscal year."

Eddy: "Okay. And... and I still have questions. I'd like to see the numbers and this is very, very quick period of time and I want to see some... some other figures related to this, but there are also a couple of other parts of the... of the Bill that are underlying that came from other... Why are those made part of this?"

Currie: "I think what you're asking about a package... a package for the community colleges and some of the things are

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

things they particularly want and while as I say this may not be a very sweet pill for them to swallow that is part of the proposal. So, they get the equalization grants organized by the formula they requested. They get a three-year freeze on tuition so they don't have to raise tuition, even as enrollment goes up and some services go down. And when it comes to the Procurement Code, they'll be treated like other agencies."

- Eddy: "Okay. Representative, one of the House Bills I think that's kind of been added or rolled into this is House Bill 304. Is that accurate?"
- Currie: "I believe that's the tuition freeze. Yes, that is in this Bill."
- Eddy: "Okay. Would you agree that the legislation would have an effect of raising, not only tuition, but it could, after the three-year period, raise property taxes?"
- Currie: "And we can certainly come back and revisit that issue over the next three years; however, the formula that otherwise might require community colleges to raise tuition, will not be in effect."
- Eddy: "Well, I think what the effect is the community college officials would have increased the districts' budget base and probably won't want to reduce spending to accommodate the dip in revenues and the result could be a property tax increase."
- Currie: "It could, but I think... I think that if you required them to raise tuition in these difficult fiscal times, my guess is that their enrollment would go down and if their enrollment goes down, they might need fewer resources to

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

operate their programs. So, I think, in a way, this may protect property taxpayers by virtue of not requiring tuition increases."

"Representative, I appreciate your indulgence on my Eddy: questions. This is a very complicated issue, one we've worked on for a long time and one that there are no great solutions to. I'm not sure this is the right solution, especially for people... and please listen carefully... Representatives who live in collar and downstate areas, this may not... very well may not be in the best interest of thousands of individuals that you represent that are in systems. Now, we have to do something understand that, but this... this is something that's come up very, very quickly at the end, something that needs more study and I'd be very, very cautious about supporting something that is this complicated without hearing from those individuals back home the effect... you are voting for an increase in the employer and employee contribution rate and you are voting for legislation that combines the City Colleges group with the downstate and suburban college retirees and we don't know the effect and it could be devastating. And the Bill also contains what is very likely a property tax increase. So, as we move along with this, I hope we get more information before we're expected to vote on something like this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I would urge adoption of the Amendment. And then I hope we can consider the Bill on Third."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, notes have been requested on this Amendment and not yet filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2407, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2407 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Members. I... Senate Bill 2407 is a correction of an error in our original budget that's been... that came out of Human Services-Appropriations unanimously today. I'd be glad to answer any questions and would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Bellock. Before Representative Bellock starts to speak, it is very noisy in the chamber. Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to get home this evening. Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill.

 This is an extremely important part of our budgeting process that we need to address. And this money goes to Mental Health which we wanted to make even with DD. And so,

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- I encourage you to support this Bill. It's extremely important to the mental health people. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for the third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2407, a Bill for an Act concerning Appropriations. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd appreciate 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? Record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Biss, Colvin, Lyons, Rita. Record yourselves. Mr. Biss, Colvin, Lyons, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes'... 109 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt. Top that, Sir."
- Moffitt: "Maybe I should come back a little bit later. It's sure good to have Representative Lyons here and have somebody cover his back. Representative Mathias is really good at covering a back, so we appreciate that. A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "State your point, Sir."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Moffitt: "I'm pleased to have a former Member of the House with us today and when he left in January, longest serving Republican in the House. Would you please make welcome Ron Wait, back to visit."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome, Representative. We're glad you're here.

 On page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate BillsSecond Reading, appears Senate Bill 269. Mr. Colvin. Senate
 Bill 269, Mr. Colvin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 269's been read a second time, previously."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 269..."

Speaker Lang: "Please read the Bill."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 269, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Colvin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the House to Colvin: consider passage of Senate Bill 269. It is an initiative of our State Comptroller Judy Baar Topinka dealing with an area of once again working to deal with minority contracting opportunities in the State of Illinois. The goal of the Bill is to provide great opportunities for minority-owned businesses and female-owned businesses and businesses of persons with disabilities to participate in state's procurement process. There is, all know, you know, a dearth question, as we of opportunities and a gap between those who seek to do business with the state, but the greatest gap is sometimes the knowledge of how you go about it. So, this opportunity

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

initiative has a few goals. The program will give small businesses and women-owned and minority-owned businesses and a better opportunity to understand the vendor bidding process which is critical to the success in doing business government. One of the goals is to participation through education and outreach by comparing annual reports compiled and submitted by the Comptroller as acquired by this legislation. The Comptroller would seek to ensure the success rate of minority businesses through activity such as small and minority business conferences or international trade seminars and other major events. This was really modeled after a program that was started in the State of Maryland. It's been working very well for several years. And with that, I'd be happy to answer any questions with regard to what the Bill stands for. I do want to thank, before I take any questions, Judy Baar Topinka for her leadership on this issue. It was an issue that we didn't go to her for it; she came to us and asked if we would work with her office. So, both Senator Toi Hutchinson and myself worked this Bill passed out of the Senate on a unanimous... on a unanimous Roll Call earlier this year. At this point, I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, actually this program is modeled after a program that Representative Morrow and I started back when I was original... year I think I was in the General Assembly. And it used to be run IFA, the Illinois Finance Authority. So, has it gone away now

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and it's suddenly coming back under the Comptroller's Office or has the Comptroller taken over the responsibility of IFA?"

Colvin: "That last part. Could you just repeat that? I apologize."

Mulligan: "I said actually this program was started like in 1993 or 1994 by..."

Colvin: "Okay."

Mulligan: "...Representative Morrow and I."

Colvin: "Okay."

Mulligan: "And it used to be IFA, which is the Illinois Finance Authority, was the one that ran it. Now, what I'm trying to understand... I like the program very much; I've always been in support of it. Particularly for minority female contractors, it's a really good program. Is it now moved that IFA things are going through the Comptroller's Office or is that why it's doing this or has it just fallen off that they haven't been doing it?"

Colvin: "Representative Mulligan, it's my understanding from the notes and research that I have, I was not aware of the Bill that you and Morrow passed in '93. It was a little bit before my time. Thanks to an..."

Mulligan: "Yes, I'm quite old."

Colvin: "I can't speak to that either, but... but quite frankly, based on the research that we have, and I'm sure that the elements of what happened at the IFA, knowing Charles Morrow's history and legacy here in the General Assembly, this is one of the issues that he cared deeply about, as... as you have. So, actually, it's good news to hear that this

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

isn't the first attempt at this, but I think this is the latest and greatest attempt to once again just deal with those roadblocks and most of it just dealing with education and they'll set aside those special programs, but teaching small-, minority-, and female-owned businesses and business people owned by disabilities really to get a greater understanding of the process which will allow them to better compete in these areas."

Mulligan: "Yes. I think this is an important Bill particularly for women contractors. It's hard when you're a first time bidder on something to get a surety bond. It's nice if you have some help from the state behind you. That first surety bond is a tough thing to get for female and minority business owners. It makes a difference if you're in the bidding process on construction. So, I think this is a good Bill. I don't know how they've been handling it before, but I'm happy to see that it would be up and running again. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Colvin: "Well, I..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative May."

May: "Thank you. I just wish to very briefly say that I commend you for bringing this forward. As someone who ran a business for 20 years, getting points for being a female-owned business is very important. So, for our minorities, for those with disabilities and for women-owned business, this is excellent public policy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Flowers: "Representative, can you just explain briefly to me what's the difference in Senate Bill 269 versus the existing law in regards to the minority female business enterprise?"

"Well, I don't know if there is a difference between Colvin: minority business enterprise and women business enterprise. Those programs that exist help individuals compete for setting aside a different business by programs, for women-owned business, opportunities minority-owned businesses, business owned by people with disabilities to better compete. This doesn't deal with any of those specific policies and programs at any of the agencies that governed by the state. What this is, is education. It's about empowerment and making people understand the processes that exist with regard contracting in general, to help those smaller firms that look to government oftentimes for leadership, but when they show up at the door, it's really about being able to compete at that moment. This program is about education and forming those small businesses, those women's businesses and business owned by people with disabilities to... teaching them how to accurately engage whether it be with a majority contractor or directly with an agency and giving them those tools and those ideas and that education to better compete in this business."

Flowers: "So, the Comptroller's Office will be a lot more aggressive in outreach in regards to seeking out the minorities to educate them and give them notification on

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

how to bid for the various contracts with the state as well as city and county or just state?"

Colvin: "Well, the way the Bill is drafted it's for the State of Illinois. It would be my hope that the city and county would look at what we're doing here in the state in taking the charge on this and follow our lead."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Those who favor the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourself, Members. Gordon, Yarbrough. Representative Gordon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'yes', 25 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lyons in the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jakobsson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Representative."

Jakobsson: "I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome a new family member to one of our staffers, Mark Jarmer who is a research staff. And he is here today with the newest member of his family along with his wife, Christine. Christine is in the balcony. There she is right in back of me. Introducing Ethan David Jarmer. And next to Christine is big brother Andrew. So, let's give them all a big, warm welcome."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations. Welcome to your Capitol. Great to have you in Springfield. On the Order of Concurrences, on page 17 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, there's House Bill 1293. Leader Lou Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. This Lang: the Bill that deals with who can do the sale of foreclosed property. You recall, as the Bill left here and is a fact that it has left this chamber on occasions, it conformed with the judicial ruling that the plaintiff controls the case in these foreclosure matters even to determine who does the sale. And the Bill had to be brought about because there were certain judges in some counties of the state that were not allowing the private sellers to do it and insisting that the sheriff does it even though it was more costly and even though it was less efficient. When the Bill went to the Senate, there was significant discussion about this. Some of the sheriffs and county people came to Springfield to complain that they were losing money over this situation and so there was an agreement in the Senate to add this Amendment. This Amendment adds a fee for private purchasers that are purchasing these properties. That will satisfy the counties, satisfy the sheriffs and still allow the private sellers to do it more cheaply and more efficiently. I ask your support on the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on the Amendment. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Jack Franks."

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

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, in the interest of legislative intent, I'd like to ask you two questions, if I may. The Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure law that was enacted in 1987, among other things, expanded the universe of selling officers available to conduct foreclosure sales throughout the state. Why do we need this Bill?"

Lang: "Representative, several counties would see the judicial sales as a revenue source have attempted to bar private selling officers resulting in increased cost of foreclosure, decreased efficiency and dramatically increasing the number of abandoned and vacant homes which are a blight on communities. House Bill 1293, as it is now, reaffirms the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure laws intent and purpose by allowing the plaintiff mortgagee to select qualified private selling officers in addition to the already existing options of foreclosure sales by county sheriffs and judges."

Franks: "How do private selling officers make the sale process better?"

Lang: "For nearly 20 years, private selling officers have routinely been appointed to conduct foreclosure sales. They are preferred provider of this service for several reasons. First, because they charge the good... significantly less than the sheriff, the cost of a foreclosure sale has been cut in half in most Illinois counties. Advertising costs have also been significantly lowered. Second, private selling officers provide many more services for their fee than the sheriff which in turn reduces costs of foreclosure

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

which, by law, in contract are borne by the financially distressed homeowner. Finally, private selling officers are more adept and efficient in executing sales. counties, it now takes five months for the sheriff to schedule a sale while the foreclosed properties fall into disrepair, are subject to vandalism and contribute to a downward spiral of home prices. The legislative history of the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure law clearly evidences the drafter's intent to empower a party to choose a selling officer to conduct a mortgage foreclosure sale. In fact, the case law affirms that. The current situation in which the courts or county boards are requiring that all sales be conducted by the sheriff is contrary to the language, intent and spirit of the statute and has resulted in an undue delay and additional costs and expenses imposed on all parties of the foreclosure process. Given the current financial and economic environment, these consequences are particularly ill-advised. House Bill 1293 amending Sections 1506 and 1507 of the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure law reaffirms the law's intent and purpose."

Franks: "Representative, there's no requirement for banks or any lenders or anyone to use the private selling officers, is there?"

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Franks: "And in fact, the sheriffs can still do the sales at the own... at the lender's wish."

Lang: "That is correct, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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

Sullivan: "Representative, when we're talking about this new fee that the purchaser is going to pay to the county and the \$300 fee, can you explain to me the breadth of the loans that will be affected by this?"

Lang: "All loans where a private purchaser comes in to buy the property will be affected by this."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, the loans that might be affected through this new law, what do you think the total percentage might be?"

Lang: "It's not a significant percentage. I've heard... I've heard 5 percent. I've heard 30 percent. It's not a sig... it's not a large percentage, but nevertheless, the sheriffs and county people, for the most part, I say for the most part, who have been opposed to this are no longer opposed. But I am aware that the people in your county are still opposed. So, I'll save you the breath of saying that."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Representative, that's why I'm speaking to the Bill. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. As the Representative just corrected, there are... there are some counties that are still opposed and our county in Lake is one of those mainly because, well, there is a \$300 fee and it does make it better than before. It only covers about 5 percent of the loans, so for our county and I would venture to guess, and that's a guess, most counties this is still not a win for them and it's a net loss if their sheriffs are actively pursuing this type of foreclosure. So, for that, I urge a 'no' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sid Mathias."

Mathias: "To the Bi... or actually, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mathias: "Representative, do you know if... there were many opponents to this Bill when it was last before us in the House. Do you know which one of those opponents are no longer an opponent?"

Lang: "Well, all I can tell you is, Representative, for the most part the opponents have become neutral. It is not true in every case. There are certainly some counties that are still opposed to this Bill."

Mathias: "Do you know which opponents are neutral now?"

Lang: "I do not, Sir."

Mathias: "Okay. Now, last time it came here, is it correct that the Will County Sheriff, the Will County Board, the Lade County Board, the Kane County Board, Metro Counties, AFSCME, Council 31, the Cook County Sheriff, DuPage County all were opponents? The Illinois Sheriffs Association."

Lang: "Sir, I don't have the list... I don't have the list, but you're an honorable man, so let's accept your list."

Mathias: "And do you know if any of those opponents are... have become neutral?"

Lang: "I... I presume many of them have. I'm certain AFSCME has because this is not a problem for them. And I can't speak to the rest."

Mathias: "You know, today when foreclosure..."

Lang: "Excuse me. Cook County is no longer opposed to the Bill."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mathias: "Okay. You know today, when foreclosures really place a devastating affect on many of our families, a lot of the sheriffs and I know your... the process under this, since the selling agent will, in effect, be appointed by the mortgage company will obviously try to do it as quickly as possible and I think you'd mentioned that, that it would for... but sometimes some of those delays help the very people that are being foreclosed and kicked out of their house. Would you... would you agree to that?"

Lang: "Sir, here's the deal and you know the deal. When this Bill was objected to by that list, it was all about money. They said it was about taking care of these people, but it was all about money. And the proof that it was all about money, is that as soon as somebody in the Senate put an Amendment on it to give all these sheriffs cash, most of them backed away from their opposition to the Bill. It's all about cash. What it ought to be about is following the law. The law said that the plaintiffs have the right to choose who they want and we have judges all over the state flaunting the law. The whole purpose of this Bill is to make sure that properties are sold more quickly, cleaned up more quickly and put back in a posture where someone's living in them so that all of the houses in this community do not have their values diminished because there's 1 or 2 or 10 foreclosed properties on the block."

Mathias: "So, you thi... To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Mathias: "I do agree with the Sponsor in the fact that this Bill has a monetary effect and an effect that will hurt all

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

of the counties. If you think that 5... 5 percent of the foreclosures there's going to be a fee involved to the county, if that's going to make a difference to those counties, I just don't understand it. It's the other 95 percent that, of the foreclosures, that will take a, I think, a devastating effect on the financial ability of those counties and their budgets. You know, Illinois, we're trying to, our state, we're trying to find more money. We did it yesterday and I supported the Sponsor in his efforts yesterday. But where we have taken money away from local governments through not giving them their fair share of the income tax increase, you know, governments are firing... are firing and laying off many workers. Here's an opportunity to let them keep their money rather than taking it away from them. And... and I... I remember this Bill barely passed the House with 60 votes, barely passed the Senate with, I think, 32 votes and I ask for your 'aye'... your 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Leader Lang, I became very, very concerned when you were debating Representative Franks because it was apparent that you were reading and I understand legislative intent, but I became very, very worried, Sir and you just made me feel much better when you were debating Representative Mathias. You had that flow and that courtroom drama that you bring here so often. It made me feel better that you're doing okay and you didn't have to read a script and I know

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

you certainly don't, Leader Lang. I... I stand in strong opposition to your Bill predominately because the Illinois Sheriffs' Association remains in opposition. We are in agreement on that, are we, Sir?"

Lang: "Well, but they're in opposition because they want to steal this money, Sir."

"No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. Leader Sacia: Lang, they do this. I mean, they're the ones that serve the civil process. They're that ones that... they ... they lead the ship on this one or I guess, in proper terminology, they're at the helm. And it is their job to serve the process, to see the process through and they have a very good track record. And again, I applaud my good friend Representative Mathias when he pointed out that very often we also could be helping, in certain cases, if there was a delay or not a delay, the point here is I don't think any of us here really believe, not in our heart of hearts, that we're going to change the length of time of the process because we go from the Sheriffs Association or from the local sheriffs' to private sales. Would we agree on that or is that something that we would not agree on?"

Lang: "We totally disagree on that. In county after county..."

Sacia: "I love it when we disagree, Representative."

Lang: "...after county after county in this state, where the private sales are done, it is quicker, cheaper and faster for the plaintiff and to get that property with someone living in it, so it's not a blight on the community and so property values for everyone else on the block go up. The sheriffs and the county board chairmen and presidents ought

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

to have an interest in property values going up in their community."

Sacia: "I... I believe they do, Leader Lang. I don't question that for a minute. I think we have a good tried and true process where fees are not involved. It worked very, very well under the Sheriffs' Association, but this... Leader Lang, this is a Bill... you made a very interesting quote yesterday and I can only paraphrase it, but it had to do with helping one guy get rich or another guy get rich. This is one of those cases where we're creating a fee. We do not have to create a fee. It's a piece of legislation we do not need. Vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do I always have to follow Sacia?"

Speaker Lyons: "Luck of the draw, Representative."

Brauer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I think that this Bill may be a good idea in some districts, but certainly in other districts I think there's a lot of concern. I talked to all three of the sheriffs that I represent. All three of the sheriffs still have a lot of concern. I mean, if there's a foreclosure, who takes care of the eviction?"

Lang: "The sheriff."

Brauer: "You mean, the Banker's Association's not going to come out and kick them out?"

Lang: "This is not about the Banker's Association, Sir."

Brauer: "Well, their one of the proponents on this."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Lang: "Sir, let... you see, when all we do is talk to one local elected official who has a vested interest, we get the wrong information. Here's the law today without this Bill. The law today says that you can a... that when there's a foreclosure and there's going to be a sale of the property, the plaintiff can ask a judge to allow either the sheriff or a private party to conduct the sale. There's a court case, an Illinois Supreme Court case... that big building down the street... that says that the plaintiff gets to decide and the judge doesn't really get to decide."

Brauer: "To the Bill."

Lang: "But all of... I'm answering your question, Sir."

Brauer: "To the Bill."

Lang: "But all over the State of Illinois we have judges..."

Brauer: "Speaker."

Lang: "...who ignore the court order."

Brauer: "To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Gentlemen, Gentlemen."

Lang: "That's what this Bill is about."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is something that has a lot of precedence in these small rural communities. It is about funding the sheriffs in there. If we take this away from them, they will still have substantial cost that they have to spend year after year after year and no way to fund that and this will actually take away from the sheriffs' deputies the ability to hire deputies in a lot of our counties. I urge a 'no' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Representative Mayfield and then Lang to close. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. The original underlying Bill had 60 votes, of which one of them was mine. I was not at my desk when my switch was voted and I did ask the record to reflect, which would have given us a 59 and it would not have passed the House. I am strong in opposition to this Bill. I have spoken to my county administrator, my county president, several board members for Lake County. This Bill would negatively affect us. And I'm asking all Representatives that have a piece of Lake County to vote 'no' to this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang. Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply clarifies the law. Yes, they added a fee in the Senate. They added a fee in the Senate to satisfy the concerns of some of the sheriffs' including Sheriff Dart of Cook County that supports this Bill. The Banker's Association supports this Bill. The Community Banker's Association supports this Bill. The Credit Union Association supports this Bill. Lots of folks support this Bill. So, don't start thinking everybody opposes the Bill. The truth is that this is a Bill that will help property values in our communities all over the State of Illinois. Everyone of us in communities have people who live there who, unfortunately, have had their property foreclosed and when there... when there are signs in front of peoples' houses week after week, month after month, and the grass is growing, et cetera, et cetera, the property values all around the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

community decrease. There's an Illinois Supreme Court case that says that the plaintiff decides who does the sheriff's sale. That's what it says and yet, we have judges in the State of Illinois that ignore that order. We have judges in the State of Illinois that ignore that order. Now, many of you from Lake County, where the judges have really ignored that order and the county board chairman that really wants this money want to stand and just say, well, the public policy be damned, we want the money. This Bill is not about the money. This Bill is about the process in the court system of how the court system must do its work and giving the plaintiff in this case, just like any case in a court system, the power to do what they need to do to get the remedy their client has asked for and the court ordered. All this Bill asks for is the ability for the plaintiff to do what the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois says they all have the power to do, control their own case. I strongly urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1293?' 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 49 Members voting 'yes', 59 Members voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. The Motion fails. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "I... Never mind, Sir."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Continuing on the Order of Concurrences, on page 17, Representative Dan Reitz, you have House Bill 1297. Representative Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1297 streamlines some of the permit fees in the Illinois EPA for air permit process all... the air permit process. Also, will... creates a new revenue. I think, at the end, the business community looks at this as a job creation measure. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 1297.' 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 Bellock, Mathias. Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98 Members voting 'yes', 18 Members voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #3 to House Bill 1297. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano, on the Order of Concurrences on page 17, you have House Bill 1490. Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2. This were... some technical changes the Senate made and this is the Mixed Marshal Arts Licensing Bill with a renewal of the boxing rewrite under their sunset. I would move to concur with Amendment #2."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any questions? The question is, 'Should the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1490?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mathias, McGuire. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 45 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1490. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano. Representative Mike Tryon, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1490, I inadvertently voted 'green' when I intended to vote 'red'.

 If you could record me as a 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Chapa LaVia, on the Order of Concurrences on page 17 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1537.

 Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1537 and if it passes, I'd like everybody in the General... in this side of the chamber to be added. What it does it adds in that designates August 7 of each year as Purple Heart Day to honor the remembrance... in memory of the U.S. Service members wounded or killed in combat. And I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House... of Hou... Senate Amendment #1 to

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

House Bill 1537 vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The Motion is to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1537. Representative Poe, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1537. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the request of the Sponsor, all Members will be made cosponsors to this. Thank you, Representative Chapa LaVia. Representative Sid Mathias, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

- Mathias: "Yes. On House Bill 1490, I inadvertently missed the wrong button and I should have voted 'no'. That was my intention."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your intention, Sir.

 Mr. Clerk, Adjournment Resolution, a corrected version, I
 believe."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Joint Resolution 39, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the two Houses Tuesday, May 31, 2011, the House adjourn on Representatives stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, 2011, in perfunctory session, or until the call of the Speaker; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 25, 2011, at 12:00 noon, or until the call of the Speaker; and the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, October 19, 2011, in perfunctory

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- session, or until the call of the President; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 25, 2011, or until the call of the President."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Derrick Smith, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Smith: "Mr. Speaker, on the Senate Bill 1293, I want to be a 'yes' on that."
- Speaker Lyons: "I believe it was House Bill, Representative, House Bill 1293."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Representative Lisa Dugan, back on the Order of Concurrences on page 17 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 1576. Representative Dugan."
- Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1576 is the firefighter hiring Bill that we talked about in the House. Some of the concerns that brought up, we did amend it in the Senate as I had said we would do. I... it does now with the Amendment the IML has now removed their opposition and it does clarify what we meant. So, the preemption... what this does is it actually is a floor not a mandate. So, it also addressed the... where they can choose from more than just the top two. So, we did take the concerns and also some of the clarification language that we needed to make sure that everyone understood what we are trying to do to just make sure we have minimum standards

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

for the hiring of firefighters and physical and mental agility tests. So, with that, I'd certainly... I'd be glad to answer any questions. The Senate vote 50 'yes' votes on this Bill as amended. So, I would certainly appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Roger Eddy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, with the Senate Amendment #3... I think that's the language that's agreed on with the IML..."

Dugan: "Correct."

Eddy: "...and the associated firefighters?"

Dugan: "Correct. That... yes, that's the issues that were brought up here and discussed with Senator Koehler, the firefighters and the IML and others that had concerns. So, this addresses those concerns."

Eddy: "Okay. So, at this point, the… the only opposition that remains is the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference and the Illinois Fire and Police Commissions."

Dugan: "The only... as far as the Mayors and Managers, the DuPage, they were contacted, they said that they could not state they were opposed without the Amendment. They hadn't had time to recuse... to review the Amendment. So, I'm not sure that we could say they're still opposed because we did address their issues. As far as the Police and Fire Commission, yes, they are still opposed. Their opposition is to the statewide hiring list, which of course is permissive, no one needs to use it anyway. So..."

Eddy: "Okay."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Dugan: "...that's the only opposition that I know of."

Eddy: "Okay. So, could you describe the concession to the Associated Firefighters? What... what change was made that removed their opposition? Well, how was it changed that they were... they were opposed when it left, but how did... what did Amendment 3 do that removed that?"

Dugan: "I'm sorry, Representative. Who was opposed when it left?"

Eddy: "Well, the... the IML. What was the change that was made..."

Dugan: "Yes."

Eddy: "...that removed their opposition 'cause I heard from a couple of my municipalities. They were opposed. But what did you do?"

"The Municipal League, some of the... the concern that was brought up was first, of course, the preemption of Home Rule which, of course, was always an issue. But what the preemption in this Bill, with the Amendment, it makes it a floor not a mandate. So, as we had said from the very just wanted to make beginning, we a floor. The municipalities could make any stricter guidelines that they wanted. It wasn't clear in the Bill, even though that was the intent of our Bill, so we did amend it to make that clear. The other part that they had a problem with was the... where they could go in the ranking, as far as the hiring, where the law now says you go from the top... the top two, what we have done is we have allowed them with the 5 percent of the eligibility list. So, many of the municipalities had a problem with the law as it reads now where you can only choose from the top two. This allows

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

them, and there was an agreement made, 5 percent, so 5 percent of the eligibility list that they can choose from."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I'm interested to some degree as to why the DuPage Mayors and Managers are still opposed, if that concession was made. Did they..."

Dugan: "When staff contacted them, Representative, to see if the opposition still held, the DuPage Mayors and Managers told staff that they didn't have time to review the Amendment so they couldn't really say."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the clarification because our analysis says opposed..."

Dugan: "Right."

Eddy: "...where in reality that position is pending. You..."

Dugan: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay."

Dugan: "And we did address their issues, so I'm going to assume."

Eddy: "Okay. I want to make sure that our side knows that that opposed is not totally accurate, that it's a pending position. Thank you."

Dugan: "Yeah. It was prior to the Amendment..."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Dugan: "...the Amendment that addressed their concerns. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

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

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

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Harris, D.: "Representative, we had a long discussion during the course of the Bill about the issue and you may have addressed this, but the term is 'banding'."

Dugan: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And has that been taken care of with the Senate Amendment?"

Dugan: "Yes. That's one of the Amendments that puts the banding into the law... into this Bill."

Harris, D.: "So, that's now permitted?"

Dugan: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Biss."

Biss: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I simply want to thank the Sponsor. This is a complicated Bill in my area and in my community and the Sponsor has spent substantial amount of time on the phone with Mayors and Fire Chiefs' from my district subsequent to passage in the House and the Amendments have done a great deal to relay the concerns of some of the local municipal leaders in my community which is tremendously helpful to me. I think it's improved the Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan to close."

Dugan: "Thank you very much. Again, this is very important to not only the firefighters throughout the state but the people that they do protect. So, I certainly thank everyone that gave their input. I'm glad that we were able to address concerns and I'd certainly appreciate an 'aye' vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan moves that the House concur in Amendments #1 and 3 to... Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 1576. 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? Barickman, Will Davis, David Reis, Dan Reitz. Danny Reitz, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 1576. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Osmond, on the top of page 18 under Concurrences, you have House Bill 2056. Representative JoAnn Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2056, a lot of the Members of the General Assembly, this is the Bill that was worked on by the students at Antioch High School and the students at Pontiac High School. It's called P2D2. And Amendment #1 adds to the Bill requires that the Criminal Justice Information Authority adopt rules to implement and administer the grant program. And Senate Amendment #2 adds to the Bill and provides for five percent of the court costs to be given to the Criminal Justice Information project for their managing of the funds. And I would move to concur with these two Amendments."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2056?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2056. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Norine Hammond, you have, under House Bills for... on Concurrence, House Bill 2094. Representative Norine Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2094. Basically, the Amendment fixes a drafting error and replaces 'wild turkeys' with 'deer'. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of concurring with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2094... 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 Durkin, Karen May. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 2094. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Burke, you have House Bill 2193."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 on this. If the Members would recall, this was a Bill that Representative

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mendoza had worked very hard on controlling the sale of caustic substances. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any... are there any questions? Representative David Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative. I hope you can tell us just a little bit. There was some concern from Retail Merchants and stuff about some changes. And I don't mean to put you on the spot, I just want to make sure that we've got all those issues addressed and that they're neutral."

Burke, D.: "I believe that this Amendment would address those concerns and specifically, would provide that the exemptions to the prohibition against the sale or possession of this corrosive or caustic acid only apply if the chemical is used to threaten, intimidate, injure or cause distress to another person."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke... Representative Burke moves that the House should concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2193. 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 Connelly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with the Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2193. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Saviano, on the bottom of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- page 17 under House Bill concurrences, you have House Bill 17... 1973. Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amen... I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's a cleanup on 2009. In the Illinois Optometric Practice Act, we inadvertently left out some language on fee splitting. This simply clarifies that.

 And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1973?' 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? Colvin, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1973. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Ma'am?"
- Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1973, I pressed by 'no' switch and meant to press 'yes'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Representative Bradley, on the Order of Concurrences on the bottom of page 17, you have House Bill 1908. Representative John Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. It puts further limitations on prior meth users who are on parole from being able to

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

acquire pseudoephedrine, the key component for being able to make meth. Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1908?' 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 Acevedo. Representative Acevedo, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Barickman, on the Order of Concurrences on the middle of page 18, you have House Bill 2362. Representative Barickman."

Barickman: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 1 to House
Bill 2362 simply places a limit on the time period for
which certain records are available for disclosure. I move
for concurrence on the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2362?' This is final action. And all those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Sommer. Mr. Clerk... Keith Sommer. Take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill having

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

re... And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2362. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Rita Mayfield, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 2397. Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill passed unanimously out of the House and the only change to the Bill is the Bill number. It was switched in the Senate. There have been no changes to this Bill. It basically promotes reading in the… grades case history. And I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2397?' 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 Hammond, Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Senate... House Bill 2397. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tim Schmitz, you House Bill 2555 on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2555. Counties that have administrative adjudication are label... are able to collect a tow fee. In the... in a stunning action the Senate actually made this Bill better

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

by... It's getting late today, Speaker, isn't it? This would relieve the towing..."

Speaker Lyons: "Do the best you can, Leader."

Schmitz: "...company from collecting the tow fee. And I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, we're having a little bit of a misunderstanding of what your intent of this Bill is trying to do. Could you please explain the tow fee?"

Schmitz: "It would be tow, with a space, fee, tow fee."

Sullivan: "As in something happened to my toe and you might give me a fee as in Mr. Dunkin should get out the trophy?"

Speaker Lyons: "Have you concluded your questions, Representative Sullivan?"

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've had enough for the afternoon."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Schmitz, it is late in the day. How about financial enhancement... financial enhancement?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "He's thinking it over. Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm wondering what the rationale is that we're going to charge a fee on top of someone who just got their car towed. What interest of it is the government to make money

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

after someone just shells out 200 bucks for their car to get towed? Why are we kicking people when they're down?"

- Schmitz: "As drafted, this would only apply to counties with the population of more than 500 thousand and already have an administrative adjudication procedure to collect this fee. It covers their man hours and the paperwork required on towing it. As I said, in this one it would not require the… the towing collector to actually collect a fee. It would put the burden back on the county."
- Franks: "But don't you think that's like a stupid rotten fee, an administrative tow fee. It's sort of like when you go to a bank and they charge you for, you know, administrative costs. It's their... it's their overhead, but they charge you 40... if you're going to buy a car, it's always a \$44 fee and you ask about it and they say, well, it's the government. I mean, what are you doing for that \$44 fee? And they don't do anything. So, I'm wondering, how do they justify an administrative tow fee when someone else is towing the car?"
- Schmitz: "Well, I'm looking at the Roll Call here. You voted 'no' last time, so I'm assuming I'm not going to change your mind this time, Representative."
- Franks: "Well, I'd certainly like... but maybe you could change somebody else's mind. I'm serious. Why are we always throwing fees on people? Just because we've had them in the past doesn't mean they need to continue. How are we ever going to shrink the size of government if we just keep throwing more fees on people because they had the unfortunate... hey, the car broke down. And it's unfortunate

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

and the guy's coming back, he's working, you know, paycheck to paycheck and he has to pay \$200 for a tow and then the county will hit him for another \$50. How do we justify that?"

- Schmitz: "Well, there would be a procedure that the person whose vehicle was towed would be able to go through and follow with the administrative adjudication to the county.

 Right now, this would apply to DuPage, Lake, Kane and Will."
- Franks: "Well, I appreciate... I know what you're trying to do.

 Just to the Bill. I'm just so tired of government taking our money. I'm so tired of that. I'm not... For no reason.

 I'd ask a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2555?' All those in favor... 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 Cassidy, Will Davis, Golar. Representative Cassidy, Representative Williams, Winters. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Congratulations, Representative Schmitz. You've done it. Last day of Session and you've done it, Tim. On this question, there's 101 Members voting 'no', 15 Members voting 'yes'. And the Motion fails. For this historic moment, the Chair recognizes Representative... Leader Tim Schmitz. Tim."
- Schmitz: "First of all, I'd like to thank my parents and everyone who stood behind me all these years to get where

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I'm at today. I'd like to thank the Senate for putting this Amendment on my Bill. I can't sp..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking for our side of the aisle, we're very happy to see the trophy move over there. And speaking on behalf of Mr. Dunkin, who I'm certain is capable of speaking for himself, no one is happier in this chamber at this moment than Mr. Dunkin. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Michael Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, on that last Bill, is that Senate Bill or House Bill 2555, I tried to bail out my colleague, Mr. Schmitz, when it went to 118 and I pressed green and you called the vote and I meant to vote 'no'. If you could record my vote as a 'no', I would appreciate it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon, the Journal will reflect your intentions. Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To my good friend Lou Lang, speaking for this side of the aisle, I'm sure it won't be long 'til you get it back."

Speaker Lyons: "Naomi Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just wondering if, you know, some kind of a tow fee. If maybe Representative Dunkin should pay a fee for having it accepted over there, a transfer fee."

Speaker Lyons: "Danny Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Welcome to the club, Representative Schmitz and just for the record, I would let it be known that I think I'm the only one that got 100 'no'

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- votes and then passed the next week. And then Representative… and Representative Dunkin's the best. He's highly capable of getting that trophy back."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Schmitz, have you regained your composure and wish to address the chamber again."
- Schmitz: "I forgot to thank Representative Cross for giving me the opportunity to carry this Bill. And are you saying we're going to be here next week so I will have another shot at this?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ann Williams, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 2903. Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies of the House. This concurrence is sent over from the Senate simply adds some definitions to the Bill that provided for grants to be awarded to car-sharing organizations. Basically, just includes expanded definitions and criteria for the grants. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Eddy: "Representative, when this left the House, it did have some opposition. I mean, it had some 'no' votes. What... what changed in the Senate and did it remove any of the problems?"
- Williams: "I... the Bill had no actual opponent that had weighed in. So, the changes in the Senate were mostly at the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

request of the EPA and provided for more detailed definitions for what a 'car-sharing organization' is. Also, delineated in the language what the criteria are for award of the grants and provided that the grant amounts were not to exceed the estimated revenues left over the rebates were granted."

Eddy: "Okay."

Williams: "So, I don't think anything impacted really the substance of the Bill or the intent that we discussed originally."

Eddy: "Okay. I guess maybe opposition is a little strong, maybe some concerns of the IEPA. And this cleaned up any concerns that they had."

Williams: "Well, the EPA was neutral, but this is just... they preferred to have the more specific component not... instead of it in rule, they wanted to have it actually put in the Bill and we agreed."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Williams moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2903. 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? Danny Burke. Monique Davis, would you like to be recorded? Skip Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2903. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, on the Order of Concurrences on page 18 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2927. Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Body to... move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2927. The Senate made some technical changes to the Bill which passed unanimously previously in the House. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2927?' 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? Skip Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Bill 2927. This Bill, having received the House Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Osmond, on the bottom of page 18, on the Order of Concurrence, you have House Bill 3012."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Senate Amendment #1 amends the… retains the provisions of the original Bill and adds provisions regarding personal property of a horse owner left on the premises of state… of the stable or boarding facility. And I wish the Body to concur with this Amendment."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3012?' 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 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3012. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lilly, on the top of page 19, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3027. Representative Lilly, you have a concurrence, 3027. Just explain the Amendment, Representative."

Lilly: "Thank you. I wish to concur... Thank you. I wish to concur with House Bill, Senate 1 and 3. Excuse me. Senate Amendments 1 and 3."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger..."

Eddy: "Thank you..."

Speaker Lyons: "Eddy."

Eddy: "...Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, what does... what does the Senate Amendment do to your Bill?"

Lilly: "One second, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative."

Lilly: "I would like to take this out of the record at the moment."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take the..."

Lilly: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "...Bill out of the record. Ladies and Gentleman, on the Order of Concurrences, on page 19 of the Calendar, so I'd suggest you take a look at the concurrences on that page and on that, we have House Bill 3033. Representative Farnham. Representative Keith Farnham."

Farnham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. First of all, I... I wish to make a Motion to concur on Senate Amendment #1 and I want to assure the Members of the House that this is not a cannabis Bill. The Senate Amendment 1 is a gut and replace. It authorizes the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority to assist local governmental entities in applying for and securing grants for gang intervention and gang preventions from the Department of Justice. The Authority can help train local government entities in order to help them procure funding from the Federal Government. I'd like an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3033?' 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 Colvin, Kosel. Elaine Nekritz. Elaine Nekritz, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3033. This Bill, having

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ann Williams, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3034. Representative Williams."

- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is simply a... some technical changes made at the request of the roofers to our agreed Bill dealing with storm chasers, the entities that follow and rip off consumers after a storm trying to get them to engage in contracts that they otherwise would not. So, just ask for your support. It's, again, a technical change."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3034?' 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 Biss, Rita, back row. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there's 116 members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3034. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Arroyo, you have House Bill 3090 on the middle of page 19 on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Luis Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur. Senate Amendment 1, it makes... to House Bill 3090 makes a minor change to state that the receptacle may

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

collect unused medication... medication in addition to prescription drugs. I urge an 'aye' vote."

"Is Speaker Lyons: there any discussion? Seeing Representative Arroyo moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3090. 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 Brown, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3090. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jehan Gordon, you have, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 3115. Representative Jehan Gordon."

Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. This Amendment further clarifies that textbooks are secular and requires the state board to publish a list of authorized textbooks be purchased. It also adds that ISBE is to adopt the rules to ensure that the religious neutrality of these books through the block grant program and monitor the authorized textbooks which are... which go to nonpublic schools. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 as well as Senate Amendment 2 which is merely a technical Amendment. It simply requires a funding formula to be based on the total appropriation divided by enrollment as opposed to the way that it was in the original legislation which was enrollment data by the total

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

appropriation. And I'd like to ask the Body to... I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 and I'm open for any questions at this point."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. The Chair... Seeing no discussion, Representative Gordon moves for the adoption... for the concurrence on Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 3115. 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's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 3115. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sandy Pihos, you have House Bill 3131 on the Order of Concurrence. Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "I actually move to nonconcur on that Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves to nonconcur to Amendment #4 to House Bill 31... Representative Franks."

Franks: "Parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry."

Franks: "On a Motion to nonconcur, does that have to go through Rules first before coming straight to the floor?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk. I've been advised, Representative, that nonconcurrences can come straight to the floor. Representative Franks, I've been advised that nonconcurrences can come straight to the floor."

Franks: "Thank you."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos, did you wish to add something to this discussion to nonconcur?"

Pihos: "No. The Bill changed to a degree that it diluted the Bill in a way that I think we're better off starting with the Bill again. So, that's why I'm moving to nonconcur."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is... Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "A point of... a point of clarification as to what we're voting on. I think what we're doing is receding from any action that the Senate took on this Amendment and we're going to send it back. They would have to... they would have to take action on this. Is that correct? We're receding from their action. We're nonconcurring with their action. It would have to go back though? So, the Senate would have to recede."

Speaker Lyons: "That would be their... that would have... that would be their call in their chamber, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "They would have to..."

Eddy: "Is this a recorded or a voice vote? I think it's a voice vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Roger, I was told we can do this by voice vote and it's final action in this chamber."

Eddy: "Okay. And then... then it goes... they would have to recede."

Speaker Lyons: "Not final action. Wait a minute. We can do this by a voice vote."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "And then... then the next step is they would have to recede from there. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves to nonconcur with Amendment #...

Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3131. All those in favor of her Motion signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does not concur with Amendment #... Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3131. On the Order of Concurrences, Representative Brandon Phelps, you have House Bill 3237. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3237. We worked this out in the Senate and removed the opposition to the Bill. We took away the Class IV Felony and made Class A Misdemeanors across the board. I honor this Bill and on behalf of Jim Riemer, Sr., when he was at the Capital Development Board, executive director. And I ask for its passage."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I want to thank Representative Phelps for working on the Bill. He did discuss this when the Bill moved out of the chamber. I just want to point out that while some groups have now removed opposition that the underlying Bill still deals with the Prevailing Wage Act and it does provide for an increased penalty and I want to make sure we get on the record what the penalty is after the Senate... after the Senate change."

Phelps: "Representative Eddy, it's Class A across the board."

Eddy: "Okay. So, there's no enhancement?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Phelps: "No. Actually, there was... we... we... there was a B and there was an A, but we just went ahead and did A across the board."
- Eddy: "Okay. And at this point, I think the Associated General Contractors and the State Chamber of Commerce are neutral.

 Maybe NFIB are... is the only remaining opposition."
- Phelps: "I... they didn't... no one slipped it in the Senate for opposition, right, Representative Eddy, but also the AGC is neutral as well. And we actually added some of their language in the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Mulligan: "Representative, on our analysis there's parts of this Bill that says they can go to jail. You can go to jail if you don't go along with the Prevailing Wage Act. I mean, I can see you being fined, but I can't necessarily see you being put in jail."
- Phelps: "Well, Representative Mulligan, I believe you were gone the last time we had this Bill and glad to have you back, but yes, it was a Class IV. We thought that was too... too aggressive, too tough, so we brought it down to Class A, but Prevailing Wage, as you know, is already the law. This is just enforcing the law."

Mulligan: "All right. So, they're just fined?"

Phelps: "Well, if... there was no opposition in the Senate. We went over there and worked it out like I told Representative Sullivan and Representative Eddy that I

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

would do. And like I said, we even put language that the contractors wanted in this Bill."

Mulligan: "You still haven't answered me. Can they go to jail or not?"

Phelps: "Well, it's up to the judge on each case, but a Class A, if I'm not mistaken, is a year or less."

Mulligan: "Well, unless they're stealing them on pur... money personally, I think that's a little stiff penalty, quite frankly. I can see a fine, but I don't see making someone go to jail over this."

Phelps: "Well, there's a fine as well. And like I said, we're just trying to enforce the law. This happens occasionally and it's mostly with out of state contractors that come in, Representative Mulligan and say they're paying prevailing wage but they actually don't and they're stealing from Illinois workers."

Mulligan: "I don't know about that. I think they're also creating jobs and I think that's a stiff penalty."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, what happens to one of these contractors if they are found guilty? Are they allowed to participate in public works projects after this finding of guilty?"

Phelps: "Well, there could be debarment, Representative."

Durkin: "Could or they are barred?"

Phelps: "There will be."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Durkin: "And so they will be, for one violation for... it would be a bookkeeping error, perhaps they just... All right. They... people run businesses. Sometimes there are priorities and sometimes the filings that they need to do with different regulatory agencies, they can't catch up with them which would be a per se violation under this Prevailing Wage Act. If they are found guilty, then they are going to be basically given... I wouldn't say the death penalty, but they are going to have four years barred from doing any public works project. That's correct?"
- Phelps: "Representative, and as I said earlier when I did the first time of this Bill, this is only for willful acts. If there's a mistake in the paperwork and the bookwork, we do not... we would not be in that."
- Durkin: "Well, willful act for me, if my business is struggling and I have a priorities... other priorities and I'm going to get... when I take the position, I'll get to filing these documents at some point later, that is a willful act. If I have other issues that are more important for the business to me, I think, that that goes too far. Stating that... for that one violation, then they would be prohibited from participating in any public works projects I think is excessive and I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I'd like to commend the Sponsor. This is not a Bill that I voted for when it left the chamber, but in speaking with the Sponsor in the Senate and the House, they made a commitment to change the very egregious penalties from a felony down back to a

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

misdemeanor. There's not a lot of great things in the Bill, but when someone makes a commitment like that, you have to follow through with your honor. And so, on behalf of Jim Riemer, Sr., I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Debbie Mell."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last time this Bill was brought here I spoke in opposition. I still am in opposition to this Bill and that's because there is a whole industry and that's the landscaping industry and also the, you know, everything from people who plant trees to roll out sod, to do construction work, there is not a set prevailing wage for this whole industry. And so, if you are going to perhaps send them to jail when it's not set in statute what they're supposed to be even following, I mean, I don't even know how you can do something like that when on one project it's one, on another project it's another. And I just want to make very clear that I am not against the Prevailing Wage Act. I think it should be set everywhere. It should be strictly enforced, but you know, if you have a whole industry that doesn't really know what it should be doing and is asking for clarification, I don't know why we should be imposing such fines and penalties. So, I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, just for clarification, is the NFIB is for or against or..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Phelps: "Representative Watson, the way I understand it, no one slipped it in opposition in the Senate. They have not talked to me. They have not reached out to me. What we did was made the changes for all the contractors and we even added language that they wanted in this Bill."

Watson: "Okay. Just... and for clarification on all sides, I guess, it's my understanding that they didn't slip because you didn't go to committee. That if..."

Phelps: "Okay. Maybe they did, Representative Watson..."

Watson: "All right."

Phelps: "...'cause I wasn't over there so."

Watson: "And... and that they are still opposed."

Phelps: "Okay. They might be."

Watson: "That's... that's our understanding."

Phelps: "Okav."

Watson: "Thanks, Brandon."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "I like to yield my time to Representative Mulligan, yes, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to go back to a comment that Representative Phelps made on his Bill which I guess he presumes that we should all be just overjoyed that he's putting this Bill out there. He referred to the fact that I wasn't here earlier in the General Assembly. I was home ill because I had a very bad reaction to a shot, but I've been here a heck of a lot longer than Representative Phelps has, almost 20 years, so I think that's an insult to the way he put it. I'm sure we're all

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

very tired and he's very proprietary about getting his Bill passed, but I think he could have a little more courtesy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Representative Phelps, as I recall, this Bill when it...
the way you had passed it through the House was to increase
the penalty from a Class A... All right. I remember when we
debated it we couldn't decide if it was Class A, Class B,
but whatever, it was a misdemeanor to a felony. And is the
only change to this Bill that occurred in the Senate that
now you've taken that change off and put it back to where
it was previously?"

Phelps: "No, Representative. We actually put on page 2 line 1 we inserted some language that the contractors wanted. We moved a... replaced the seven days that's... the three days back to seven and took the Class IV off and made Class A across the board."

Tracy: "I'm going... Okay. You said page..."

Phelps: "I can read it to you, Representative. Page 2 line 1,

'A certified payroll must be filed for only those calendar

months during which construction on a public works project
has occurred.'"

Tracy: "Thank you."

Phelps: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Reboletti: "Representative, I know that you've reduced from a felony down to a misdemeanor and I appreciate that part.

 What if the person who was charged with a Class A Misdemeanor receives supervision on the case. Will they still then lose their opportunity for state contracting?"
- Phelps: "Regardless, it would still be debarment, Representative."
- Reboletti: "Would you be... and I know it's obviously the last day of Session, but I would suggest to you, Representative, that maybe if you only receive supervision or if it was your first offense, that maybe you might give that person another opportunity. I think this may be a little egregious with respect to that. Would you consider something like that?"
- Phelps: "I would work on a trailer Bill with you, but being the last day, I'd like to go ahead and get this passed. But I'd be willing to sponsor a trailer Bill with you on it, yes."
- Reboletti: "If... with that, I think that might alleviate some of the concerns over here that, if supervision was the disposition, that might be something that'd be more amenable to some of the other Members. So, thank you very much."

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Yeah. Let me say to Representative Mulligan, by no means did I mean... mean any disrespect whatsoever. We had a long debate the last time. That's the only thing I said. I have all the respect in the world for Representative Mulligan and everybody on this side of the aisle, as well

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

as that side of the aisle and I think you know that. I appreciate everybody working on this. And like I said, we just tried to make this Bill a lot better. So, I just urge an 'aye' vote."

"Representative Phelps moves that the Senate... Speaker Lyons: House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3237. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Fortner, Pritchard, Stephens. Mr. Clerk... Ron Stephens. Take the record. On this, there are 74 Members voting 'yes', 42 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3237. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative André Thapedi, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir? Well, it is... André, your light was on. Do you wish to seek recognition? The Gentleman does not seek to be recognized. Representative Emily McAsey, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3300, on page 19 of the Calendar. Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3300. This is something that I worked with a family in Will County to accomplish so that families who have lost a loved one in a traffic fatality have an opportunity to address the court through a victim impact statement. What the Senate did was to change by adding an entirely new Section to the Crime Victim Witnesses Act whereas we just had to change the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

definition of 'victim of violent crime'. So, I would ask for the Body's support to accomplish this very important goal."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3300?' 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 Kay Hatcher, like to be recorded? Kay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3300. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3371. Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Environmental Protection Agency. Language in the Bill last year was just meant to be an example instead became the whole Bill. So, for the agency to propose rules for TACO tiered excavation, they won't have the ability unless we follow their lead and give them the flexibility that this Bill will now offer. I'm happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support for this Environmental Protection Agency initiative."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3371?'

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

This is final action. All those in favor signify by saying... 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 Phelps, Representative Riley, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3371. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Brandon Phelps. For what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Phelps: "Point of personal privilege, please, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Brandon."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to have an announcement. I have Senator Jones with me on the floor and on behalf of myself, Representative Bradley, Bost, Reitz, Cavaletto and Reis, Senators Luechtefeld, Jones and Forby, I would like to thank each and every one of the Members that have gone above and beyond helping out the flood victims of Southern Illinois. As you know, all of us Legislators in Southern Illinois are hosting a benefit auction and fundraiser Saturday night, June 4, 5:30 p.m. at the Black Diamond Harley Davidson office warehouse in Marion, Illinois. I also want to take the time to thank Representative Jim Sacia for agreeing to come down and being our auctioneer. Let's give him a hand. Any help you can give us, I'm still around. And just thank you and God bless you."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Lyons: "Senator John Jones, welcome home to the House chamber. Good to see you, Senator. Brandon, thank you for that... for that announcement. Representative Tom Morrison, you have House Bill, on the Order of the Concurrences, on the bottom of page 19, House Bill 3384. Out of the record. Representative Morrison. Out of the record. Representative LaShawn Ford, point of personal privilege."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just hoping that Representative Sacia could show us what he plans to do when he goes down. He should rehearse right now for a moment as the auctioneer. Sacia, Representative Sacia. It's my request that you practice now."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia, you want to give them a little taste of what's going to go on down in southern Illinois?"
- Sacia: "No. I'd be happy to. Going to sell the rest of this box of candy now. Whoever is the successful bidder has to buy it. Start me out. (Auctioneer call). Bingo. Sold it to Representative Nekritz, 105 bucks."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Sacia, for that sampling, appreciate it. I hope we didn't traumatize the students that went through the chamber, while we were doing that, too much. Representative David Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Harris, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a verbatim transcript of that..."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal Room will get right on that for you, Representative. On the Order of Concurrences, on page

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

20 of the Calendar, Representative Williams, you have House Bill 3390. Representative Ann Williams."

Williams: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This just slightly narrows the Bill that we passed providing that persons that point a firearm at first responders it is making it a nonprobational offense. The Bill simply provides that the gun must be aimed at said person and eliminates a few of the categories of first responders. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote or support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any questions? Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3390?' 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... Representative Davis, Flowers, Verschoore. Monique Davis, Jefferson, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3390. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Pat Verschoore, on the top of page 20, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3414. Representative Pat Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the Main Street Act and all this does when we passed it, the Lieutenant Governor was the chair of that council. And what this concur… or this Amendment does is makes the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Governor, after the effective date, is the amendatory Act becomes the Act the Governor will be the chair and the Lieutenant Governor will be a designee. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

"You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Speaker Lyons: there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3414?' 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? Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Bill, having House Bill 3414. This received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Tom Holbrook, you have House Bill 3425 on the Order of Concurrence."

Holbrook: "Thank..."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Tom Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3425. It adds the City of O'Fallon to the medical district and allows appointments of members to that board. At the request of that mayor and in support of the Legislator in this Chamber that represents that area, I'll support it."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, you mentioned the Senate Amendment and this only applies to the Mid-America Medical District Act."

Holbrook: "Correct."

Eddy: "But it expands the boundaries of that to include some boundaries of the City of O'Fallon?"

Holbrook: "Yes."

Eddy: "Then it adds three members to the Commission."

Holbrook: "Yes."

Eddy: "But it allows the mayor of the City of O'Fallon to make those appointments. Is that correct?"

Holbrook: "Yes."

Eddy: "And then, I think further, the appointments have to be approved by the City of O'Fallon Corporate Authority?"

Holbrook: "Yes."

Eddy: "Now, is there any opposition to this?"

Holbrook: "I know of no opposition."

Eddy: "Okay. When it... when it left the House, there seemed to be a number of 'no' votes and you seemed to have removed the opposition... opposition in the Senate. What..."

Holbrook: "I believe most of the opposition was all medical districts have eminent domain. I took that out of this one originally and I don't think people realized that when they voted on it. I don't know why they would vote against it, quite honestly."

Eddy: "Okay. So, the thought that there might be eminent domain in it is probably responsible and I'm glad you said that.

There is no eminent domain in this Bill..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Holbrook: "No."

Eddy: "...when it went over..."

Holbrook: "No."

Eddy: "...and there still obviously isn't. It was unanimously approved in the Senate."

Holbrook: "Correct. I know of no opposition to this Bill."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

Stephens: "This Bill is good for St. Clair County. It's good for O'Fallon, the City of Belleville, Southwestern Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3425?' 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? Barickman, Bellock, Thapedi. Patti Bellock. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 81 Members voting 'yes', 35 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3425. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapa LaVia, you have House Bill 3440, on the Order of Concurrences."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. And what it does it makes it a little bit fle... more flexible

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

for the schools to accommodate children that need... need service animals. And I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Are there any... is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440?' 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 Poe. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Bradley, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3635. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would simply say that the long-term care provider assessment cannot be passed on to residents in nursing homes. It came back with a... it was a change in the rules in the appeal process. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall House... shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3635?' 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, Representative Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3635. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor earlier, someone voted my switch. On House Bill 2555, Representative Schmitz, I believe, was the Sponsor. I was recorded as a 'yes'. And as everyone who knows me knows, I should have been a 'no'. I would like the record to reflect that I would have been negative vote #102... 3, excuse me, 103. I should be #103. Representative Cross, I believe, is seeking recognition."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Stephens, on your request, the Journal will reflect your intentions. Leader Tom Cross."
- Cross: "Well, I was not on the floor either and I... someone made a mistake on my switch. I'd like to be recorded 'no' as well on that Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cross, with all due respect, that's a unique spin on Leadership, my dear friend. Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My seatmate voted my switch on that and I'd like to be recorded as a 'no' also."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect yours and Leader Cross's request. Representative Dan Brady."
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I... I, too, voted 'yes' by mistake on Representative Schmitz's Bill, but I'm starting to feel so sorry for him that I thought I would

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

take this container of homemade chocolate chip cookies that my wife made this morning and give them to all of you except Representative Tim Schmitz for that... for that crumby Bill. These cookies will be in back and first come, first serve. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Brady. Representative Jerry Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like you to know that the record was right and I was paying attention and I did vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Well, Representative Schmitz, do you have something to say for yourself, Sir?"
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I got a copy of the Roll Call in front of me and I, too, inadvertently hit my switch. I voted 'yes'. If I could have the record reflect that I intended to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will so reflect. Representative Schmitz, you're not the first person to do that. I remember Steve Davis voting against his own Bill, also, when he took the trophy. So, Steve, if you're in the sound of my voice, you've got good company. Thank you, Representative Schmitz. On the Order of Concurrences, Representative Dave Winters, you have House Joint Resolution 27. Representative Winters."
- Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Joint Resolution 27 which is a cleanup on the Rock River Scenic Trail. Be happy to answer any questions."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Winters moves that the House...
the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint
Resolution 27. 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 May, you'd
like to be recorded? Karen May. Mr. Clerk, take the record.
And on this Motion, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0
voting 'no'. And Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 27
is adopted. The House does concur with the Amendment and
the House... the Motion is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, on
the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative
Barbara Flynn Currie, on page 11 is Senate Bill 2172.
What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2172, the Bill was read for a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted to the Bill. No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2172, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, and Members of the House. We began discussing this measure earlier. It would extend the lapse period spending opportunity from August 31 of this year to December 31 of this year. All bills would have to be in at the Comptroller's Office by the 31 of August, but this is an effort to try to make sure we can pay a few more of our bills than we would be able to do

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

were we to keep the lapse period at August 31. We did the same thing last year. And I hope I'll have your support to make it possible to pay more of our vendors who today are acting more like our bankers than people who provide us services. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you. Would the Majority Leader yield for a question?"

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

Eddy: "Leader Currie, I just have one question about procedure and I know you have someone there I... not that you need the assistant, just in case this question is something that's a little more technical, but if something is allocated or appropriated in one fiscal year and... does it have to be vouchered during that fiscal year or can the voucher take place during the lapse period?"

Currie: "You can voucher in the lapse period."

Eddy: "Okay. So, an appropriation that is made in FY11 and the voucher isn't sent to the Comptroller by June 30, it can still be paid... the voucher... during that lapse period and paid?"

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "And what we're trying to do is use... permit the lapsed appropriation to be paid until December 31."

Eddy: "Okay. I appreciate that. As I stated earlier, this is obviously something that helps us in a difficult fiscal

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

time with cash flow issues and probably most importantly because three months may not be enough for some of the backlog of bills. This would avoid the necessity for individuals to go to the Court of Claims, school districts or whomever. And last year when we did this, in many cases school districts received money for early childhood education, mandated categoricals including transportation in November or December, but at least the appropriation was made and the money was sent. I strong... I strongly support this during these difficult times so that those payments can be made again."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2172 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 3 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Readings on page 11 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 2293. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2293, 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 and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Naomi Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2293 creates tax checkoffs for two different programs. One of them is the Illinois State Crime Stoppers Association and the other is... excuse me, just a second. These... these would be safe... would be tax checkoff programs for the After-School Rescue Fund. I'm sorry. I was just drawing a blank on that. So, it's Crime Stoppers Fund and the After-School Rescue Fund. And I urge an 'aye' vote, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2293 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mathias, Representative Smith. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Barickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"
- Barickman: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. My vote on Senate Bill 2... 540 was intended to be a 'no'. And I'd ask that the record reflect that."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your intentions, Representative. Mr. Clerk, on page 11 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative Sara

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz has Senate Bill 2255. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sara Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2255 is actually a culmination of a lot of negotiation that's gone on between the nurses, the APN, the Illinois State Medical Society. It's an agreement. And I'd be glad to answer any guestions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, you mentioned that this was an agreed Bill and really the intent of this is to allow for some expansion of prescriptive authority for APNs to prescribe Schedule II oral medications. Is that the underlying Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "That's correct."

Eddy: "Okay. And the reason that this is necessary as these oral medications are more effective."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Hospital Association have any issues with this?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz: "They do not."

Eddy: "They're neutral."

Feigenholtz: "All... everyone was at the table playing nice."

Eddy: "That's nice. So, it's a totally agreed Bill?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes. The proponents are the Illinois Nurses
Association, the Illinois Society for Advanced Practice
Nursing, the Med Society, the Hospital Association and the
Nurse Anesthetists. There are no opponents."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ed Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a potential conflict,

I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ron Stephens."

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

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

Stephens: "Will the... will this practitioner have a DEA number?"

Feigenholtz: "Excuse me. I can't hear... I can't hear him."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please, there is a discussion going on the floor. Representative Feigenholtz is having a hard time hearing the questions. Please bring the noise level down. Shhh. Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you. Will the practitioner have a... a requirement of having a DEA number, a Drug Enforcement Agency number?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I don't know the answer to that, but I will find out."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could take the Bill out of the record because without a DEA number that's the way

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- pharmacists keep track of Schedule II drugs. And I think it's a clarification worthy of a few moments delay."
- Feigenholtz: "Okay. I will take the Bill out of the record and be back with an answer shortly."
- Speaker Lyons: "Fine, Representative. We'll get back to you.

 Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Hou... Senate Bill 2255?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2255 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the question that was posed just before we took a little break is yes. They have a DEA number and have had it for their prescriptive powers that they've had up until now."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I appreciate the courtesy extended by the Lady and I rise in support of the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2255 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Representative Eddy. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill... on this Bill, there's 114 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Naomi Jakobsson, for what purpose do you seek recognition...?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Naomi."

Jakobsson: "After the Capitol Capers show, there were... when cleaning up... we found a white jacket and a pair of reading glasses. So, if anybody has been missing these things, I think the white jacket is a women's... a woman's jacket and maybe the reading glasses also. But please listen, if you are missing reading glasses or a white jacket, they're in... at the secretary of Patti Bellock, Representative Patti Bellock."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Speaking of missing items, as you know, I inquired of the Chair some weeks ago about that Grecian Formula 44 that I was missing. Have you or any of your staff seen that?"

Speaker Lyons: "We're still looking, Representative. We'll let you know when we find it. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on Senate Bill 2062?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2062, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Amendment #2 was tabled. Floor Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "If it would be okay, I'd like to adopt the Amendments and debate it, if appropriate, on Third."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman motions to adopt Amendment #3, discuss it on Third Reading. All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Amendment #4 offered by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Again, I'd ask for the adoption and debate it on Third."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2062, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you. This is the FutureGen Project. The additional piece, Amendment #4, was some language with regards to the IPA to create additional autonomy and independence there. Director Pruitt has been doing an exceptional job in keeping our power rates low. And as we look toward generation in trying to create additional projects in the State of Illinois, I think... we think it's going to be even more crucial for he to have the independence necessary to keep the rates low. That's what that would be regarding. The underlying Bill itself is FutureGen and it's dealing with the issue of liability of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

CO2. Free sequestration of CO2 would be the responsibility of the operator. We would create a state trust fund, which would be funded through both insurance policies to be taken by the operator as well as through an annual fee that would be deposited into the trust fund. The state would take liability at a point in the future, but the resources from the insurance and the trust fund would be used in case of a liability exposure and we would also leave open the possibility and be hopeful that we would recou... receive indemnification from the Federal Government as this is a federal project. This is a billion dollar project. This project is not in my district. It is for the better good of the state. And I rise in support and ask for an 'aye' vote to help us create a clean generation of energy in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 2062. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its passage 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? Durkin, Eddy, Kay Hatcher, Representative Mell, like to be recorded? Kay. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 98... 99 Members voting 'yes', 15 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1586."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Resolutions, is Senate Joint Resolution 30. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook on Senate Joint Resolution 30, Representative Karen Yarbrough. Record... out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Continuation of Rules Committee Report.

 Recommends be adopted is Senate Amendment #3, Motion to Concur, House Bill 2972."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Representative Yarbrough on Senate Joint Resolution 30."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 30 has to do with a... creating a foreclosure working group that's appointed by the State Housing Task Force to create recommendations to address the foreclosure and housing crisis in the state. I don't think you have tell anybody in this room about the problem that we have with foreclosures all across the state. I spent the majority of this Session focusing in on this issue. And so, this task force will meet and focus its attention on the impact of foreclosures, housing education outreach. And I'd be happy to answer any questions in reference to this Resolution."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. I want to urge individuals to support this. This has been a very... very difficult issue. One that there are some... some

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

differences that remain and I think, come a long way toward solving some of them but additional study is needed. I appreciate, again, the amount of time, energy and effort that's already taken place. And I wish you well as you work on this because there's still some divergent views on... just philosophically on who should be responsible, but it is a problem that needs to be solved. And hopefully over the summer, you'll be able to come up with some solutions that everyone can agree on. And again, I appreciate the approach you're taking. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I applaud the Sponsor. I saw today in the Chicago Tribune there was new figures on home sales for the first quarter in Chicago. And it showed that out of the home sales 29 percent of all home sales were foreclosed properties. And the difference between foreclosed properties those and that were nonforeclosed was a 41 percent difference in price. The foreclosed properties were 41 percent less than those that were nonforeclosed properties. Also, we saw that homeownership has fallen significantly. It's approaching 64 percent from a high of 69 percent and it's thought that it may go down as low as 62 percent, numbers that we haven't seen in almost 30 years. So, I certainly believe this is a worthwhile endeavor. I think it's in all of our interest to try to solve this crisis and to come up with comprehensive solution. And I think that the Lady has a very good idea."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Yarbrough to close."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thanks to those Representatives that spoke. We didn't create this problem, but we do, I think, have a responsibility to put forth some effort to try to help solve this problem. So, I do ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Lady moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 30. 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 Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Amendment, 115 Members voted 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And House Joint Resolution 30... Senate Joint Resolution 30 is hereby declared adopted. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, on the middle of page 8, Representative Marlow Colvin has 15... Senate Bill 1533. What's the status on the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1533, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Colvin, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Marlow Colvin on Floor Amendment #2."
- Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for the adoption of Senate Amend... excuse me... House Amendment... Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1533. It is a techni..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Marlow... Marlow, it's Floor Amendment #2."
- Colvin: "Excuse me. Floor Amendment #2, it is very technical in nature. It's a request from Nicor Energy dealing with... clarifying language dealing with cost recovery and allocation. The Bill is very technical in nature and

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

amounts to small grammatical changes. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1533, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Marlow Colvin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have for the House to Colvin: consider this evening Senate Bill 1533 that deals with natural gas production in the State of Illinois using clean coal technology. This, quite frankly, is not a new Bill. This is something we passed last year during Session... during the 96th General Assembly both out of the House and the Senate and which the Governor summarily vetoed. As a result of which having Veto proof Majorities in both the House and the Senate, we've decided to take a slightly different tact and deal with those who have specific objections to what this Bill, which has been commonly referred to around Springfield as the Leucadia Project. Simply put, this Bill is a clean energy project that will bring the largest private sector investment to Illinois in several decades. This project will provide ratepayers with relief from damaging natural gas price spikes by producing pipeline quality substitute natural gas

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

from Illinois coal and petroleum coke. There are a number of benefits to this Bill and I'd like to explain just a few them to you. Let me talk about the environmental benefits, first of all. This plant uses gasification which is a clean, green technology and which is the future of Illinois coal not only in Illinois but across this country. It is 99 percent cleaner than conventional coal and that's as a result of this burning no coal whatsoever. This is a chemical process that is performed at this proposed site. It captures the impurities on the front end as... as opposed to it emitting them as pollution on the backend which is typically how coal is used in this country. It captures and sequesters 85 percent of the CO² gases in the... which is the highest mandated level by law in the United States of America. And before anything is done in this plant, it is... it will remediate a 140 acre brownfield site on southeast side of Chicago which ironically, once this plant is built and operational, will provide a cleaner environment that exists on that location right now. It's substantial environment that Leucadia must make, they estimate in the neighborhood of 25 to 29 million dollars before any construction actually begins. Economic benefits speak for themselves. This is a privately financed project that generates over \$10 billion in economic output for Illinois. It'll create several thousand jobs and will create an estimated \$1.25 billion in added state and local tax revenues. There are no tax breaks or exemptions with regard to this privately financed plant. Once occupational, there will be 200 permanent engineer-grade, high paying

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

jobs with an additional 460 jobs at local and related businesses at the facility, an additional 165 mining jobs in southern Illinois with another 259 local jobs in those communities where the coal would be mined from here... right here in the State of Illinois. So, the benefit is both to the City of Chicago and northern Illinois as much as it is to southern Illinois and of course, the coal that would be used to use in this gasification process comes from southern Illinois which is an additional economic boost to struggling communities south of I-80. Again, there are no tax dollars used in this project and it brings \$3 billion in private investment to Illinois. One of the ... one of the specific objections that we heard from, from a number of corners, was dealing with consumer protection. And that's why we spent the most time working on those consumer protections and beefing up that standard in this Bill. Illinois taxpayers are not liable for the financing or developing or construction or operating the clean... Chicago clean energy facility, instead the developer bears all of the risk for the cost overruns and any delays that might occur. Ratepayers are guaranteed to save over \$100 million in natural gas bills and are projected to save more than \$1 billion over a 30-year life..."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Jim Sacia, Jim."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Sacia: "Representative Colvin, I want you to know that I stand in the strongest support of your Bill. I think many of us, no fair to say all of us, on this floor are very familiar with the term 'R and D', research and development. And I am amazed... literally amazed when I talk to specialists that tell me that we are sitting, in this great State of Illinois, on more BTUs of energy than the entire Middle East. We hear about all the oil of Saudi Arabia of Iraq. We fight to keep that and this very state is on top of more energy than anywhere in the world. That being said, there are the antigroups, there are some environmentalists who will say no such thing as clean coal. That's why we have research and development. Am I right, Representative? It is ab..."

Colvin: "You're absolutely right."

"It is absolutely imperative, not only for Illinois, Sacia: certainly not just for your district and what I appreciate so much about what you're doing, Representative Colvin, is this is a bipartisan effort. It's not about Democrats; it's not about Republicans; it's about jobs; it's about our future; it's about an opportunity not only for your district, Sir, as you recognize, not only for Illinois, it is a world's future. The only way we're ever going to get coal cleaner and cleaner and cleaner is by doing what your actually is creating more does research development. Ladies and Gentlemen, what an opportunity we have here today and I'm hoping Tenaska comes up yet today because these are opportunities to get this energy moving forward with 'R and D', research and development, putting

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Illinois in the literal spotlight, not only of the nation, but of the world. This state can make Saudi Arabia take a backseat. And I applaud you, Representative Colvin, and I thank you for bringing this legislation."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Al Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, part of the House Amendment that you just passed it... I know it dealt with saying that no utility can purchase a certain percentage of the annual output. Does that have something with trying to be sure that no utility had a monopoly? Can you sort of explain that... that Amendment?"

Colvin: "Well, not only that no utility has a monopoly, but all of these utility companies are very excited. And there are specific opt out provisions in this Bill for utilities that may not be able to handle as much gas as some of the larger service providers in the region where this gas would be and used. There are allocation provisions that protect those companies that distribute natural gas and also exempt any natural gas company that supplies natural gas in the service area of less than 100 thousand customers would be exempted from this legislation at all. So, they would not be part of that contracting opportunity that will help finance this plant."

Riley: "Also, could you explain the cap on increases?"

Colvin: "I'm glad you brought that up. With regard to caps, which is one of the specific objections that we dealt with in this Bill, Senate Bill 1533 with the House Amendment #1

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

establishes a rate cap for residential customers similar to the one that's in the current law for it... which is in the current proposal, the Tenaska Bill which provides that cost over those limits shall be spread evenly among other industry users who receive gas directly from the gas utility or have gas delivered to them by a gas utility. A five-year average is used to calculate the rate cap amount rather than a single year and this is language that was suggested by the Attorney General's Office. We had no objection and adopted it in the Bill."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Elaine Nekritz."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, it sounded to me like your presentation got a little cut off there, so I wanted to ask you about some of the environmental provisions in this. I think you've been working with the Sierra Club on this."

Colvin: "We have."

Nekritz: "And what is there... what was the result of that work?"

Colvin: "Well, the Sierra Club had asked for a number of small technical changes to this Bill many of which we agreed to.

I'm not going to stand here and say that they're in support of this Bill today. I think just their philosophical approach to using coal in any project in any which way prevents them from being supportive of these type of plants. But I will say, that we've gone out of our way and I don't think anyone in the Sierra Club who represents

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

their interest here in Springfield will say that they were shut out in any of these discussions or these debates."

Nekritz: "That is my understanding, Representative, so I appreciate that. I also wanted to pursue the allocation between the various gas companies 'cause I believe there's been some changes from the Bill that you ran before which... which I ga... I think gave one quarter to each of the major gas companies and that really didn't work for North Shore Gas. What's the change there?"

Colvin: "Yes, there has been. One moment, Representative."

Nekritz: "No... no problem. There's no timer running, so I think I'm good. There may have been on you, but there wasn't on the questioner."

Colvin: "I don't want to get cut off again. What we... how we changed it in the Bill is that all participating utilities will receive a proportion of allocations or substitute natural gas adjusted to address their accounting issues."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Colvin: "So, these companies that maintain these balance sheets, I guess, place a great emphasis on the amount of natural gas they have on hand. The language and how it was changed in the Bill deals with those proportional shares and how it's addressed on their balance sheet."

Nekritz: "And I think that that proportional issue was really important because, again, it's North Shore Gas has maybe, well, like 5... and my numbers are going to be wrong... but 5 percent of the customers and we're forced to buy 25 percent of the gas. That was a real problem. So, the proportional issue, I think, is... has been contained."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Colvin: "And total egregious why..."

Nekritz: "Right."

Colvin: "...that change was made."

Nekritz: "Yes. That sounds great. So, Representative, I know you've done a lot of work on this and I appreciate your good, you know... all the effort that you've put forward. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Colvin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Winters: "Representative, I rise to ask a few questions about the economics of this project. I certainly laud your goal to use a brownfield site and turn it into a productive asset for your community. I believe that you're also using something known as petcoke, some of the byproducts of petroleum fracturing that are a common byproduct that we really don't have much of a economic use for and turn that and coal into a synthetic natural gas. But my concern is, the gas that comes out and is being put into the pipelines Ι believe and I've been told, has a price of approximately eight dollars per thousand cubic compared to the market price, at this point, of three and a half dollars. When I looked out on the futures market, out... up to seven years, the highest price that we can find is a little bit over six dollars on futures contracts. I want this Body to understand that if we move this project forward we're going to be producing a synthetic natural gas at a cost of eight dollars when we can buy it for three and

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

a half dollars and even under the worst prospects, six dollars. So, it seems to me that there is a fairly hefty cost to our public of this project. Am I wrong in any of my facts?"

Colvin: "I wouldn't... Representative, the one thing that we've been told, for a century, is that there are people who can accurately predict the... both the supply and the cost of natural gas, petroleum. I think what is abundantly clear here and I would ask you to apply the simple science of supply and demand. What we're trying to do here is provide a safe, reliable, naturally... naturally borne source of energy... of energy, which, when added to the market, I'm hard-pressed to figure out how one would say that it would drive the price up. What I think we're doing here long-term is securing both the supply and an affordable supply of natural gas. Now, if it's... those indivi... the ratepayers that you're concerned about, once again, we've put in the type of price control along with running a number of scenarios that show that rate cap in this Bill will work for those residential ratepayers so will not will be subjected to those outgrowth in costs. We have, in a painstakingly way, dealt with this idea that there is this never-ending supply of natural gas, same way that, I guess, oil was considered in... over the last 50 years. I think what we're doing here is smart, clean, and works very, very well for the Illinois economy."

Winters: "Well, I would... I would, for future argument, you said an affordable supply of natural gas and we have an

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

affordable supply that is given to us from the process of fracking, of underground..."

Colvin: "And I..."

Winters: "...fracturing of..."

Colvin: "But I want..."

Winters: "...existing gas fields, making the gas available and they're able to bring that online for under five dollars. That's why the future prices out up to seven years is under six... or around six dollars at the highest and yet, I've been told that your cost is eight dollars. Fracking will give us the gas at about five, why are we subsidizing it? You also mentioned that you're..."

Colvin: "Well, first of all, wait..."

Winters: "...protecting the con... you're..."

Colvin: "...Representative Winters, we're not subsidizing this.

There is no state money, there is no tax dollars involved..."

Winters: "No, no."

Colvin: "...in this whatsoever."

Winters: "But the way I understand it ... "

Colvin: "The company Leucadia, they bear all the risks... they bear all the risk and they've written into this Bill there's guaranteed \$100 million in savings."

Winters: "Let... let me ask this question. You said that the residential customers are protected by the rate cut."

Colvin: "And I'm also... it is also my understanding that the prices that you're referring to are... are woefully artificially low and that..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Winters: "This is the market. I don't care... You cannot claim that it's artificially low if the market is offering gas at that price."

Colvin: "But it really doesn't matter because we still have the guarantee that they have to produce a \$100 million savings to the Illinois consumer."

Winters: "My understanding of the Bill is, that you're protecting the residential gas consumer, but you are not protecting the industrial and heavy commercial user. Therefore, it's like a balloon full of gas. And you're going to say half of this balloon that's going to the residential we're going to guarantee it only goes up by 2 percent. If that balloon expands, because it's a higher cost, there are more dollars in that balloon, you can't get the... you can't extract it from the residential consumer. The only person left to pay the additional cost of the higher gas price is commercial and industrial. It's a great way to drive industry out of Illinois."

Colvin: "Representative, I would also ask you to remember that those large users, industrial, commercial... industrial and commercial users of natural gas, would still be under that 2 percent increase that's written into this language."

Winters: "That's... that's not our..."

Colvin: "I think we can continue..."

Winters: "...that's not our understanding of it."

Colvin: "I think we can continue and I've been given some notes here by some of the folks who come up with these forecasts for a living and I guess we can say, to split hairs, both

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

of us can speculate on what the cost of natural gas will be..."

Winters: "Do you..."

Colvin: "...four or five, six years out. The estimates that we've..."

Winters: "Do you have a price of gas provided by this project?

Do you know what it will cost on an equivalent thousand cubic foot basis against..."

Colvin: "I think... I think what we're both here doing is and what I've heard a lot of, is speculation of what this cost is. The pin point of the eight dollars, I think it may be just a little disingenuous. I think what we've seen in the fluctuation of energy across, not only in Illinois, but across the globe has been something less than predictable. The estimate we've been working off of is by January... January 2017 is merely seven dollars, not eight, but seven."

Winters: "That's... that's your cost of production?"

Colvin: "No, the future price. The price on January..."

Winters: "Well, I don't care what the future price is."

Colvin: "...that's the price..."

Winters: "But your cost of production..."

Colvin: "...that's the price of the estimate..."

Winters: "...is above that, it doesn't make any difference."

Colvin: "I'm sorry?"

Winters: "If you cost of production is eight dollars and you can buy it on the market for 6.60 or 6.70, every cubic..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Colvin: "No, our price... the price in the actuary numbers that we have run, the price on 2017 feet, on that same day, when it was 6.92, will be seven dollars."

Winters: "About seven dollars, okay. And I..."

Colvin: "That's an estimate. That's just an estimate."

Winters: "Okay."

Colvin: "Just like your numbers."

Winters: "Seven dollars versus eight dollars, the market value today is three and a half, the highest price is about six and a half dollars on the futures market."

Colvin: "But then... but what makes the difference, what makes this work is that \$150 million fund which is replenishable on an annual basis to hold even the largest users at no more than a 2 percent increase in cost."

Winters: "And where does the \$150 million come from?"

Colvin: "It comes from the private company Leucadia."

Winters: "Okay."

Colvin: "And to the extent that they deplete it... and to the extent that they deplete it, it must be replenished. Over the life of the contracts, it's over \$1.5 billion of private investments that will guarantee there'd be no rate increases beyond 2 percent."

Winters: "Okay."

Colvin: "So, Representative, respectfully, all this speculation I don't think is serving anybody here except maybe confusing a little folks, probably even you and me. But what's real, what I ask you to consider, is what's written in the law. There is no law or guarantee that says that gas will sell for eight dollars at this plant on 2017. There's

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

no guarantee that it'll be four dollars or five dollars or six dollars and since you... as you stand here and speculate. But what we do have here is a Bill that's written into the law of how we shield residential customers from rate increases and how we protect big business in Illinois that they will absorb no more than 2 percent of the cost and that in the last fact is that we are growing a homegrown source of energy and creating thousands of jobs and expanding tax base all while we do this."

Winters: "And Representative, I do appreciate what you're trying to accomplish. I do appreciate that the \$150 million is an investment by the company. I hope that your scenario is correct. I'm simply trying to warn the Body we may find out that this is not an economic project. From the numbers that I was given, it doesn't appear to be and there's no way to shield the public even with the rate cap, it's not an economic going concern if their cost..."

Colvin: "That's exactly what it does, Representative."

Winters: "Well..."

Colvin: "That's exactly what it does."

Winters: "I... I hope... I hope the project works. I don't believe it will. I reluctantly will vote against it, but I appreciate your efforts."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I commend the Sponsor on the work he's done on this. We need coal gasification pro... projects in Illinois. We need to find a way to put people to work, to burn our energy, our coal and produce our energy in Illinois. I said before during a

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

number of the other Bills, we have the… we have the ability in Illinois to control our own destiny, did not use less natural gas from… from others countries, from other places, use less energy from other parts of the world. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Randy Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Representative, I supported your Bill the last time around and I applauded the work that you were doing to it in using the brownfield and getting jobs and using, as the previous speaker has talked about, stuff that we wouldn't normally be using. But now, I was informed that with your Amendment you gained a new opponent. Would that be a true statement?"

Colvin: "Who it..."

Ramey: "What... as the manufacturers."

Colvin: "And you... what specifically are you... what part of it?"

Ramey: "Well, the question is, they weren't an opponent before, but now they are because of the Amendment. Can you tell me why that Amendment was added?"

Colvin: "Representative, it's... which Amendment are you talking about, Representative?"

Ramey: "Well, your second Amendment, I would assume. I've been...

I was just told that you added... with that Amendment, you added them into the Bill as to cover some costs or they would have to pay higher rates and that's why they became an opponent to your Bill, before they weren't."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Colvin: "Once again, I'm fearful for an outright speculation as to why they would be specifically an opponent to the Bill. The analysis, of which I'm working off of, does not reflect that. But if you tell me that they're opposed to it, I guess I'd be more interested to hear from you what specifically brought their opposition."

Ramey: "Well..."

Colvin: "I mean, in the Bill...

Ramey: "...they were incorporated..."

Colvin: "...as I... as I discussed with the previous..."

Ramey: "...'cause they were incorporated as being users and so they're going to be..."

Colvin: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

Ramey: "They were incorporated in your Bill as being users."

Colvin: "But I think they were incorporated in the Bill as being users before. And again, as much as I explained to the previous speaker, they are part of that 2 percent... they will be shielded from any real spikes in energy and they would be shielded by that 2 percent cap to any increase in their... in their rate."

Ramey: "But are they going to pay a rate that's already higher?"

Colvin: "Well, once again, and my advice to the last speaker is that we be careful about speculating... a wild speculation here today what gas prices are going to be 3, 5, 10 years from now."

Ramey: "Well, Representative, what I'm getting at is that your past Bill didn't incorporate them. That's why I was very supportive of it. And now, I have a little concern that

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

they're going to be charged the higher rates. We just increased taxes on business. Now, you're going to increase their rates for your gas pro... natural gas product. We have another Bill that's going to come up that's, again, going to hit business on... on the Tenaska Bill on... up with their charges. Do you feel that we're now trying to create jobs and we're going to be forcing other businesses and jobs out of the state?"

Colvin: "I think, as it relates to protecting large consumers of natural gas, our Bill did a pretty good job in the first integration and I think it does a better job in this Bill. Again, Leucadia is putting up 150 million of their own dollars, private investment, to guard against any real spikes in the cost of gas. I would also remind you of the 2 percent cap that they would be subject to, all consumers and users of natural gas. We have, in a very painstaking way, tried to shield business of while at the same time providing an abundant source of natural gas while creating thousands of jobs, putting people to work both in Chicago and in southern Illinois where this coal is produced, and expanding the tax base of both regions. I think what we've done here is a very good attempt to keep everybody whole. And once again, I... and I would hope that... that all of us would understand that the speculation of natural gas prices going out 5, 10 years serves no purpose. What we can accurately predict is how those large consumers will be treated under this legislation. I think I've exhaustive in that attempt and would ask that you would also see it that way."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Ramey: "Well, I have one last question then for you, Representative. And having been in business myself and knowing that if you buy in bulk, you usually have a lower price, but here we've seen if they're buying in bulk, they're large users, they're going to be paying a higher rate and I find that a little odd, wouldn't you? Make that a question."

Colvin: "Representative, previously in the Bill they were not addressed with that cap."

Ramey: "Cor... well, they..."

Colvin: "In this version of the Bill, they will be able to be protected by the \$150 million account."

Ramey: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May."

May: "Thank you very much. To the Sponsor. I very much appreciate what you're trying to do as far as use a contaminated brownfield site for... for good manufacturing, but I... I do have some questions for you. Does this project have an air permit from our EPA or the U.S. EPA?"

Colvin: "That's a very good question. And again, part of the specific objection of the Bill that we first passed, we had kind of a run-in with the ELPC. Through our negotiations with them, they have since removed their objection. They have agreed with Leucadia in principle that they will work on those permits together. That going forward, they would have to significant input on those air and water permits with regard to what the emissions claims that are in this Bill as well as the water usage which is in this Bill. So, with respect to those air and water permits, it is my

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

understanding that they are very expensive and to apply for them before there's a project that's real and that they can go out and finance and begin, clean up that brownfield site. It's tantamount to getting license plates before you buy the car. So, I think, once, that process starts in earnest that those folks who are most concerned about those permits, will be working with them hand in hand with regard to those air and water permits. This is, and I should point out to you, whenever an energy plant like this, whether it's gasification or something else, this is the standard operating procedure. They're not asking for nor are they receiving from any government any special circumstance or consideration. That when we're building energy plants in the United States of America, that Leucadia will be treated differently or subject to any special rules consideration, so to take exception to the permitting in that process is take exception to what the EPA and IEPA already knew."

May: "But I understand we're faced and going to be asked perhaps on another project, a power holding project which is also synthetic national... natural gas and they already have their air permit?"

Colvin: "Representative, the thing that I would ask you to consider is that these are two different plants, two different regions, producing two different products using two different contract structures and two different lengths of contract structures. Now, I am probably the least sophisticated person to ask you why they are further along in their permitting process. But as it relates to following

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the law, the law, both Federal and State, Leucadia is right where they need to be."

May: "Thank... thank you for that. My concern is we're faced with, not only this project and others, is that we don't have one uniform standard. We haven't, as a policymaking Body, said what should the standard be for synthetic natural gas or any of the gasification processes. This is a slightly different deal or arrangement than... than power holdings. And I just don't think that it's wise to have each Bill, each project, be slightly different as far as the rate cap or consumer protections and we are being asked to decide project by project by project instead of taking the time to figure out what sort of rate caps do we want, not only for residential but for our larger consumers, what sort of... well, just all sorts of things and what the procedures should be when we get our permits and all. That... that is... that is troubling to me as we are faced with deciding one, two or three different projects. I believe a more prudent course would be to... to try to get some sort of an overarching policy rather than one... one project at a time."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin."

Colvin: "Representative, I appreciate your comments and I will say that I agree with you, but right now, right here, today on May 31, 2011, we are following the law, both Federal and State Law. There is in... in and I guess the implication that somehow there's some special consideration with air permitting and what have you, is not the case here. I also heard you in your response just now talk about rate caps

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

which one of the… another reason's the way we drew specific objection. During our exhaustive conversations over the last three months, we have dealt with those concerns. My only con… and I bring that back up so that… that you and others understand that these are objections that we dealt with that put us in the position to call this Bill today. So, I would just ask you to be mindful of that notion and those guaranteed savings are not speculative. They are written into the Bill. These are real dollars put up by private investors to guarantee rate savings and shield consumers against exhaustive increases in natural gas prices."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The previous speaker from Highland Park and I agree except that I am for this Bill and I would urge an 'aye' vote. But last year at this time when we were discussing this Bill, we talked about the fact that there are no standards and that you have to piecemeal these projects in and these Bills passed and went to the Governor and the Governor vetoed them. Instead of trying to override the Veto, we tried to make standards and we tried to make these Bills better. And so, the Sponsor comes to you with a very good Bill to take the concerns of the Governor and the Attorney General and CUB and so forth, and try and get a project built for his area. It would be nice to be standards, but there's not so we have to do it this way. But when the Governor asks for something and a Sponsor goes... does... goes ahead and does it, you would hope that these would pass. So, at some point,

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have to see what we're going to do in regard to energy policy, but down the line when we start having some of our coal-fire plants come offline and we don't have any base load, I don't know what we're going to do. So, we have to start now. We have to support a Member who is doing something for his district, we have to support southern Illinois through jobs using an energy source that we have an abundance of. Now is the time. It's the last day. We need to start to do something in regard to these projects. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin to close."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me say to the General Assembly. I really enjoyed this discussion and I'll look forward to continuing it as we continue to work on securing our nation and our state's energy supply. The last speaker, his comments is exactly where I started my discussion. When these Bills were vetoed, we had Veto Proof Majority, but we took a different tact. We decided that we would, and I did, go and sit with our Governor and Jack Lavin and talk about the specific objections that led to his Veto. I feel very confident that we've addressed those concerns. All those different groups; CUB, the Attorney General's Office, ELPC, Sierra Club, anybody who wanted to sit with us and talk about this Bill had input. Many of which saw specific changes that either removed their opposition, make them neutral or even in some cases, support. I've got a list of over 750 labor organizations, community organizations, Chambers of Commerce, who are in support of this, not only because it secures our energy future, but it gives Illinois

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

what we need most, jobs and expansion of our tax base. Yeah, we raised the income tax. It'll be a long time before we do it again. So, instead of talking about raising taxes, we've got to create more taxpayers. We also have to create and expand our income tax base and our sales tax base and our real estate tax base to get much needed revenue to continue to grow and make our state a whole place. These projects help us get there. During the President's State of the Union address, he talked about securing America's energy future. He mentioned coal gasification in that speech and I'm asking you to consider that as well. It's one thing to give lip service to the creation of jobs; it's another thing to do something that creates them and expands our tax bases. With that, I want to thank you for your indulgence and ask you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Colvin moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1533. 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? Lilly, Mell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 75 Members voting 'yes', 38 Members voting 'no', 1 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 10 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading in the middle of the page, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie has Senate Bill 1967. What's the status of that Bill, Sir?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1967, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

previous day. The Bill was held pending notes. The note request has been withdrawn."

Speaker Lyons: "Move that Bill to the Order of Third Reading and the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1967, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Senate Bill 1967."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. discussed this measure at length on Second Reading. It is a Bill that provides continued state support for community college retiree health insurance. This year... this coming fiscal year... we'll be at the same level as in the current year and then that level will decrease that will put more pressure on the community colleges and on their active teachers and on their retirees, but the reality is this state is broke. We are having trouble meeting the health care needs of our employees and our retirees and the idea that we should be an open spigot for community colleges, we are not their employer. It does not make sense. This is not a happy pill for the community colleges to swallow, but the colleges are not opposing the Bill and the reality is, if we do not do this, the retired community college teachers will have no health insurance, zero, nada, not a penny of health care insurance will they have as of July 1. So, we're... we don't have a choice, I believe, but to support this Bill. The measure includes several other items that were House Bills that we have seen before, one is to have a three-year freeze on the requirements that under certain

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

circumstances the community colleges have to reduce tuition. We also are the... have put in this Bill the measure that the community college board sent to us that would increase the number of colleges that are entitled to the equalization grant and finally, on procurement issues, the community colleges would follow the same rules as do other entities, public entities in the state. As I say, not a happy proposition, but it's the only one that will keep those health... health costs covered for retired community college teachers. And I hope I will have your support. We create a board that will be charged with responsibility to see to it that the health care needs are being met and as I say, the trustees and the community colleges themselves are not opposed to the Bill, but if we do not act today, we are ensuring that those teachers will not have help in paying their health care bills as of July 1. I'd be happy to answer your questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Crawford, Representative Roger Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Majority Leader yield for some questions?"
- Speaker Lyons: "The Majority Leader is ready for your questions."
- Eddy: "Mr. Speaker, I might ask if we could just get the noise level down a little bit. This is an important Bill. I want folks to know what they're voting on."
- Speaker Lyons: "Absolutely, Roger. Ladies and Gentlemen, we need to lower the noise level on the floor. This is a major

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

discussion. We need your attention. I'd ask you, please, to refrain from the conversations. Shhh, shhh, shhh. Roger."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Leader Currie, I did get the fiscal note back on this and it does indicate that there would be approximately a nonstate revenue increase of about \$54 million between FY12 and FY15."

Currie: "And a significant portion of that was always contemplated."

Eddy: "Would..."

Currie: "Contemplated even if the state had decided to increase its contribution."

Eddy: "So..."

Currie: "There was some talk of the state going up from 4.8 to whatever we are today, to seven point something, so the increase there described, a three-year increase, would not have been a lot less even had the state been in a financial position to increase its own commitment."

Eddy: "But... but the increase is the result of... and some of it's projected because I think the only thing they could really tell is the increase in employer and employee contributions goes from .5 to .97 which will increase the amount that community colleges would have to contribute on behalf of their employees?"

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "And they've agreed to that. And I get that. I understand that. But part of this increase is going to be something they're going to have to make up for in their budget and my concern is there are two parts to this Bill, and I'll get to the other one in a minute, that could cause community

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

colleges as a taxing body to have to increase property taxes in order to pay for the costs incurred."

Currie: "Well, many of them, of course, are capped. They would not be able to raise their property taxes and I would hope that the community colleges would be able to provide for this cost increase out of their current budget. Remember we are freezing the state's contribution. We're not yanking it this year. We are giving them a bit of a cushion, but I would remind you that the employer of these retirees, the person who employed them during their active years, is the community college system not the State of Illinois."

Eddy: "I understand. I just want... but the fact is that as these... as the state's contribution diminishes over the four years, it will increase the burden on the community college system to pick up the difference and that's the philosophy behind this."

Currie: "Some..."

Eddy: "It's basically a switch."

Currie: "Some portion of the difference, the active employees, I presume, will also be paying a slightly larger share and the board can make decisions about what premium and copay levels the retirees may face and the board will make decisions about what level of benefits ought to be available to the retired community college teachers and staff."

Eddy: "So, I think you just made one of my points and I appreciate it the fact that this has to take place within caps and if that happened then, and they do have to increase the amount of this expense, then perhaps they

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

won't have as much for other things. They're going to... they're going to have to pay this. Now, this eight-member board, did you just say that they make decisions related to the benefit package?"

Currie: "They make decisions about the... who pays what in terms of providing the health insurance. They would make decisions about the benefit package. They would make decisions about premiums and copays. Under this measure, that eight-person board would have to project out five years of financial solvency. COGFA would be in a position to look over their shoulders to see to it that they're right. And if there is reason to think that they are not fiscally solvent, then they would not be able to spend any money. So, that's a pretty effective incentive to get it right."

Eddy: "Well, I had that... I had COGFA written by the eightmember community college fiscal board because I wondered if
COGFA had to approve the, or at least certify, the figures
that the eight-member panel comes up with."

Currie: "They do and that's in the Bill."

Eddy: "So, COGFA has to agree that those costs are incurred and here's what the increase would be after the .97?"

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "Okay. The other part of this, the cost is incurred by the employee. So, I guess it's my contention that for an employee that makes \$50 thousand a year, if we're talking about current costs at .47, we might be talking about a little under \$250, but if this goes to .97, it's not

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

doubling but it is a substantial increase for that employee."

Currie: "It is still under 1 percent of total salary. I don't want to minimize, but yes, this is going to be an increase, but that was contemplated even had the state decided to increase its contribution. We're not increasing, but this year we're not decreasing. We are holding our contribution flat at the level of support we gave that system in the current fiscal year."

Eddy: "Okay. But the reality is, for a person that's making \$50 thousand a year, effective July 1 which is not very far away and they're making \$50 thousand, their contribution for health insurance could... I mean, essentially, double."

Currie: "It's likely under 1 percent."

Eddy: "I understand that, but for them... for them it's a doubling of the cost. And then, in subsequent years, they don't know what they're going to be paying until the eightmember panel meets. The increase could be substantial. I mean..."

Currie: "That's right it could be. I doubt that it will be.

Remember, that under the… under the program we envisioned,

were the state to increase its contribution, they would

over the next several of years have gone up to the .97

anyway. So, I think the fact is that those costs were going

to increase how quickly may differ depending on this Bill."

Eddy: "Well, as we reduce the GRF, that has to be factored in by the eight-member board."

Currie: "Correct."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "So, they'll transfer those costs along with any increased cost for the health insurance so for the employee, it could be a substantial increase and it could drive them out of that coverage and into another."
- Currie: "Right. And Representative, if we don't pass this Bill, they won't have the option because there will be no health insurance coverage for retired community college teachers."
- Eddy: "I did... I did also confirm there are over three thousand that are not eligible for Medicaid."
- Currie: "Our figures say one thousand nine hundred."
- Eddy: "Okay. I got a figure, you do. Let's just say one thousand nine hundred for the sake of the argument. What happens to those individuals if they're driven out of this?"
- Currie: "What happens to those individuals if we don't pass this Bill, then they are really out of luck. They have no help in meeting their health care costs."
- Eddy: "So, basically, what we're saying, on the final day of the Session a few hours before we're done, is your choice is to either lose your coverage, accept the pool from the City of Chicago Community Colleges into... and by the way, that was their choice not to be in this pool originally... and either do that or you're going to lose coverage. There's no middle ground here and the state's getting out of the business of subsidizing or helping with any portion of that cost."
- Currie: "These are not our employees, Representative. We're having trouble meeting the health care needs of our employees and of our retirees. So, yes, this is a decision

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

I believe the General Assembly should make to say to the community colleges and to the employees in that system that they should take responsibility for their health care costs, but we're not cutting them off cold turkey. We are saying the commitment we made in the current year we will retain next year so as to soften the blow. But again, if we don't pass this Bill, they got nothing."

Eddy: "Okay. Well, I want to reaffirm one thing and is that...

that's my belief in the number of three thousand. I used
your number, but I really..."

Currie: "Okay."

Eddy: "...believe we're correct with our number."

Currie: "I believe it's under two thousand..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Currie: "...out of a pool of six thousand."

Eddy: "Well, we can disagree on that number 'cause I think it's over three and we can check that later. But what about community colleges, how do they budget for the increase?"

Currie: "Well, this year, as I say, the coming budget year, they'll be getting the same amount from the state as they got in the current fiscal year. So, the question will be, how they want to budget going forward and I give them... I give them credit for figuring that out."

Eddy: "Okay. So, they're going to have to figure out the first year based on the number of .97 applied to their payroll, but after that, they're not going to know... When does the eight-member panel make the decision on the increased percentage so for planning purposes the community college would even know that number for budgeting?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "Ninety days before the end of the fiscal year."

Eddy: "So, if the fiscal year ends June 30, they have to report so that that number can be put into the budget and then the community college would have to decide, especially if they're capped, what programs they're going to cut in order to pay for this transfer of the responsibility."

Currie: "It's just the way they budget for any other problem, any other issue, some of them haven't been paid by the state in a while and yet, as far as I know, most of them figure out how to continue providing their programs."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you... thank you for those answers. I want to move on to a different part of the Bill very, very quickly. I may come back to that. But I also want to talk about the portion of the Bill that amends the Public Community College Act and provides the tuition rate and fee limit of one-third per capita cost applies until the end of the effective date of the Act and then... and then, again, three years after the effective date of the Amendatory Act. This is suggested by the college board. I think this is one of the Bills and I think House Bill 304 that's rolled into this."

Currie: "It was... Representative Tracy's House Bill 304, yes."

Eddy: "Okay. I have a concern that this legislation will have the same effect that it could raise tuition but it could increase property taxes. So, there are two things in this Bill that have the likely effect of raising local property taxes."

Currie: "Well, Representative, I think that the proponents of House Bill 304 made a good case that were they required to

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

reduce tuition that would have meant that they might have to raise property taxes. So, I think, in fact there is protection in this part of Senate Bill 1967 against the need for property tax explosions."

"Okay. Thank you, Representative, I appreciate your Eddy: answers. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. This... this particular Bill is tremendously important. Please pay attention to what you're voting on. There is no question that these funds need attention. The question is, how do we solve the problem? The first part of this Bill blends the community college of Chicago retirees with the rest of the state. Again, I'm not so sure that that's something that shouldn't be done, but the manner in which this is done will transfer a significant cost increase to individual employees. And you are actually voting, in real terms, to take an employee that's working who may make \$50 thousand a year and increase their contributions starting July 1 from about a little under \$250 a month to double... almost double that, not quite because we're going from .5 to .97. That's a significant increase to someone who has an income of about \$50 thousand. The second thing this does is it has the potential, the real potential, to increase property taxes on two fronts. So, the State of Illinois will get out of... and by the way, that's right away... as the state reduces its commitment for the payment, those ... those liabilities will go up and an eight-member board will continue to increase what the employees will have to pay. We have a large number of people who aren't eligible for Medicaid who will be negatively affected and property taxes

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

are going to go up. So, you're voting for a Bill that will double the contribution of active employees and for sure, raise property taxes. This is not the right solution. I understand we're being told this is it. You either throw people off the health insurance rolls or you double the employer contribution, the employee contribution and you set up a system that's going to raise property taxes and we're going to transfer this over. There needs to be a shared decision making in this. We have met several times. We had other solutions. There were other agreements on how to solve this problem. We had higher buy-ins by the Chicago Community College Group and we had different approaches. Those were all rejected. We had bipartisan meetings between the Senate and the House. We had agreements on how to solve this problem, but instead with just a few hours left we're told that your vote... your vote has to be this or you're going to end that system. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, effectively, this is a problem that doesn't have a good answer, but this is not the solution. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Randy Ramey."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Ramey: "Thank you. Representative Currie, kind of following up on what the previous speaker just closed with. Was this an agreed upon process on the… on the Bill process?"

Currie: "We met with the community college trustees, the community college boards and the unions representing the majority of the teachers."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Ramey: "How many times did those stakeholders get together?"
- Currie: "They... we actually met with them several times.

 Yesterday was the most recent meeting with the Senate

 President and the House Speaker."
- Ramey: "How many times did those groups come together on an agreement?"
- Currie: "Well, I mean, remember, that this is not a very happy solution from the perspective... I remember... I do believe that the former speaker misstated the actual cost. I believe he said 250 a month; I think it's 250 a year. And then it would doubled for that 50 thousand a year teacher, it be about 500 a year. But yeah, this is... and they were looking at, even if the state shoveled a lot more money into this program for people that were not our employees ever, ever, ever, even had the state decided we could afford to do that, they still would have been looking at significant increases."
- Ramey: "Well, but my question was, how many times did they come to an agreement? How many times did they come to an agreement?"
- Currie: "No, there was not agreement, even on the original proposal."
- Ramey: "Well, I believe they got together... they did come to agreement. A previous speaker mentioned there were agreements multiple times. I believe that only in the text..."
- Currie: "Well, yeah, if they agreed, maybe they agreed to take more of our money that we don't have."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Ramey: "Well, I don't know what that agreement was that's why I was hoping that you did. If they... is that what you're saying that they want to take more of our money?"
- Currie: "I'm sorry. Did you ask a question?"
- Ramey: "I said is that what you're saying? Is that what their agreement was that they were taking more of our money?"
- Currie: "Yeah, they did want more of our money. Unfortunately, we don't have it to give."
- Ramey: "Okay. Well, all I have to say... and to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that, you know, on many occasions we get groups that are at odds to come together, come to the table, and we force the conversation and get to agreements. And normally, in these discussions, it's going to hurt everybody who is part of the process, but when we walk away from those discussions, that's when one side usually gets hit pretty hard. And so, I would, again, agree with the previous speaker and ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosenthal."
- Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a potential conflict of interest, I'll be voting 'present' on this Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. So noted.

 Representative Barbara Flynn Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. It's pretty simple. We don't have money to pay more than we're paying this year for health insurance coverage for community college teachers. They're not our employees, they never were. We're having trouble meeting the health care needs of our workers, current and retired. I think this is a reasonable, a fair proposal. We're not pulling the rug out from under. We are going to

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

appropriate as much money for this program in the next fiscal year as we do in the current year. The choice is simple. If we do not approve this measure, there will be no coverage for the retired community college teachers as of July 1. This is a take it or leave it proposition. And I hope, with me, you will decide to take it."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1967. 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 Acevedo, DeLuca, Flowers. Representative Jackson. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 48 voting 'yes' and 66 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Currie. Representative Currie moves to put the issue on Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please suspend the posting requirement for consideration of House Resolution 435."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to suspend the posting requirement.

 There being no objection, is there leave? Leave is granted.

 And the Lady's Motion carries. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Joint Resolution 35 may be heard."
- Speaker Lang: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave?

 Seeing no objection, leave is granted. And the Lady's

 Motion carries. On Supplemental Calendar #2, under the

 Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2972. Mr. Turner."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #3 on House Bill 2972."

Speaker Lang: "Can you give us a brief explanation of the Amendment, Sir?"

Turner: "A person appointed by the Governor cannot stay in office longer than 60 days after the expiration of their term. After 60 days, the office is considered vacant."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 2972. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, can you repeat again and... and be a little more specific about what the Senate Amendment did to this Bill?"

Turner: "The Senate Amendment amends the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. It provides that holdover appointees, temporary appointees, and acting appointees the offices requiring Senate confirmation may not continue in office longer than stated limited periods."

Eddy: "Okay. So, I think in plain speak to for a... we had a Senate Bill here, Senate Bill 1?"

Turner: "Right, similar to Senate Bill 1."

Eddy: "Is it similar or is it exactly what Senate Bill 1 did? 'Cause I think there was a lot of support..."

Turner: "Yes."

Eddy: "...for Senate Bill 1."

Turner: "It's the same, exactly as Senate Bill 1."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "Okay. And Senate Bill 1, I think, made it out of the Senate unanimously, had about 103 votes over here and the Governor amendatorily vetoed that Bill. And he was trying to delay the implementation of the provisions 'til July of '11?"
- Turner: "I'm hearing that it's a bit different from Senate Bill

 1. It includes a couple of exemptions. Exempts from these
 provisions appointments to serve as the Director of the
 Illinois Power Agency or the State Board of Elections."
- Eddy: "Well, Representative, I want to make sure that, again, everybody knows what they're voting for here. I think... I think House Bill 2972 allows the term of office for the expired appointments to continue for 60... only 60 days after the expiration of their term. Senate Bill 1 immediately terminated those salaried appointments."
- Turner: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative Eddy, could you repeat that last part?"
- Eddy: "Yeah. I think... I think this allows the terms of office for those expired appointees to continue for 60 days after the expiration and in Senate Bill 1 those were immediately terminated salaried appointees."
- Turner: "Well, yes, this is right. It gives them an additional 60 days..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Turner: "...for the Governor's Office."

Eddy: "And I think this also adds members of the public university board... to a public university board of trustees."

Turner: "Yes."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Those are a couple of pretty significant differences.

And I think it then excludes the Director of the Illinois

Power Agency from the provisions of the Bill."

Turner: "As well as the State Board of Elections."

Eddy: "So, the State Board of Elections and the Director of the Illinois Power Agency are excluded, so… Let me ask you. Why… why is it important that these changes be made?"

Turner: "I can't speak to that, Representative."

Eddy: "Representative, is this your first concurrence?"

Turner: "Yes."

Eddy: "Well, actually, that's not the reason for my question. I just want to make sure that we know. Senate Bill 1 was a pretty substantial piece of legislation that addressed a problem. And what you have here is a Bill that attempts to do similarly what Senate Bill 1 did. It's to get the Governor busy to make some appointments, but you're actually giving him a little more time than Senate Bill 1 did."

Turner: "Yes."

Eddy: "And you think that's fair. You think that's the way we ought to approach this."

Turner: "I think that's fair."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner to close."

Turner: "I move for a Senate Amendment... concurrence in Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2972. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cavaletto, Morrison, Unes. Mr. Morrison. Please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2972. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Brauer."

- Brauer: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I had a call from Representative Black about the gaming Bill and I inadvertently hit my 'yes' button when I meant to be 'no'."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Rose."
- Rose: "Speaker, would you let the record reflect that I intended to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2972."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. The Chair recognizes Mr. Watson."
- Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Republicans will caucus immediately in Room 118."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Republicans will caucus for approximately one hour. There will be committees at 7:30 and back to the floor at 8 p.m. One half hour for committees, back to the floor at 8 p.m. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "The following committees will meet at 7:30 p.m.

 The Executive Committee will meet in Room 118 and the Human

 Services Committee will meet in Room 122-B."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will stand at ease 'til the hour of 8 p.m."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Clerk Mahoney: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie,
 Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the
 following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved
 for floor consideration is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate
 Bill 325 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 620;
 recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions
 is Senate Joint Resolution 34; on the Order of Concurrence,
 recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate
 Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3039."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is Senate Joint Resolution 35."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 11 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2188. Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2188 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley on Senate Bill 2188. Please read the Bill. Please move the Bill to Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2188, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you. This is an initiative of the Governor's Office. There's a dispute going on currently with the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Governor's Office and AFSCME over the characterization of employees within BIX. These are highly technical positions. It's my understanding they've been in negotiations. They haven't been able to work it out. This would resolve the issue in favor of the Governor's Office. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Eddy: "Representative, I... I've got some questions related to the veterans' preference."
- Bradley: "It's my understanding and the position of the administration, that this legislation in no way affects the veterans' preferences."
- Eddy: "Well, according... according to at least one source or at least their interpretation of this..."
- Bradley: "Yes. They've been saying that and it is the opinion of the Governor's Office that this does not affect veterans' preferences."
- Eddy: "Well, it does remove a specific 'technical and engineering staff' in CMS from the Personnel Code. Is that right?"
- Bradley: "I believe that's correct."
- Eddy: "Okay. And the administration's claim is that that's necessary so that it can hire some information technology staff."
- Bradley: "Correct."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "And I think the connection there is when the hiring takes place of the information technology staff that's done without regard to veterans' preference."

Bradley: "I'm not an expert in the employment... Personnel Code. My understanding is that the Governor's Office has certain positions that they can hire outside the Personnel Code and some that they can't. But it is the emphatic position of the Governor's Office that this does not affect the veterans' preference and does not undermine the veterans' preference. If that is, in fact, the reason with regards to that, it would seem to me a be... be a bit of a stretch, but in any case, that's my understanding."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, I appreciate the answers to your questions. Obviously, there's a disagreement over... over the... the veterans' preference; however, I think you did state the Governor's position on this and I think everyone else knows the other position. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Dugan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Dugan: "Yes. Representative, I just want to clarify again the question and unfortunately I was talking so I didn't hear it. We understand that... that this will supersede the veterans' preference. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "Again, I think that that's a matter of semantics. And I don't have the expertise on this particular subject to speak eloquently on it, but I've asked the Governor's Office that question. They're emphatic that this in no way undermines or goes against the veterans' preference. It

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

would seem to me that if I wanted to try to stop something that would be something that would be brought up and the logic that I've seen with regards to that appears to be a bit of a stretch. And I'm not interested in doing anything to undermine the veterans' preference."

Dugan: "Okay."

Bradley: "And I don't think the people that brought this to me would do that either. And so, the Governor's Office is emphatically saying this does not undermine the veterans' preference."

Dugan: "Okay. And it certainly would... this Governor, as we know, is a very strong supporter of veterans, so I'm sure that would..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Dugan: "...never be his intent."

Bradley: "I just can't imagine Governor Quinn's Office doing anything to undermine veterans."

Dugan: "And I don't think that they ever would. I think my concern is is that if we take them out personnel policy then I think that automatically takes them out of the veterans' preference. I'm sure Governor Quinn's Office would always make sure that the veterans' preference would..."

Bradley: "Yeah. I think he wasn't even..."

Dugan: "...from a technicality, would..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Dugan: "...but going from there, if you take them out of the personnel policies, I'm just afraid it would take out the veterans' preference and that's..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bradley: "I..."

Dugan: "...my only concern."

Bradley: "I think the Governor probably has a finer track record of hiring veterans even in positions that there is no veterans' preference and most places do that have no requirement so."

Dugan: "Well, I just... I'm not saying your intent."

Bradley: "I'm not concerned about that. It's certainly not... the purpose of this is not to undermine the veterans' preference. The purpose of this is there's a dispute between the Governor's Office and the collective bargaining unit as if they should hire these people and they need highly technical skills, as you know, technical people with expertise in certain very scientific and technologically related areas. That's what this agency does."

Dugan: "Right."

Bradley: "And so, they need to have the ability to hire folks that are qualified for these very high level jobs. It's my understanding of the situa… computer technicians and…"

Dugan: "Right."

Bradley: "...scientists, et cetera, so."

Dugan: "Okay. So... and again, and I know it's not their intent, so I would just like to ask if... in this... if this Bill passes and everything works out fine that... but if we do find that somewhere within this... well, and it gets passed that... that maybe for the future we'd want to make sure veterans' preference is in there in case, you know, if someone else maybe doesn't have the same..."

Bradley: "We'll fix it."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Dugan: "...but then we would be able to address that later in another Bill."

Bradley: "We have a (indiscernible) from the Governor's Office to fix..."

Dugan: "Okay."

Bradley: "...any unintended consequences."

Dugan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stephens. The Gentleman passes. Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I think the purpose of this Bill is more directed at the request of the Governor's Office and the administration in order to bring the state forward in implementing some of the very, more complex and urgently needed analytics and other computer systems that the state has unfortunately not been able to put into place. I think this is an extremely important Bill and it's one that I would hope everyone could support."

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? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: on the Order of Concurrence, recommends be adopted is Senate... is a

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804."

Speaker Lang: "On page 17 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1698. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Comprehensive Workers' Compensation package that we voted on on Sunday night. We went through it in detail. Everyone got to speak in detail. There was in-depth conversations and discussions and it hasn't changed. So, I would, again, ask for an 'aye' vote, ask people to pass this historic, comprehensive, substantial workers' compensation reform."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to House Bill 1698, on a Bill he has not changed since yesterday. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the... the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Eddy: "Representative, is this the Bill that we had the last chance at yesterday?"

Bradley: "Well, this is the last chance, Roger. It's the same Bill."

Eddy: "I was just wondering."

Bradley: "Yeah. This is... this is the same Bill,

Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative Bradley, there have been a lot of discussions over the last day or so about how there could be a little different approach to this, so that rather than one group taking a... a predominant hit as far as the savings is concerned, that... that we would look at some other details, maybe work on... really other things folks have

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

agreed to or most people have agreed to and try to sit down and fashion a Bill that would have more agreement. Now, my request would be that you reconsider that we have to be at that position and that we still have some time to... to look at some of those figures to look at alternatives and come to a more... a more agreed Bill. This... this is not the way this has to be done. I think that there are at least questions about the savings that this Bill is purported to provide. And I guess my question is, would you have any interest at all in working just a little bit more as... as we move toward an agreement on this?"

Bradley: "There has been substantial agreement and I'm interested on having a vote on this Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, I'm... I'm a little bit disappointed in the fact that we can't at least in a... on such an important issue, one that has taken so much time and energy and effort of so many people, have an opportunity to really look at a way to get some agreement. I think there are ways that there would be a lot of people that would be willing to support this Bill and some of those things have been agreed to."

Bradley: "Representative..."

Eddy: "I'm not sure what the tr... have the trial lawyers... How do the trial lawyers feel about this Bill?"

Bradley: "They are officially neutral."

Eddy: "They're officially neutral. How about the unions?"

Bradley: "The AFL-CIO is officially neutral. I can't speak for every individual union. I think some of them are opposed."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "How about the Chamber of Commerce and... and Manufacturers Association, Retail Merchants?"

Bradley: "The Chamber of Commerce would be neutral. The Manufacturers would be enthusiastically supportive. The Retail Merchants would be enthusiastically supportive. The Chicagoland Chamber of Commerce would be enthusiastically supportive. In addition to that, Mitsubishi, Navistar, the Illinois Business Round Table, Illinois Municipal League, Cook County, City of Chicago, all proponents. Southland Chamber of Commerce, ComEd, United Airlines, Petroleum Council, Chemical Industry Council, Ford Motor Company, they would all be enthusiastic proponents."

Eddy: "Representative, what about the..."

Bradley: "Pepsi... PepsiCo."

Eddy: "Okay. Yeah, I've heard from some of those folks, today.

How about... how about... where... how's the Hospital Association and the Medical Society?"

Bradley: "The Hospital Association and the Medical Society are opposed."

Eddy: "Okay. Can you understand why?"

Bradley: "I can certainly understand why any of those groups would be opposed to this because I think it's shared sacrifice and we may differ for and have differences of opinion as to the level of sacrifice, but we've tried to craft the Bill which spreads out the sacrifice across a broad parameter of groups. And I don't think and I'm not going to and I'm going to be very respectful here and I hope you'll be respectful of me, I don't think you can in any way any of us can undermine the significant sacrifices

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

or the significant constrictions on employees that are included in this Bill. AMA is big, UR is big, Choice of Physician is big, PPO is big, a carpel tunnel limitation, that's big. These are huge changes in the workers' compensation system in the State of Illinois. Firing arbitrators is big. So, huge changes."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative. And by all means, I respect..."

Bradley: "Wage differential too. I left that out."

Eddy: "Okay."

Bradley: "Wage differential, huge."

Eddy: "Well, I don't want there to be a misunderstanding. I respect very much the work that you've done on this Bill. The... problem... and very quickly, to the Bill. I'm sure there are a number of people that want to make comments. The... the problem remains that your, perhaps your idea and my idea of shared sacrifice are different. When I look at this Bill, see the predominate sacrifice and the and... and Ι predominate amount of the savings that... and everybody's looking for savings here... that they're taking place in their Bill. They come from one place. They don't come from what I would call a shared sacrifice and... and I think we haven't addressed some of the primary issues that at least business and industry in my area have talked to me about related to the real cost of work comp. Now, I... I think that probably if you and... if you get to a Bill that is really going to do what we need to do in Illinois, there would be a lot more strong opposition, a lot more strong opposition from other groups. Because of that and because I think we can do better for the problem, the under... underlying

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

problem, I would urge the Body that this doesn't have to be done now, this can be done better, it can be done right. Nothing is now or never. We've proved that in just a short period of time, that this is it isn't really it. It can be something else and it can be better. Vote 'no'."

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

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise simply to announce a potential conflict of interest. And as I do on all workers' comp Bills, I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, should this Bill get the requisite number of votes for passage, I would ask for a verification. Request for verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Yeah. Mr. Stephens has requested a verification. Anything further, Mr. Stephens?"

Stephens: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Madigan: "Anything further?"

Stephens: "Yes."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Stephens: "Did you recognize my request?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes."

Stephens: "I'm sorry, Mr..."

Speaker Madigan: "The answer's yes. The answer's yes."

Stephens: "I appreciate..."

Speaker Madigan: "Did you wish to..."

Stephens: "I appreciate your clarity. Yes, I would like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Please proceed."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Stephens: "Thank you very much for your courtesy. Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman has just stated in his opening that we have... we waited 48 hours, nothing's changed and then he suggested that, yeah, there was some... there was some negotiation and nothing changed. That's not negotiation; that is arrogance. And the arrogance needs to be dealt with. We voted on this exact same language just 48 hours ago. There's no reason to change your vote, nothing wrong with your vote the other day. If you were for the bad Bill, vote 'yes'; if you're opposed to the bad Bill, vote 'no'. I stand in strong and continued opposition to this weak Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis. Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if I have a parliamentary inquiry or I should address this question to the Sponsor, but the short description on this Bill says it's amending the Adoption Act. And I'm just wondering how workman's comp reform is germane to amending the Adoptions Act?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "I'm sorry. I'm going to call this a parliamentary inquiry. I notice on our short description that we're amending the Adoption Act..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis, could I ask you to defer momentarily to Mr. Kay. The parliamentarian is out of the way."

Reis: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "So, Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, this came to the committee which I sat on the other day and I think a lot of us left that committee with a lot of questions. And I think we need to spend some time looking at the facts and trying to find out if this is reform and a good Bill or whether or not we can do better. So, if I can start back at the beginning, with some cost savings. The Director of Insurance provided me some information after the hearing which indicated that there would... that there, in fact, was significant savings to be found in five, six, seven areas, possibly eight and I went..."

Bradley: "Well, if I could, Representative. I believe that the information that he provided you, and it came from the Director of Insurance not from me."

Kay: "No. I..."

Bradley: "But I... I believe that the information he provided you listed several items that have an empirical value assigned to them in terms of potential value savings. Then there was a whole list of items, in addition to that, where it's very difficult until the program is implemented to put an empirical value on the savings to business. And so, the AMA utilization review, the PPO, those types of things, once they get started has significant cost savings. So, yes, there were some things that were outlined: differential, fee schedule, things like that that he felt could be calculated empirically. There's other things I think are of equal or greater value that they're difficult to empirically calculate until the system starts running."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Kay: "Okay. Representative, my question is just this and we had this conversation earlier today. I ask you to double check your numbers against what the fee schedule is on the workers' compensation system by geo zip code. And I ask you to do that because I saw some inconsistency in error and what you provided us at the committee. Do you still think that your numbers are correct and that..."

"Well, the mistake is, I understand, there was a Bradley: mistake with regards to... with reference to doctors as to outpatient procedures and inpatient procedures. understanding is that has now been corrected. The numbers were accurate, but the category titles were not. The number that's most important though which has not been disputed by anyone that I know of which came from the Workers' Compensation Research Institute is that Illinois is 180 percent above Medicare and the next closest state is 131 percent above Medicare. Kentucky, for instance, where many of my friends and colleagues are surrounded by, is 50 Medicare. So, this is percent above a substantial disbursement from neighboring states, so that is the most important thing. And we could go through and we could pick out geo zips and numbers and argue over specific procedures, but the real number is the 180 percent above Medicare on average and the average major surgery rate which is 504 percent above Medicare."

Kay: "Representative, let me go back to my original question.

Did you go back and look on the workers' comp site and look

at CPT codes and look at what was allowable for billing

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

under the workers' compensation system for particular procedures?"

Bradley: "Did I?"

Kay: "Yes."

Bradley: "No, did you?"

Kay: "Yes, I did."

Bradley: "Okay."

Kay: "I did."

Bradley: "All right."

Kay: "As I told you this morning, John, I went through and looked at all of the geo zips, all of the procedures, and all of the costs that is cited on the Illinois Workers' Compensation System and quite frankly, the savings you predict don't add up. And I grant you the fact that you won't know for maybe two years, but my concern is when constituents say, Dwight, can you, from an economic or factual standpoint, tell me that the numbers are somewhere in the neighborhood of six or seven billion dollars worth of savings based on the information which I pulled off the Illinois Workers' Compensation System, Representative, I have to say, 'no'. How do I respond to them?"

Bradley: "Well, you respond to them in several different ways that you, if you so choose and if you support this legislation, which I hope you will. You'll first respond by saying Illinois is 180 percent above Medicare; it's the second highest reimbursement rate in the United States behind only Alaska. You tell them that you'd have to drop the rates 50 percent to get to third and then you would barely be in third place. You can tell them that half of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the cost of the total \$3 billion Workers' Compensation System in the State of Illinois are the result of medical fees and by doing a simple process of mathematics and doing the numbers, that taking a third off of that, or 30 percent, would be a reduction of somewhere between 450 and 500 million dollars if, in fact, half of the cost of the fed... of the Workers' Compensation System is actually the fee schedule.

Kay: "Well, John, I do..."

Bradley: "You could reach it there or you could go through or..."

Kay: "...forgive me..."

Bradley: "...you could go through all the CPTs and all the geo zips..."

Kay: "...well and it's..."

Bradley: "...and all the hundreds and thousands of different procedures in the state and try to come to these averages that are already established."

Kay: "Forgive me. Let's talk about the Bill for just one second. The information that you gave us and I don't believe it was the information that you developed, but the information you gave us is wrong. The economics are bad and you cannot save the money that you're predicting. We save because you're overstating... you're overstating the fees."

Bradley: "I don't agree with... Representative, I don't agree with that. The number that matters is a copulation; the number that matters is the aggregate."

Kay: "Representative..."

Bradley: "Those numbers are not disputed..."

Kay: "Forgive me."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bradley: "...180 percent..."

Kay: "Forgive..."

Bradley: "...above Medicare."

Kay: "...forgive me. Forgive me, John, but the truth is that you
took one geo zip and I took them all."

Bradley: "No, no."

Kay: "And one geo zip is not going to make an argument to anybody."

Bradlev: "Not... but with... This is where the confusion is coming from and I'm not going to get into an argument with you, is where the confusion is comina Highlighting specific outliers of codes and procedures is one thing. The number that matters in terms of calculating the overall savings are the overall averages. The 180 percent of Medicare is based upon all the different aspects of the geo zips and the different procedures. That's the number that matters. The fact that \$1.5 billion of a \$3 billion system goes toward medical costs and that you're going to cut 30 percent out of those costs, that's the number that matters. That can't be disputed; it hasn't been disputed and I don't believe it will be disputed. "

Kay: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The numbers that have been presented to the committee first and now to this Body are bad economics. They're bad economics based on the numbers that are carried on the Workers' Compensation System themselves. All you have to do is do your homework. And I suggest that we haven't done our homework. And that's important because when you tell somebody you're reforming a Bill of this magnitude and you're predicting... you're

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

predicting a savings between 500 and 700 million dollars, you need to be very, very careful that you're right. And Representative, you're not right. Secondly, I will... I will tell you this, several scholars who are economists that I spoke to today, opine, one of whom... one of whom was from Massachusetts and research his Workers' Compensation Programs throughout the nation said to me, it is unlikely... it is unlikely that you will come anywhere near saving of half a billion dollars. Now, he's an expert, he's an economist. His name is Richard Victor. And I think... I think we need to start listening to some authority and he is an authority. Mr. Speaker, I would... I would say this. I would say that we have not intentionally... I would say mistakenly presented information and numbers that economically are not right. I would say that we have put Bill... put forth a Bill which business would have been happy with, had the numbers been correct. I think they would be happy if we had addressed more succinctly, issues such as, carpel tunnel which John, you have addressed and I think that's great. But I think in addition to that, the standards that we have set up for the AMA guidelines are not what they need to be. Networking, PPOs are not what they need to be. And frankly, it concerns me that if we question the economics, we question the numbers, and we question the foundation of this Bill, you can't call it reform because of foundation is not right then the house we built is probably broken. I would also remind Members that in 2005 we started down the very same path toward reform. I wasn't a party to that; I wasn't a party to this. But I can tell you for

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

companies in the State of Illinois, it has been devastating. We do not want to make the same mistake tonight. If we are going to do real reform, let's look at what the states around us have done to reform the system, to make it fair, to make it balance, to bring everyone into the mix. To call this reform does not single out one party, it involves all parties. And I would submit tonight to this Body that we have not done that. We have simply said we're going to cobble together some numbers, we're going to cobble together some expectations with no way of forecasting or predicting a result and we've called it reform. And albeit, I com... I compliment you, John, for your hard work on this measure; it's not good enough. If this is the Bill, it's not good enough. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis on a parliamentary inquiry."

- Reis: "Mr. Ellis, we were just noticing that the short description on the Bill is adoption... amending the Adoption Act. And is the work comp Amendment germane to a Bill like that?"
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative, on behalf of the Speaker in... in response to your inquiry, the title of the Act is an Act concerning civil law. I think that's a germane title although, I would note that a germaneness challenge is only in order on Second Reading. So... so..."
- Reis: "Could the courts that... could someone sue us and say that this Bill was not germane outside of the General Assembly and how... and would that be upheld?"
- Parliamentarian Ellis: "A germaneness challenge is not a constitutional challenge. It's a House Rules challenge.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

You're probably talking about a single subject challenge and certainly someone's free to make that challenge, but it'd be outside my purview to comment on a constitutional challenge, it would be in court."

Reis: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Connelly."

Connelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that due to a potential conflict of interest I will be voting 'present' to this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Arroyo."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Arroyo: "John, if a... if you go to a hospital and a doctor diagnoses you with a certain illness like cancer or something like that, do you have the right to go and get a second opinion from another doctor?"

Bradley: "Sure."

Arroyo: "How... how does that work?"

Bradley: "If..."

Arroyo: "The doctors in my district are telling me that there is nothing in this Bill where it says you have to go..."

Bradley: "You get a... you get a sec... you get two second opinions, 'cause you get one line of..."

Arroyo: "I can't hear you, John."

Bradley: "...you get one line of referral and then you get a second line of referral."

Arroyo: "So, you're saying there is a second..."

Bradley: "Yes, correct."

Arroyo: "...chance in this Bill."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bradley: "Correct, absolutely."

Arroyo: "All right. Thank you, John."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to go directly to the Bill. And I want to make sure it's clear to everybody in this chamber and those of you that are listening and those of you that are advocating for or against it, but the this side of the aisle people on support workers' compensation reform. I don't think there's any question about it. We have small business owners in this caucus. We all interact with small business owners and large business owners on a regular basis and understand 100 percent we need to do workers' compensation reform, support workers' compensation reform, have advocated for workers' compensation reform, have filed Bills that outline workers' compensation reform and will continue to push workers' compensation reform regardless of our vote tonight. But one of the things that concerns our caucus is whether or not we have real workers' compensation reform before us in this chamber. And I think you've heard a variety of people speaking over the last couple days and the consensus by many people in this state is this Bill is not real workers' compensation reform. And one of the things we've seen happen in this state over the last couple years is the attempt to sell ideas or Bills as real reform when in reality they do nothing but look good on mail pieces and look good in the newspaper as headlines. I can remember the conversation a couple of months ago, maybe more like a year ago, year and a half, about the need to do real ethics

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

reform in the State of Illinois. We did some ethics reform, but I think everybody in this building knows the real gist of what we needed to do involved whether or not the Leaders had the ability to hand out money and in the amounts they handed out money and collecting of money and we didn't address that. And while everybody went around patting themselves on the back for doing ethics reform, everybody in this building knew we really had not addressed the real problem, the real root of the problem and we really didn't do real ethics reform. And while people talked about it, everybody knew it wasn't real and I think that's problem have tonight. And as Ι listened we Representative Kay, it occurred to me that in our attempt to sell reform and push ideas that we have, we have the ability and we... I guess it's human nature to embellish the significance of what we're doing. And when you Representative Kay kind of drilled down to the core of what's gone on here, those numbers a couple of days ago suggested we have savings of six to seven, eight, and nine hundred million dollars, when in reality, when you look at the real numbers here, we may be lucky to get to a hundred to two hundred million dollars in savings. And the reason we're not having real savings and the other numbers I think we've seen have been embellished and manipulated and it's 'cause we are not getting to the root problems. Some would say we're nibbling around the edges, I alluded to that ... to the other night. I'm not even sure we're getting around or nibbling around the edges. Think about what this Bill does not contain or what does it not do. This Bill does not

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

change in any way the culture of corruption that centers around or hovers around the world of workers' compensation the State of Illinois that we are, unfortunately, familiar with. This Bill does not contain anything with respect to the world of causation. So, the person that plays football on Sunday afternoon and gets hurt and goes to work on Monday and says he or she has a workers' compensation injury, we don't address that under this Bill. The very meat and potatoes of what we need to do, we don't touch it. We don't touch it. We embellish some numbers, but we don't go to the real root of the problem. There is a reason that the Caterpillars and the John Deeres and the NFIB and the Chamber of Commerce are not supporting this Bill, 'cause they are the people that live this every day in their small and large businesses around the State of Illinois and they know how people game the system. They know that people come in and say I got hurt at work when in reality they got hurt over the weekend or at an earlier time in their life and that this does nothing to that. Nothing in this Bill, nothing in this Bill addresses the issue of what we hear about in this building about PPO networks or to stop the idea of doctor shopping, another significant real life experience that businesses employers face day to day that is not addressed in this all. Causation, gone, PPO networks, doctor shopping, not in here. Then the other thing that we faced as a state recently is the issue that we heard about down at Menard's, the fraudulent activity of certain doctors and attorneys and arbitrators. I haven't seen anything in this

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Bill that goes to the root of that problem. And I would suggest that something that needed to be addressed, what's the other big issue that every employer tells you about that needs to be involved in here... that needs to be covered in here? AMA guidelines. The utilization of AMA guidelines. the country where you have Everywhere else in significant reduction in cost expenses have implemented true, real AMA guidelines. The AMA guidelines that would if, been implemented in this Bill, would have brought Caterpillar Tractor onboard, John Deere onboard, live with businesses. Again, they this day to day. Caterpillar Tractor says, you have the same company Illinois versus the same company in Indiana, you may pay half a million dollars in Indiana to provide works' comp... workers' compensation coverage to three and a half million dollars in the State of Illinois. One way to drop that is through AMA guidelines, absolutely nothing in this Bill. And then on the world of alcohol and drugs, the abuse that goes on in that is something you will hear with almost from every employer you've talked to large and small, not in any significant way is addressed in this Bill. So, whether it's causation, doctor shopping, Menard's, AMA quidelines, alcohol and drugs, they are not addressed. So, what do we have? What do we have? Especially in light of what Representative Kay just outlined. Embellished, it's the kindest he's going to say it. He has a lot of respect for Sponsor, but someone's manipulated these numbers. They're not real, they don't work, and so we're left with a product that does very little to help us in a state that is

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

already struggling with awful tax policy, awful regulatory policy, awful litigation policy and yet, we at best nibble around the edges. I guess this, at the end of the day, you ought to think about why are the trial lawyers in this state and the unions in this state, not objecting to this Bill and are neutral. That speaks volumes. They're not objecting to this Bill because it does nothing at all in the way of reform. And I guess if I was a business owner, the thing that might scare me the most and with all due respect to the person that's going to do it, we're about to have a Governor that has not demonstrated any, in my very humble opinion, any recognition or understanding of the significance of business in the State of Illinois with some of the policies that have come out of his office. That applies to small business and large business, medium size business. You are now allowing this Governor to appoint every arbitrator under the Workers' Compensation System. If you are an employer in the State of Illinois, I don't think you would find that very comforting. Every new arbitrator in the State of Illinois's Workers' Compensation System will be appointed by this Governor and I don't think anybody in this room would suggest that he has been the biggest friend of business to the State of Illinois. So, this Bill is lacking woefully in doing what it needs to do. The numbers, at best, get us to two or three hundred, at best. It lacks a variety of areas that need to be addressed and that's a shame we didn't do that. The process didn't work its way through like it should have and that's unfortunate. So, at the end of the day, I know that people

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

are going to want to take a victory lap. I know there's some people that have worked on this a lot and I appreciate that, but this is not reform. It doesn't look like reform; it doesn't smell like reform. It isn't reform and that's a shame because we had an opportunity to do something very real here today and I think most of the people in this building know that. And I'm hopeful that someday we'll get back to having a real discussion on making sure the Caterpillars of the State of Illinois want to stay and do business here in Illinois and this is a way we could have gotten that done. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The last speaker will be Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bradley, you're smiling back there. It's always good to have the notoriety of doing a... an important Bill and that seems to me where you're at, and the more we put it down the more you get to do it. Now, I happen to know and have worked with Director McRaith and I can't believe that he couldn't give you better numbers if he wanted to. I know he could and it just... my feeling is that you haven't taken them. Also, you're very popular about doing your Bill Clinton imitation, well, I'll tell you my hom... my home district has Hillary and I've met Bill, and you're no Bill Clinton. So, you can just keep right on doing that and smiling, but I think if you were smart what you would do is you would come up with a real Bill so that when we walk out of here we actually accomplish something which very rarely we do at the end of Session. And I sure think the director could

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

certainly come up with the figures if you asked him because I know he's talented and able to do that. No, it isn't awful. I've met him. So, I think that if you wanted to because you've worked on this for a while and though you've cut our guys, at some point, you could come up with a really good Bill and accomplish this and then it would be done and you'd walk out of here with a really big accomplishment. So, why don't you try that?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley to close. Mr. Bradley, just want to ask for a 'yes' vote? The Gentleman..."

"My grandfather Bradley got me started in politics, told me what you do for yourself dies when you die, what you do for others lives on and on and on. We have an opportunity here to do something historic. We have an opportunity here to do something that no other Legislature has done in 100 years. We have an opportunity to save Illinois business upwards of \$500 million. We have opportunity to address intoxication, to address standards, to address utilization review, to address wage differential, to address the second highest fee schedule in United States, only behind Alaska. We have opportunity to limit carpal tunnel injuries to stop what happened at Menard. We have an opportunity to put the hands of the arbitrators' confirmations in the Senate. We have an opportunity to beef up the fraud unit, to fix a broken system. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, and the people of the State of Illinois, I ask you, this isn't about me; this isn't about you; this is about the future of our state. This is about the people we represent. Have you lost sight

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

of that? This is about going forward and not staying in the past. This is about doing something historic. This is about whether you're for change, whether you're for doing something different, whether you're for fixing broken systems or you're for the status quo. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "There has been a request for a verification. All Members will be in their chairs. All Members will be in their chairs. The question is, 'Shall the... the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #3 and 5?' 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 62 people voting 'yes', 43 people voting 'no'. There is a request for a verification. Mr. Stephens. Mr. Stephens. Turn on Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Did you have a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Do you have any questions of those voting in the affirmative?"

Stephens: "I haven't heard the names read, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the names of those voting 'yes'."

Clerk Mahoney: "Voting in the affirmative are: Representatives Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Biss; Bradley; Burke, D.; Burke, K.; Carli; Cassidy; Chapa LaVia; Colvin; Crespo; Cunningham; Currie; D'Amico; Davis, M.; DeLuca; du Buclet; Dugan; Dunkin; Farnham; Feigenholtz; Flowers; Ford; Franks; Gabel; Golar; Gordon; Harris, G.; Hernandez; Holbrook; Jackson; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Jones; Lilly; Lyons; Mautino; May; Mayfield; McAsey; McCarthy; McGuire; Mell;

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mussman; Nekritz; Nybo; Phelps; Reitz; Riley; Rita; Sente; Smith; Soto; Thapedi; Turner; Verschoore; Williams; Yarbrough; Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens, are there any questions?"

- Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, this place is run by rules and due process and I appreciate your honoring that. I have no questions."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. There are 62 people voting 'yes', 43 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #3 and 5. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Mr. Mautino seek recognition?"
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which the Bill passed. Mr. Bradley moves to lay that Motion on the table. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is put upon the table.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Committee Reports. Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1556. Representative Dan Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 435, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 63, Floor Amendment

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

#2 to Senate Bill 335, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill
2405 and a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 1716."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege, if we could have some order, please."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point, Mr. Watson."

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Mr. Speaker, if we could have some order for a second. The purpose of the legislation that we just passed, and I believe that all groups are sincere, is to put more Illinoisans to work, is to create an environment where we put more people to work. All I ask... all I ask from each one of you on both sides of this issue and in the press, is a year from now or two years from now quantify this vote. Does this really make a difference? Can you really address workers' compensation without getting into causation and some of the other factors? If I am wrong and you can, I will give you kudos, but if you cannot, then let us heed the results. Let us come back together and not just make this a victory lap and something we'll have a press pop on tomorrow. Let us re... if you're really sincere about putting Illinoisans to work, let us come back and address this one year from now or two years from now. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege. Please let the record reflect that I intended to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 2188. Thank you."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Madigan: "Representative, your statement will be reflected in the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 42. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 42's been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Beiser on Amendment #3."
- Beiser: "Yes. I would ask the adoption of House Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 42."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any furthers Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beiser."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 42 as amended is a issue that... to address an issue in my district for a company called Olin Brass. And it basically allows IDOT, the secretary of IDOT, excuse me, to issue a permit for any loads that will exceed the gross vehicle weight limit. There are four conditions that the secretary has to approve before he would do this. I would be happy to answer any questions."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr... Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Thank you. Representative Beiser, very quickly, there was some opposition to this Bill as it was introduced. The Floor Amendment that we adopted moments ago, I think remove… removes that opposition. Is that correct?"

Beiser: "Yes. The Illinois State Police are neutral."

Eddy: "And IDOT?"

Beiser: "IDOT has no position."

Eddy: "Okay."

Beiser: "But I've worked with Secretary Hannig. In fact, this is Secretary Hannig's language."

Eddy: "Now, the only group that I find still opposed is... are
the county engineers."

Beiser: "I talked to them. My county engineer in Madison County is in favor of this. The village engineer in the Village of East Alton which covers three-quarters of this route that would be covered is in favor of it. Quite honestly, Roger, I believe because of the late hour and the holiday weekend I was not able to get any documentation to that effect, but we did have a meeting on the phone Friday afternoon with the county officials."

Eddy: "So, does this just... just cover a certain amount of land in your area?"

Beiser: "Yes. There's... We have two facilities. We have the casting facility and in 2.2 miles away, there's a finishing facility. Three-quart... that's 2.2 miles. Three-quarters of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

a mile is on state road and that's why we're requesting this. We've been working with our District 8 IDOT. I've been in speaking with Secretary Hannig. He requested this legislation just to be sure that we follow the federal guidelines."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you very much. Very quickly, to the Bill and I understand your local situation. I think there's some concern among county engineers that this could be easily replicated in other parts of the state and they do have some concerns. They want to make sure that, you know, that this type of permitting doesn't cause problems, budgets are limited. So, I have heard from my county engineers. Everybody would like to help certain situations, but they still have some concerns as a group about the possibility of this expanding, being replicated and there being some concern for road conditions. So, thank you for the questions... or the answers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill.

The Gentleman brings forth a Bill that will help jobs in his district. Olin Brass is a big employer and they need some of these changes to maintain their viability here. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Just very quickly and I'm sorry I missed the debate.

There are a lot of things going on here on the floor. This basically just allows the weight to be distributed."

Beiser: "Yes, Representative Bost. I failed to mention that.

These will be specially designed trailers that will take

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

the existing imprint and spread it out so it does not... not increase the imprint on the local roads."

Bost: "Right."

Beiser: "Thank you."

Bost: "And... and Members of the chamber, I want you to understand. We have what's known as a Bridge Law in the State of Illinois and that Bridge Law is based on engineering design of how that weight is distributed. These vehicles are built specially so that the road does not take a heavier impact than a normal vehicle. It just allows them to go higher gross, but it still distributes over a greater period. I support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beiser to close."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Real quickly to Mr... Representative Eddy's point with the county engineers. I feel very strongly in speaking with them, had we had more time we could have worked this out. Secretary Hannig has asked for this language noting that we would have these issues and I believe that any time there would be a request that Secretary Hannig has this language such that he could address each and individual in his... each and every individual issue. So, I'd appreciate the... an 'aye' vote on this Senate Bill 42 as amended."

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? Have all voted who wish? Bellock. The Clerk shall
take the record. On this question, there are 102 people
voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill... Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: on the Order of Concurrence, recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1723."

Speaker Madigan: "Page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1914.

Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1914 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment 3 and 4 have both been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment 3 and 4."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz on Amendment #3."

Reitz: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3, I'd like to adopt Amendment #3. I think it takes the City of Chicago out of this."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman moves for the..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you. We'd like to adopt Amendment #3. This has to do with markings for no trespassing. And this would take the City of Chicago out of this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #4 by Rei... Representative Reitz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Reitz: "Thank you. Number 4 becomes the Bill and basically says that they won't have tres... it'll... purple markings will determine no trespassing."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1914, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."
- Reitz: "Thank you. This Bill will just allow purple markings for no trespassing. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Bost: "Sorry. I just have some specific questions. How do we notify the general public that all of a sudden a purple is the tres… no trespassing sign? I'm... I'm trying to..."
- Reitz: "This has been used in other states and this is an education campaign. It's an issue of the Illinois Forestry Association."
- Bost: "Okay. I didn't know who was going to do the education."
- Reitz: "They're starting it right now."
- Bost: "Oh good. Everybody, you better listen up. If you see a purple tree, don't go past it. Right?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Reitz: "Post, not a tree."

Bost: "Oh, a purple post. I'm sorry."

Reitz: "We don't mark trees."

Bost: "Don't mark trees, purple post. Okay. Thank you."

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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 335. The Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 335. This is the finance... this is the finance budget and limitation Bill. And what this does is to create a certain number of transfers from one fund to another. And I think the people in the Executive Committee heard more than they wanted to hear about it. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions or better yet, put the Amendment on the Bill and discuss it on Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Currie: "Technical Amendment. I'd like to adopt this Amendment as well."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "On Third."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Third."

Speaker Madigan: "Withdraws. The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 335, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, again. This is the finance budget implementation Bill. With... makes various kinds of transfers some of them responsive to substantive Bills that we have passed or budgetary decisions we have made this Session. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a potential conflict,

I'm going to be voting 'present' on the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "Leader Currie, I have a question regarding the Corporate Personal Property Replacement Fund. My understanding is that this implementation Bill would allow for a portion of the CPPRT collected to go toward local salaries?"
- Currie: "Stipends for local assessing and other officials. And what this language does, Representative, is reflect the decisions that were made in the budget Bills that had passed in this chamber."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, I've had some questions related to the distribution of Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax to school districts. And I want to make sure that we understand where that is paid. That... that's actually a subtraction at the very end of the formula and it doesn't affect the calculation of General State Aid and really if they don't get Corporate Personal Property Replacement they would more state aid?"

Currie: "I believe that's right."

Eddy: "So, if a school district, either alternative or foundation level, receives a calculation that says here's how much General State Aid you have; you subtract EAV and local... or the Corporate Personal Property Replacement. So, this does not have a negative effect unless maybe you're a flat grant district?"

Currie: "Exactly."

Eddy: "Okay. And as you mentioned, the purpose of this is to allow the use of this... these funds for those stipends as part of an agreement on the overall budget?"

Currie: "Correct."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative Currie, my question pertains to the subsidies that are being made to Pace, Paratransit, RTA, and Amtrak are those in accordance with the amounts that we allocated in the Public Safety Committee?"

Currie: "Indeed they are and we did this last year as well and if they had not come from this fund, they would have come from the General Revenue Fund."

Reis: "Well, just to clarify, the thing that we did different this year and it was an agreement between both caucuses... or both sides of the aisle in the Public Safety Committee was that... was that the entire Amtrak subsidy would be paid out of the entire states road fund, but that only 55 percent would come out of District 1 for RTA and Pace. And I just wanted to make sure that those two subsidies were coming out of the road fund, but the rest of it was coming out of GRF?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. And I just want to make sure that everybody knows that this is something that we agreed to in the Public Safety Committee. They may not approve of it overall but this is just for one year. And...

Currie: "This is for one year."

Reis: "Sorry, Representative. To the Bill. I just want to make sure everybody knows that this is just for one year and that District 1 is making their share. But the rest of the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- state is not coming out of the road fund; it's still coming out of GRF. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill.

 Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 92 people voting 'yes', 20 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Yarbrough."
- Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, please."
- Speaker Madigan: "State your point."
- Yarbrough: "I want to acknowledge the Governor of the State of Illinois on the floor. Right up there with you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Madigan: "On page 11 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2405. Representative Currie. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2405's on the Order of Second Reading and has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino on the Amendment."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a supplemental for fiscal year '11. It increases the appropriation for the Healthcare Provider Relief Fund by \$1,388,300,000 so that the Department of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Family Services can pay Medicaid bills. And this is possible thanks to the 'bimp' Bill language that allowed this to be done through interfund transfers. Second, it makes a change. Basically, in the budget Bills which reach the Governor's desk, we had a misnumbering. Basically, two... two items were listed as 2011 when it should have listed as 2012. And that's the technical correction. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote and adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read it for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2405, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. The Amendments became the Bill. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. This is simply the supplemental appropriation. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, could you please tell us where we're going to get this \$1,388,300,000?"

Mautino: "Yes. This would be done under the Governor's powers for interfund borrowing. Basically, there are a few funds that can be utilized here. One was the GOBRI fund, the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

water development fund, as an example, so he could take those, do a short-term borrowing and then use this to pay down some of that massive backlog of bills."

Franks: "So, this will be a short-term borrowing where we'll get a 57 percent match from the Federal Government instead of a 50 percent match if we would wait, correct? So, we'll get a... assessed..."

Mautino: "Yes. This takes care of the enhanced match."

Franks: "So, we'll get 7 percent more if we do this. Now, when you say short-term borrowing, how long is this short-term borrowing?"

Mautino: "There's... there's a couple ways that I just explained to you as far as how they could do that, but this is just the approp. There's no borrowing in the... Longest period would be an 18-month period, if that route was chosen, but that's not what's... This Bill itself is just the spending authority or approp so that we can get the maximum Medicaid match."

Franks: "I just want to make sure that if we borrow that it's going to be repaid and if it's not repaid on a timely basis, there'll be penalties paid to those funds."

Mautino: "We're borrowing from ourselves, from our current funds, so..."

Franks: "No, I understand, but oftentimes when you steal from...
well, borrow from funds..."

Mautino: "And we do have to pay interest."

Franks: "That's what I... Okay. We're going to pay interest.

That's what I needed to know. This will be a net gain for the state by doing a short-term borrow."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mautino: "Actually, it's about \$95 million net gain to the state."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, there's references in here to the SURS, to the Education Assistance Fund. And can you explain what those references mean?"

Mautino: "House Amendment 2 became the Bill. Hold on one second."

Eddy: "Okay."

Mautino: "The Bill makes the technical changes to two Bills:

House Bill 2168 and House Bill 3700. The dates on those

were incorrect. It's... Those Bills were listed as 2011

appropriations and this makes them 2012. So, the date was

wrong and that corrects that."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. Let me ask you about the funds that are going to be used. I think we protected a couple of funds in the original legislation that allows the authority to gather funds, to make the payment so that we can get the match?"

Mautino: "Yeah. This is actually just the appropriation. Now, the previous Bills which talked about what funds could be used. Those are on the Governor's desk and those were lined out. This is simply the authority to go up to \$1,388,800,000."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. I... I..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mautino: "I believe you... what you had there was the analysis of the underlying Bill, but the Amendment became the Bill. So, that's gone."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mautino moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Colvin. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 2169. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "21... Senate Bill 2169 has been read a second time, previously. Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 2169, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reitz."

Reitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a power holding Bill that we passed last year. It would turn coal into synthetic natural gas, create over two thousand jobs, provide four construction seasons and... and have at least 700 new permanent coal mining and plant jobs. I think this legis... this is similar to the Leucadia Bill as far as

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

making gas out of this. I can tell you that the Illinois Power Authority has deemed that this project will have zero impact on both residential and industrial users. We took the Veto message last year and worked with the people that were opposed. We have CUB and the Attorney General's Office are both neutral on this Bill. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of the Bill. This is a movement like we have done with the other Bills that were moved earlier tonight. These are true job providing measures. We did deal with the fact that there were some concerns that the Governor had last year, when we tried to move this legislation. The Sponsor has done a great job of working on this to move it forward. This will provide a tremendous amount of jobs to central and southern Illinois. I'd appreciate and encourage your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have been talking about jobs. The coal mine is a real job for a man and we need them in southern Illinois. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Colvin."

Colvin: "Real brief... real briefly, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. As two previous speakers have spoken, there is a lot of similarity between the Leucadia and the power holdings Bill here, but more importantly, this is a Bill about securing energy for the future of our energy

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

supply and creating an awful lot of jobs and expanding tax base at the same time. Those of us who are interested in accomplishing these three great goals will vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

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? Have all voted who wish? Mayfield. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 71 people voting 'yes'; 44 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Mr. Ford seek recognition?"

Ford: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make an announcement. After voting for a lot of Bills, I'm just announcing to the people of the 8th District that they should move downstate and apply for some jobs. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "On page 5 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 63. Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 63 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

Committee Amendment #2 was tabled. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross on the Amendment."

Cross: "I'd moved to adopt Amendment #3."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 63, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a fairly simple Bill. Right now, there are three counties that make up the 16th Judicial Circuit: Kane, Kendall and DeKalb. This splits the counties apart between Kane, which will stay separate and puts Kendall and DeKalb into its own circuit, the 23rd. I'm not aware of any opposition. The chief judge of the 16th who resides in Kane is supportive of this split as is Justice Thomas. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1586. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1586 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #1's adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski on the Amendment."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to adopt the Amendment which shall make a technical change regarding the veterans' referendum issue."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "I'd like to ask a question of the speaker... or the Sponsor, if I could, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman... the Sponsor yields."
- Reis: "Representative, there was substantial opposition to this Bill in committee this afternoon. We got this language this morning, 140 pages. Why didn't this Amendment go back to committee so that the County Clerks and especially the Cook County Clerk could have a chance to see the Amendment and see if it addressed their concerns?"
- Zalewski: "Representative, the Amendment is more restrictive than what was presented in committee. I think it certainly addresses the concerns we heard in committee with regard to this specific aspect and therefore, answer your question."
- Reis: "Well, it was brought up several times in committee that we're rushing this Bill through; there's a lot of unanswered questions. We are going to fundamentally change elections in Illinois, going to a California-style referendum while narrow... for just veterans issues, but there was a lot of concern in committee about this Bill. We think it's moving too fast. I think if the Amendment should have went back to committee so that the people could have seen it and commented on it. They can't comment on the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

floor. I don't know why we're rushing this Bill through tonight at the eleventh hour. The Bill was just introduced today. I think that we should pull this back and give time for the Amendment and the whole Bill to be aired out this summer."

Zalewski: "Again, Representative, I would reiterate what... what is presented in the Amendment, that I'm wishing to adopted, is far more restrictive than what was originally proposed in the Bill... in the Bill and addresses the concerns with respect to these referenda that if... if there is a funding revenue or appropriations issue relative to what's being put forth, that has to go through the corporate authorities. So, with specific respect to your point, I would suggest because the Amendment is more restrictive than what the committee heard this afternoon it's appropriate for it to go from Rules to the floor."

Reis: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative Zalewski, the hour's late and I know that you and... we've worked together on a couple provisions of this Bill and I just wanted to say thanks for that. I'm... don't want to speak to the rest of the Bill, but I wanted to say thanks, you're a man of your word."

Zalewski: "You're welcome, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, wonder why there's some of the provisions in here like it permits the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

reproduction of absentee ballot applications. I mean, currently, you can only get one from an election authority. So, you can just copy one as... and you don't know where it came from."

Zalewski: "Rep..."

Mulligan: "It's not from the pit..."

Zalewski: "...Representative, perhaps I can reset the posture of where we're at right now. We're talking about the adoption of the Amendment. We're not talking about the Bill in chief, so be happy to answer those questions on Third."

Mulligan: "All right. So, in the Amendment, just what's added to the Amendment that... the extension of..."

Zalewski: "We're asking to adopt..."

Mulligan: "...the grace period voting?"

Zalewski: "No. We're asking you adopt an Amendment which restricts an item in the Bill related to ballot questions on veterans' issues. This Amendment would simply say that if it... if there's a revenue expenditure and appropriations involved, that that matter has to go before the corporate authority before it's implemented."

Mulligan: "All right. I'll wait 'til the Bill is presented."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. However, notes have been requested and not yet received."

Speaker Madigan: "So, the Bill shall remain on the Order of Second Reading. On page 8 of the Calendar there appears

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Senate Bill 620. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 620's been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I Motion to adopt Amendment #3 which gut and replaces and becomes the Bill. A little history on this Bill. In the 96th General Assembly, 2010, we, in this chamber, passed House Bill 363 to create a Chicago (sic-Educational) Facilities Task Force to come up with a recommendation to address school closures and school actions only in Chicago. This Bill has been a year in the making with as much as four to six hours twice a week and even sometimes more. Senate Bill 620 is based on many of the recommendations made by the Chicago Facilities Education (sic-Educational) Task Force which problems related to school closures and facility disparities in the City of Chicago. House Amendment #3 preserves the core of the element on the underlaying Bill... underlying Bill. There is no opponents to this Bill. And I would also like to take a moment to thank the members of the Facilities Task Force, a bipartisan task force. Senate Bill 620 cochairs were Heather Steans, myself, Senator Iris Martinez, Senator William Delgado. I'd like to also thank State Representative Golar, State Representative Pritchard, Saviano, Ken Dunkin and also volunteer advisors Roger Eddy, Jerry Mitchell. Organizations on this task force: Homeless

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Coalition, Designs for Change; President Clarice Berry from the Chicago Principals Association and Administrators; Dr. Nona Burney; CPS administrators: Bill Gerstein, Bob Runcie, pro bono; national expert on education and best practices from Washington, D.C., Mary Gallardo, pro bono; advisor Jackie Leavy. Thank you, John Keigher, task force attorney. Mayor Dal... Mayor Rahm Emanuel, representative... Mayor Rahm Emanuel's representative here in Springfield, Mike Ruemmler. Thank you. You guys are the best. I really appreciate all you've done. I urge an 'aye' vote and appreciate it. Thank you. There is no opponent..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple of seconds. I'd like to commend the young Lady on her hard work on this Bill. This has been a year in the making. And what she really intended to do at the beginning of this Bill was to bring some sunlight into the process of school closings, how facilities are repaired and how the Chicago Public Schools takes care of their children within their facilities. I think this is a great first step. She didn't get everything she wanted. She showed her negotiating skills. And this Bill is the beginning of us really understanding how the process works in Chicago. I think it's a great Bill and I commend the Lady and urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 620, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Bill has been adequately debated. The Chair recognizes Mr. Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was waiting until we got to Third to make some comments. It was my pleasure to work with the Representative on this Bill. And she has been tenacious in trying to gather the information to try to work with communities that have questions about why their schools aren't being repaired, why they're being closed and why new buildings are being built in certain districts and not others. I compliment her for what she's trying to do here and this transparency, I think, will serve all of us. I urge 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This
 Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
 declared passed. Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to reflect on Senate Bill 2169 that I wish to have voted 'yes'."
- Speaker Madigan: "The record will reflect your intention. On page 17 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1574.

 Representative Hernandez."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. Motion to Concur, Senate Bill...

Senate Amendment #1... #1 with House Bill 1574. The Bill

becomes an agreed Bill. This Bill will help prevent renters

from losing their security deposits because their landlord

has lost the property in foreclosure. I ask for an 'aye'

vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, what exactly did the Senate Amendment do to the Bill? I think the underlying Bill everybody pretty much understood. It made provisions for the transfer of security deposits, but what... what did they do over in the Senate?"

Hernandez: "What had happened is that we ran out of time to try to make the Amendment in the House, so we said that we were going to do this in the Senate and bring it back. But what it does... it does three things. In the rental property with five or more units, the foreclosure court will automatically order the transfer of security deposits and an accounting of those deposits to the bank or other buyer at foreclosure at the end of the foreclosure case. And then 2) when the bank has transferred the deposit, it will become responsible for security deposits like any other landlord. And 3) the bank that has transferred the security deposits must notify tenants that it has received the deposits. Now, the financial institutions are in agreement with this."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "So, the 21 days that was to be within the receipt of the security deposit is now in rec... after the receipt of the security deposit. Is that... that pretty much..."

Hernandez: "Yes."

Eddy: "...what was done to satisfy the opponents?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

Eddy: "So, at this point, there are no opponents. Those ind...
the groups: the credit union league, the bankers, community
bankers and the Illinois Bankers Association are neutral on
the Bill based on that clarification of the 21 days."

Hernandez: "That's correct, Representative."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Hernandez moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1574. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 114 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1574. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 1909. Representative Gordon. Representative Gordon, 1909."

Gordon, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to concur with Senate Amendment 2. Senate Amendment 2 expands the content of a notice of violation and it modifies the definition of 'repeat offender'. Senate Amendment 1 does two things. The code enforcement officer of the county where the violation is alleged may serve a notice of the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

violation subject to the approval of the ordinance administrator. It also clarifies the date to appear should be no sooner than 15 days after it is served to the owner. This Amendment was offered to address a concern that were expressed in the committee. I am open for any questions and I move for concurrence."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1909. The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, the Bankers Association opposes this because a notice to appear could be issued to a lender. Did that get changed?"

Gordon, J.: "Yes, it did."

Eddy: "Okay. And then the Realtors were also opposed, but I believe they are now neutral on the Bill?"

Gordon, J.: "Yes, they are."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1909?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair... the Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 113 people voting 'yes', 1 person voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1909. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 18 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2804. Mr. Reis."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment in the Senate simply makes sure that the deer processors are a member of the Illinois Sportsmen Against Hunger, that they keep additional records and that meat processors... that meat must be tagged and labeled. This was a suggestion of IDNR and I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804?' 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 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2804. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #3, on the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 1716. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This... I move that we concur in Amendment 1 to Senate Bill... House Bill 1716. This is an initiative of the Attorney General, Lisa Madigan, who has been a champion for the Freedom of Information program. She was the prime author of last year's significant changes, but after a year in operation it becomes clear that some things don't work as effectively as they might. This Bill makes three significant changes, some smaller ones as well. First, under the current law, if a local government wants to redact the name of somebody in responding to a request for information, they must first check with the public access counselor. Public access

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

counselor can't tell them at that stage whether they must or must not, so what you've got is a huge backlog of requests, an extra step in the process that helps not the requestor of the information, is cumbersome for the Attorney General's Office and doesn't help the local government. So, we eliminate that requirement. Second, there is a provision that would allow people requesting information of a commercial nature, something that's going to actually to help them in their business model, that they can and in some circumstances, charge the commercial requestor some money. And finally... finally, if somebody is a frequent repeat requestor the public body has additional time to respond to those requests. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd be pleased for your support for this measure from our Attorney General."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the House to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1716. On this question, the House recognizes Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?

 Representative Currie, the definition of a 'recurrent requestor'. That's a person I guess that requests a lot of Freedom of Information Act information. And how is someone defined as a 'recurrent requestor'?"
- Currie: "At least 50 requests, a... no, at least 15 requests during a 30-day period or 7 requests within a 7-day period to the same public body. And understand, that if you make one request and there are many sub-parts to the request, that counts as one request. So, we're talking about somebody who may be standing there at the counter filing

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

request after request after request. And all this does, this doesn't say the public body can deny the request, it just gives them a little extra time to respond to a request from somebody who has repeated at the level at which I've just described."

Eddy: "So, the increase in time becomes 21 days. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Right."

Eddy: "So, they can continue to request some times... well, you mentioned some numbers: 15 requests in a 30-day period, 7 in a 7-day period and then the public body can take more time. What about any ability for the public body to charge? Is there anything..."

Currie: "That would only apply to people who are making commercial requests and only to the extent that the time involved from the public body is significant. So, if someone's already spending eight hours... someone who has spent eight hours searching for, retrieving a record, the actual cost of retrieving and transporting from an off-site facility that after that eight-hour period the commercial requestor can be charged \$10 for each additional hour. But only someone making a request for commercial purposes."

Eddy: "Okay. All right. What about the Press Association... where are they at with this now?"

Currie: "The Press Association has no objection to the Bill."

Eddy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1716. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 84 people voting 'yes', 31 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1716. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Senate Bill 1586. 1586."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1586 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 are adopted to the Bill. No Motions... all Motions have been withdrawn."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1586, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1586 is the...
 well, it was..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."
- Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we could just have a little bit of time. We're going to check to see the origin of that note to make sure we've not..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Yeah. We'll take that out... Take the Bill out of the record. On Supplemental Calendar #3 there appears House Bill 3039. Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 3039."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... I'm sorry. I'd like to... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Representative, there was some opposition to this Bill. Has the opposition now been removed with this Amendment?"

Lilly: "As far as I know, yes."

Osmond: "So, Blue Cross Blue Shield is fine with it?"

Lilly: "Yes, they did, they worked with us on this Amendment."

Osmond: "All right. Thank you very much."

Lilly: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3039?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3039. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Resolution 271. HJR34. HJR34, Representative Yarbrough. Representative Yarbrough. HJR34."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 34 is a Resolution that enters the findings regarding air pollution and its effects on human health and states that the House of Representatives and Senate support the United States Environmental Protection Agency in its efforts to protect Illinois from pollutants. I ask for your vote."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Representative Reis."

Reitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a lot of talk in Washington about the far-reaching effort that the U.S. EPA has been engaged Circumventing the Congressional process, legislative process in Washington, D.C. and kind of doing what the administration says it should be doing. Part of this Resolution says that the U.S. EPA has a proven track record of cleaning up pollutants and they're taking that to the extreme. U.S. EPA is poised to set a number of stan... new standards under the Clean Air Act. I don't think that in the resolve that we should support the EPA in its efforts. It also says in the resolve that we oppose any efforts in Congress to weaken the EPA's ability to set these standards. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no one in the EPA is elected. Your Congressmen or your Congresswomen are elected. They should have some say in this. And we should not be sending a message to them that they have a free run to regulate and circumvent the legislative process. I would urge a 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, I would request a Roll Call on this Resolution."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. We've stood on this House Floor this very day and talked a lot about how Illinois has such fine coal reserves and the importance of creating Illinois jobs based on utilizing those coal reserves in a proper manner to preserve air quality. However, these EPA rules are being rushed into

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

implementation without any regard for the impact that we are having on coal burning power plants. There's not been adequate examination of the impact this will have on coal reserves or the U.S. economy. Power plants are either going to be forced to install costly control equipment or faust into... forced into early retirement which of course will resort in high... result in higher energy costs that will impair our nation's economy. We should not stand for a Resolution that would cause any harm to our coal burning power plants at this time. So, I urge a 'no' vote on this. It's not necessary. It's not something we need to do. And I very much urge we send a message and not support this Resolution."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, you know, quite often we have people from the D.C. that... that push aggressively against things that... that are very important to us. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a product in coal that allows us the opportunity to use an energy source that allows us the opportunity to provide jobs, but unfortunately, this is something we shouldn't be involved with. We should let the Federal Government do what they've got to do. They... they argue their points, they do all that, but when it comes to this, we should be looking out for our jobs, our people, our concerns. When the Clean Air Act passed years ago, the Clean Air Act devastated the jobs in southern Illinois. And they pushed forward with some things that later on proved out that didn't... didn't exactly represent or didn't exactly prove out for what they

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

tried to represent. I encourage people to vote 'no' on this. And I'd appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. This is about... this is about mercury, this is about nitric oxide, this is about sulfur dioxide. This is about the pollutants that we're putting into our air and trying to get a handle on that so that our human health is not affected or is less affected by it. Earlier today, a number of people on this floor voted for the clean coal technology, so we're trying to move in the right direction, but we won't get there unless we ask these old polluting plant to close down or do better. And so, I think this is actually helpful to moving Illinois in the right direction on clean coal technology and... and getting the Federal Government to help us in that effort. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Yarbrough to close."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the previous speaker. We want to clean up the dangerous air pollution including mercury, lead, soot, smog and carbon pollution. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Resolution be adopted?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 59 people voting 'yes', 56 people voting 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 271, Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 271 simply urges our President from this very state, President Barack Obama; the United States Drug Enforcement Agency, the United States Food and Drug Administration, the United States Attorney General and all other relevant agencies in the Executive Branch of the United States Government to take immediate steps to remove barriers that prevent Illinois and other American farmers from growing industrial hemp. I would ask and encourage an 'aye' vote. I'll take questions."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, somehow I'm traveling back in time to another hemp Bill. Of course, this is a hemp Resolution, but I think... I think when you introduced the hemp Bill for Illinois, we had a kind of a... at least a bit of a problem in this chamber with that. Do you remember that?"

Dunkin: "Can you repeat that, Sir?"

Eddy: "Yeah. If you remember the issue related to the hemp Bill earlier this year. I think there was a vote on that."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Eddy: "And now, I think this Resolution... you know, I didn't think you'd try to get the trophy back the same day you lost it. I thought you'd wait a while, but... The hemp Bill didn't make it, did it, this year?"

Dunkin: "No. We fell short by a few votes."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Okay. So, this Resolution it takes a different tactic.

It kind of deals... you couldn't win at the state, so you're urging the Federal Government to intervene?"

Dunkin: "Yes. That was per the request of the Body here. I understand that... especially our downstate farmers, if I can recall, I know it's been a long Session, that if I had come up with a House Resolution that a lot Members can support it. Especially encouraging the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Attorney General and the U.S. President, of course, and all of those other key executive officers or agencies of our Federal Government to... just took a different perspective on industrialized hemp and the benefits certainly here in our state to make sure that we are a part of the cutting edge 21st century."

Eddy: "Have you heard from the Family Institute or the Illinois
Church Action Council on the Resolution 'cause they were
pretty strongly opposed to the original Bill, the hemp
Bill. Are they... what do they say about the Resolution?"

Dunkin: "The Family Institute?"

Eddy: "Yeah."

Dunkin: "You know, I did not hear from them on this. I did hear, however, from the Illinois Farm Bureau. Yeah, they're still a proponent."

Eddy: "Thank you, Representative."

Dunkin: "Representative... Rep..."

Eddy: "You're at least tenacious on the issue. I absolutely admire the fact that you would try again at the federal level after losing the Bill at the state level."

Dunkin: "Yeah, but..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Eddy: "Good luck to you."

Dunkin: "...again, well, Leader, that was a... you know, this Bill is in response to many Members here on this floor. They said, look, let's do a House Resolution encouraging the Federal Government to allow Illinoisans to produce industrialized hemp because the reality is..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin..."

Dunkin: "...hemp is a major product in this state..."

Speaker Madigan: "...Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "...hemp cereal, hemp waffles, hemp bags, hemp ceilings."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dunkin, there was no one else seeking recognition. I propose that we go to Roll Call. Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 21 people voting 'yes', 92 people voting 'no'. The Resolution fails. On Supplemental Calendar #4 there appears House Bill 1723. Mr. Holbrook. Mr. Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment... Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1723. This is identical to the Bill, House Bill 18... or excuse me... 815, we moved over, the agreement between the IMEA and Exelon. They voluntarily come up with additional funds to provide the federal security systems and remote systems for our nuclear power plants. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Madigan: "And the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1723?' Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Eddy: "...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know about you, but I thought he was going to do it. He was close, a pretty good effort. Representative, can you give us an idea of what the Senate did to this after we sent it over because..."
- Holbrook: "They did... they did their usual, absolutely nothing.

 Didn't get to it in time and had to stick it on a Bill and send it back to us."
- Eddy: "So, what was the... what was the Bill that it went out on?"
- Holbrook: "It went on House Bill 815."
- Eddy: "And what... was there opposition on 815 when it left the chamber?"
- Holbrook: "There were a few 'no' votes. I... But there's no known opposition to the Bill. It's an agreement between Exelon and IMEA to meet the fed... many of the new standards needed for our enforcement and introduction of the remote sensors used our nuclear power plants."
- Eddy: "Okay. So, really those that were... objected to the original House Bill that you mentioned, there wasn't any action taken in the Senate that changed any of that. They just simply took the language on a Bill that you passed out because they basically dropped the ball."

Holbrook: "Correct."

Eddy: "And they sent it back on this Bill for concurrence. So, those people out of fairness who may be have objected to the original Bill may still have some objections..."

Holbrook: "Sure."

Eddy: "...'cause there wasn't any change. Thank you."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Holbrook: "If they don't think Exelon should give us the money to monitor our nuclear power plants, they can vote 'no'."

Eddy: "All right. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1723?' Those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 69 people voting 'yes', 44 people voting 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1723. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1586, Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've resolved those issues. Senate Bill 1586 is an elections omnibus Bill that contains several positive reforms to the elections process. There are several items in the Bill, most of which have been thoroughly discussed over the course of the spring Session, some of which have not, but deal with veterans' issues pertaining to referendum questions. With the Amendment I adopted a few minutes ago, I hope we addressed those concerns. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I'd be happy to take questions about individual components of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Eddy: "Representative, there was a... there was a state mandates fiscal note placed on the Bill and it's been returned. And

70th Legislative Day

- it's very clear from the analysis of the fiscal note, that Senate Bill 1586 as amended by House Amendment 1 does create a state mandate and there's a cost involved. Is there a... is there anything in the revenue stream that's going to pay for the implementation?"
- Zalewski: "What... what specifically are you referring to when you say there's a cost involved, Representative?"
- Eddy: "Well, I mean, are there mandates in the legislation that will require implementation related to the changes that will cost money, locally?"
- Zalewski: "I mean, with respect to... with respect to what's in the Bill, I mean, any discussion we've had about the Bill has not centered at all around the cost. It centered around the policy and being implemented and the various aspects of the Bill."
- Eddy: "Well, I understand that, but there's a cost involved to implement that policy."
- Zalewski: "I will just add that the only mandate that is involved in the Bill is the mandates placed upon it by the State Board of Elections. We're not giving them any more money to carry out their function or any new duties."
- Eddy: "Well, are you saying that there are no mandates in this Bill for clerks?"
- Zalewski: "Are you... are you suggesting that the state mandates note affects the clerks?"
- Eddy: "Absolutely do. When you have a mandate that costs money and it's a local cost, then the state mandate does create an expense and it's unfunded."

70th Legislative Day

- Zalewski: "My... my... I would... I would... I thought you might... my understanding was you were referring to the state mandates placed upon state finances. I mean, individually I knew you couldn't make the argument that there are certain costs... mandates placed upon clerks with this Bill."
- Eddy: "Thank you. I appreciate that because it's obvious that there are and it's obvious that there's no money to pay for that, so it's a state mandate that's unfunded."
- Zalewski: "What I would say to you, Representative, that the shifting of the time periods with respect to Election Day are the only additional cost overruns that a county clerk would have to perhaps concern themselves with. Other than that, I would suggest that there's nothing in this Bill that should raise the concern of anyone about what the additional costs would be."
- Eddy: "Well, I appreciate that, but the DCEO has rendered us an opinion that is a little opposite of that. Let me ask you a question about the Bill's intent related to campuses. It seems like that this particular legislation is catering to a certain constituency, purposely and we're talking about students. Would you agree with that?"
- Zalewski: "Would you repeat your question, Representative?"
- Eddy: "Yeah. Would you agree that if you read this you could come to the conclusion that this is catering to a certain constituency?"
- Zalewski: "No, I... What we have heard during the course of discussion about this Bill for a certain college campuses made use of their early voting locations others did not. So, what we've done is with the cooperation of some folks

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

on your side of the aisle try to draw a line between who uses these early voting locations on campuses and who does not. The bigger universities use the voting locations in their student unions, the smaller ones may have a early voting location a block or two away. So, we've done our best to draw that bright line."

Eddy: "Okay. Representative, if you're going to do that, I... my question is, why... why not senior citizens? Why are we ca... we're going to set up special locations and it's very specific to some locations on campuses. What's the purpose of that constituency as opposed to others?"

Zalewski: "I would just say to you, Representative, that with respect to voting in... in large population centers, especially college campuses, there are instances where there needs to be a centralized voting location for these... and it's not just students. It's staff... faculty members, staff, where they can access... I mean..."

Eddy: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...universities are large community places."

Eddy: "Why just SIU and the University of Illinois. Why not... why not NIU? Why not EIU? I mean, what's the..."

Zalewski: "Our feeling... our feeling was the smaller state universities would be... would be better off utilizing the off-campus sites that were made available to them while the larger campuses, there was a compelling need to keep the early voting site on campus."

Eddy: "Well, if that's your purpose and your point, I don't know why... I think that's a good idea at SIU and the University of Illinois. I don't understand how this

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

implementation in certain spots is the best way to do this. What about the… what about the binding referendum language in this?"

Zalewski: "Which specific language are you referring to, Representative?"

Eddy: "The one for veterans."

Zalewski: "So, the Governor requested that as, you know, again, this... there are issues that he's been working on for a very long time. It was in an Amendatory Veto that with questions respecting veterans, ballot questions, they should be given the opportunity to put forth a question affecting veterans and therefore, we included that in the Bill."

Eddy: "So, if I'm reading this correctly, all units of local government... all units of local governments are affected by this mandates related to veterans and a binding referendum?"

Zalewski: "So, what you're... what we're saying in this Bill is that citizens in each local unit of government will have the opportunity to organize, collect their petitions and put forth policy items that will..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "...benefit veterans."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Zalewski, we're going to take this Bill out of the record for a moment. Take this Bill out of the record. On page 8 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1556. 1556. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1556. And if

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

possible, could we amend the Bill and then debate it on Third Reading?"

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1556, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "...present... Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an effort to make sure that management people, management supervisory people in Illinois State Government not just in the Governor's Office but in the Treasurer, or Comptroller, Secretary of State, Attorney General's Office are, in fact, able to serve as managers and not be members of collective bargaining units. What this measure does is to say working at that quite closely with public employee unions that if this Bill were to pass there would be no more than 3,580 people who are currently in a union or have applications pending for union participation that that number could be subject to petitions from the Governor's Office or the Secretary of State or what have you, to say that these people are managers and ought not to be part collective bargaining unit. The ... there are, of course, some 55 thousand state workers today, so these numbers, in fact, are quite small, 1900 on the one hand, 1680 of pending petitions. The reality is that 20 years ago only 80 percent

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

state workforce were members of collective bargaining units. Today that percentage is 96 and if petitions now pending before the State Labor Relations Board are approved, it would be 99 percent. There are some worksites in the Department of Transportation where there is no one in charge. There is no supervisor. There are people who are Deputy Counsels, who are Deputy Directors, who are members of the collective bargaining unit. I think that union activity is terrific and I support the union movement, but I do think you have to have people who are in charge of the operation and I think 99 percent of the workforce, as members of collective bargaining units, turns the idea of running the ship of state totally on its head. It runs it a ground. I would be happy to answer your questions. This, as I say, is a milder version of what we saw during the... during January, but I would certainly appreciate your support for passage of this Bill. I want an efficient State Government and I don't think you can have an efficient State Government if virtually everybody who works in State Government is a member of the collective bargaining unit and there is nobody in charge."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have been given a document from the Governor's Office. They have an excellent staff as many of you know, and particularly Mr. Cameron Schilling who does a great job for them. This document is pretty amazing. Illinois is 95.5 percent represented by a bargaining unit. Compare that to Iowa, 82.1. Connecticut is less. Wisconsin's less. Minnesota's less. New York is less.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Pennsylvania is at 81 percent. As the Majority Leader just said, there needs to be a clearer line of demarcation between management and labor and one of the things I thought a year ago when this happened was so silly is we had a lot of the legislative liaisons that were told to clock out even though the Legislature stayed in past 5:00. And you know, what happens when you have that kind of a question late at night. Well, does this do what it doesn't do, oh, they're gone for the day and they'd be grieved if they were here. When you stop and think about this document from the Governor's Office, Pennsylvania's at 81 percent; we're at 95.5. And that's a pretty strong reason to be for this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, exactly what did the Governor think what's going to happen when he issued two successive letters saying that no one in the union and AFSCME could be fired? Didn't he think everyone was going to join the union? They'd have to be stupid not to. I mean, usually the way we trim the budget in agencies is you trim a little bit of program, you trim a little bit of staff, but he made it so that we had to trim all program and no staff and now he finds that unpalatable. How do you tell people you're out of the union and now you can be fired? How does that work?"

Currie: "Going back to, of course, the history here is long and old. It's a history that long preceded the ascension to the Governorship of the current incumbent. So, I think that we

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- all know what some of those problems were, but I think it's up to us to solve them."
- Mulligan: "Well, I do think it's very interesting that he sent letters out and said that the AFSCME members couldn't be fired and when we were in committee, we'd say the first year, what percentage of your agency was union last year and what's this year? And they all went up. Then the second year went up even more which really made it difficult to cut. So, now you have all union. How do you pick and choose who can no longer be union? Are they going to say that no administrative people can be union any longer?"
- Currie: "The people who have senior management responsibilities. Those are the ones that, under this Bill, will not become part of the collective bargaining unit."
- Mulligan: "I think this Bill is really interesting considering he used this for an election tool and now that it's causing problems in a state budget where we really have hard times, he's got to narrow it back down and he's going back. If I were the union, I'd probably sue and most likely they will because now all of a sudden you're telling them they have to leave the union after you've given them the promise that they're not going to get fired. This is a really unusual Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

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

Mitchell, B.: "Madam Leader, did this Bill go through committee today? Did I miss something?"

Currie: "Did it go through what? Excuse me?"

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Mitchell, B.: "Did this Bill go through committee today?"

Currie: "It did not. We have seen this measure before and several other Bills that have been on the floor this evening did not go through committee either. We're coming to the end of the day, the end of the evening, the end of spring Session. I think the Members of this chamber are familiar with the issues that are raised and solved by passage of Senate Bill 1556."

Mitchell, B.: "Did the State Government Committee meet in the last couple days?"

Currie: "In fact, this Bill has passed the House."

Mitchell, B.: "I realize that. But did this Bill... did the State Government Committee meet in the last several days?"

Currie: "I don't know."

Mitchell, B.: "I do believe that it did. I saw the postings. It's just unusual that this Bill didn't get assigned to committee and instead you bring it to the floor well into the late evening. It just... To the Bill. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. It just seems quite odd that... why Governor Quinn would just a few short months ago call something very similar to this Wisconsin-Scott-style tactics. As a matter of fact, he said... this is the Governor... public employees should be entitled to having democracy in the workplace and a voice at the table. That's what collective bargaining units and unions are all about. And for those that don't believe that, you ought to back and soak your head. He said that on Chris Matthews. On Fox Chicago, he said I believe it's the right of everyday people, if they have the right... if want a union to organize and represent their interests

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

on wages and working conditions, health benefits, that's America. That's what it's all about. I have a lot of differences with unions, this is according to Governor Quinn, that represent state workers, but we sit around the table and we negotiate and work out the details. In Wisconsin, the Governor wants to extinguish the right of everyday people to have a union. That was just our beloved Governor just a few months ago and now, it's changed. I have another question for you, Leader and... Did not these folks... did not these folks who are now in the union that went from merit compensation did they not petition the two previous Governors? Did they not petition Governor Blagojevich and Governor Quinn to leave merit compensation and go into collective bargaining?"

- Currie: "Some of the current... the pending petitions would have happened during this administration, but most of the rest happened before Mr. Quinn took office."
- Mitchell, B.: "I understand that."
- Currie: "And remember some of these people didn't, in fact, petition themselves. The collective bargaining unit petitioned them in."
- Mitchell, B.: "I... I didn't understand your answer Ma'am. Could you repeat that?"
- Currie: "Yeah. What I said was that the ones that are pending and happened under Governor Quinn and this measure would say that some of those pending will not become members of the union and the ones that preceded... preceded the tenure of Governor Quinn."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Mitchell, B.: "But you don't disagree with me that some of these folks that the Governor would like to bring back in to decertify them, so to speak, were petitioned the administration whether it be Governor Blagojevich or Governor Quinn and that the Governors didn't protest at the time."
- Currie: "I think under the prior incumbent that might well be true, as I said, it's, I think, a somewhat sorry history. I think the efforts on the part of the previous incumbent to reward more generously members of collective bargaining units than those who were not also encourage the rust... the rush to collective bargaining. But that is history and today, I think, we have a problem that we, grownups, need to solve."
- Mitchell, B.: "It's a history, a sad history, of Illinois that I didn't vote for Governor... former Governor Blagojevich, but nonetheless, it's just interesting that some of the folks that I know... I was just given some names, Madam Leader, who called the Governor's Office tonight. These are, I believe, good Democrats: Rich Trumka, the National AFL-CIO President; Randi Weingarten, Gerald McEntee, the National President of AFSCME. Some other folks have called the Governor's Office and said, Governor, you decried these tactics just a few short months ago and now you're doing them. I would urge the Body to oppose this."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Feigenholtz: "Representative Currie, do you know what percentage that the Department of Human Services is a bargaining unit?"

Currie: "I believe about 97 percent."

Feigenholtz: "Do you... have you heard complaints like I have about management issues and could you share with the Body what some of those issues may have been?"

Currie: "I think what's happened in that department and in some others is that there's not a sufficient management presence, so it has to devert resources to handle basic office management. People... supervisors are traveling great distances because they don't have anybody at that location who is of the supervisory quality. So, they're wandering about the state in addition to handling their regular responsibilities because we don't have managers in those other locations. So, I think in that agency they have a very hard time operating effectively and expeditiously."

Feigenholtz: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think that this year has been an extraordinary year especially for the House Human Services-Appropriations Committee. We go home with heavy hearts because we've had to make severe, severe cuts and... in... in all levels of government especially in operation. And what we hear time and time again from the directors and from other people in management is how bad morale is in these departments and... and how unproductive... We ask Health and Family Services to apply for waivers. We ask the Department of Aging if they can make... if they can do a waiver to make people Medicaidable and they look at us and they're exhausted and they don't have help to do it.

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill has to become law so that we can make government more efficient. I encourage an 'aye' vote and applaud the Sponsor of the Bill for moving this forward. Let's vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, we had passed this Bill, previously.

What happened to it in the Senate?"

Currie: "Oh, what happened was that it never was called in the Senate."

Franks: "Okay. So, if we pass this tonight, it's going back over to the Senate to be called?"

Currie: "And we are hopeful that it will be called and it will be passed in the State Senate. This is a different Bill. It is one that the Governor's Office has worked closely with the unions on. In fact, I've had nine meetings at least and much of the language in this Bill reflects those discussions and met specific objections from the senior people at AFSMCE."

Franks: "Okay. Is this... is this something that the Governor can do now by Executive Order?"

Currie: "No, it is not."

Franks: "'Cause I've... I've wondered that because these folks are those that have to respond directly to him who are... you're talking about the liaisons, for instance, they're the ones..."

Currie: "Right. Okay."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Franks: "...who would be doing this policy."

Currie: "Right. Well, they don't have to respond directly to them if their major allegiance is not to the person that they serve but to the collective bargaining unit of which they are a member."

Franks: "And the ones that you're trying to exempt are basically political jobs, aren't they?"

Currie: "These are jobs in which there is management in which there ought to be some flexibility on the part of the person doing the appointment. So, for example, counsels, deputy directors, public information officers, chief financial officers..."

Franks: "Policy... it's policy people. It's people who..."

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Franks: "It's policy. It's folks that would be..."

Currie: "Policy, exactly."

Franks: "...giving it, right."

Currie: "Policy and management. These are people who ought to be primarily responsive to those who appoint them not to their colleagues in a collective bargaining unit."

Franks: "I'd certainly want the people who were representing me and acting as liaisons being under my control order rather than someone else because if they didn't act how I'd wished I'd like to get rid of them."

Currie: "Exactly."

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Watson."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

- Watson: "Majority Leader Currie, do you think it would be possible over the summer... you've carried quite a few Bills to clean up some of the messes that the administration has not been able to do themselves... perhaps over the summer you guys can get together and maybe we can take care of these things early."
- Currie: "What we need to do, I think, is to give them the management tools it takes to run this ship of state in an expeditious, effective, cost-effective fashion and I think we ought to do it today."
- Watson: "But it... it just needs to be pointed out though that we're in this mess because they allowed themselves to get in this mess."
- Currie: "I wouldn't say this administration allowed itself it get into this mess. I would say that there were prior decisions that happened before this Governor took office and I think that we are seeing some of the problems that that administration caused."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

- McAuliffe: "Majority Leader, what happened to the current... the pay of the current employees? Would that maintain... would that stay the same, their pay or would it decrease?"
- Currie: "I think that people will be in the appropriate pay grade given what kind of job they are doing. I do not anticipate wholesale reductions in salary or anything... anything of that nature, but I think salaries ought to be commensurate with the responsibilities of the workforce."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

McAuliffe: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McCarthy."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

McCarthy: "Representative, if I'm reading this correctly, anyone that was in a unit... a union before December 2, 2008 cannot be changed under this legislation?"

Currie: "There will be no change. We're talking about people who are currently part of the petition and people who became a member of a collective bargaining unit after that date..."

McCarthy: "Okay."

Currie: "...in 2008."

McCarthy: "And this ought to be..."

Currie: "And again, that's not automatic."

McCarthy: "Right."

Currie: "The administration would have to go to the Labor Relations Board and make an argument that these individual job titles ought not to be... ought not to be in a collective bargaining unit and we have limited the number, that was not true in the Bill we voted on in January. We limited the number so only of those who were petitioned in, since that date in 2008, only 1900 could be..."

McCarthy: "Well, there's a number on the bottom of 25... page 25, 3,580. That's the absolute top number that can't be... it can't be exceeded, correctly?"

Currie: "Right. That's exactly right. And that... that (unintelligible)..."

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

McCarthy: "And then further on 26, there's 1900 who are currently..."

Currie: "Right. Exactly."

McCarthy: "...in a bargaining unit."

Currie: "Exactly."

McCarthy: "I mean, if there's 3,000, only 1900 could be... changed."

Currie: "Three thousand five hundred eighty. And let me just tell you that 3500 figure to date almost 53 thousand workers of the State of Illinois, employees of the State of Illinois, are part of a collective bargaining unit. So, we're talking a very miniscule proportion..."

McCarthy: "Right."

Currie: "...of the actual number of people who are in collective bargaining units in the state workforce."

McCarthy: "Okay. And I do think those numbers are less than what I heard from different sources, so I'm glad that they're actually in the Bill."

Currie: "Yeah."

McCarthy: "There is one question I have though. It's the second full paragraph on page 28 and it basically says that if the Governor chooses not to designate of a position set. The way I read that is that if he doesn't choose this person and then it says, then that decision does not preclude a state agency from otherwise challenging the certification of that position. And that's the only thing that really throws me off on this because it seems like the Governor wouldn't have to pick it as being one of his 3580 positions, but the state agency could then go in and say... I

70th Legislative Day

- mean, I don't think that's what they want, but that's the way I read that."
- Currie: "I think all it means is that the decisions that are made about who and who not will not effect the law under which the public... the public employee... the Labor Relations Board operates. So, this will not have a... this will not say if the Governor doesn't designate this job title, it doesn't mean that that's part of the law and so the Labor Relations Board in another context might say, oh yeah, we're not designating that."
- McCarthy: "Okay. And is that 3580 a number that's solid from this day forward then so. Say, a few of those people retire and then he just... he just always has the 3580 going forward."
- Currie: "Yeah. It runs with the position. So, there are 3500...
 3,580 positions."
- McCarthy: "Okay. Well, thank you for the answers."
- 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 62 people voting 'yes', 52 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Rules Report. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 31, 2011: approved for floor consideration, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1968."

70th Legislative Day

- Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, could everybody welcome the esteemed Senate... Senate President John Cullerton. Representative Currie moves that the vote by which the last Bill passed be reconsidered. And Representative Lang moved that that lay on the table. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion lays on the table. On page 10 of the Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1968, Representative Currie. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "I move to waive all applicable rules so that... so that the House can consider immediately the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1968."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? Leave is granted. Senate Bill 1968. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1968 has been read a second time, previously. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is a technical Amendment. It provides for an immediate effective date for one Section of the Budget Implementation Act that we had earlier this evening pass. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I hope you'll vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is on the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Mahoney: "No further Amendments. No Motions filed."

70th Legislative Day

- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. The technical Amendment just add in an immediate effective date to one Section of the Budget Implementation Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the passage of the Bill vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the... the Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 115 people voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 120. The Chair recognizes Mr. Rose. Mr. Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was requested by the university because some may have already met. There were no… there were no energy requirement."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have over 20 Resolutions on the House Calendar and I discussed this matter with Mr. Cross. We've agreed that we will take all of these Resolutions on one record vote. They've all been examined by the Leadership offices. There were two which were deemed to be controversial. They were taken out of the package. And so...

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

so, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'll look at the scoreboard, those are the numbers of all of the Resolutions. (referring to - HJR 8, 16, 19, 35, 36, House Resolution 13, 71, 107, 120, 124, 145, 227, 284, 285, 286, 292, 314, 321, 325, 326, 330, 331, 371, 372, 373, 382, 383, 390, 395, 402, 405, 406, 411, 423, 424, 435, SJR 15, 34, 35) So, those in favor of the adoptions of those Resolutions vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 112... 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 2 people voting 'no'. The Resolutions are adopted. On page 10 of the Calendar, on the Order of Second... Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1883. Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1883's been read a second time, previously. No Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move Senate Bill 1883 to Third Reading. This is... represents part of a Bill with agreed language that... it is... represents a Bill of agreed language and it mirrors some of the House Bill 1079 that was passed with unanimous votes. And the differences in the universities must include in this report a synopsis of programs of instruction, research, public service that have been terminated, dissolved, reduced and that's still in there but differing. It amends existing law by providing that the state's supported institutions of higher learning must now submit a plan for capital improvements of

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

noninstructional facilities to IBHE for approval only if the total of the cost of the project is in excess of \$2 million and that is if it's approved by the institution's board."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1883's on the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Mahoney: "No Amendments. No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Mahoney: "Senate Bill 1883, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson has explained the Bill. The question is, 'Shall the 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 111 people voting 'yes', 3 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Mahoney: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions is House Resolution 442, offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolution 443, offered by Representative Monique Davis. House Resolution 444, offered by Representative Tom Cross. House Resolution 445, offered by Representative Poe. House Resolution 446, offered by Representative Dunkin (sic-

70th Legislative Day

- Durkin). House Resolution 447, offered by Representative Fortner. And House Resolution 448, offered by Representative Fortner."
- 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. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to go on the record to change my vote to a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 2188."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Speaker Madigan. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2189. Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2189 is on the Order of Concurrence. I'm the principal Sponsor of the Bill. I move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendments."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2189. Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I plan to communicate with Senator Cullerton and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee relative to this Bill. I plan to appoint the following Members of the Conference: Representative Mautino, Representative Yarbrough and Representative Crespo. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're prepared to adjourn. And I'd like to thank all the

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

Members of the House, all of the staff for a very productive Session. Much was accomplished in Legislature, much was accomplished right here in the House. We're all familiar with the procedure that we use in the House and the process that we use in the House to adopt a budget. And I know that everybody in this chamber is very happy, very pleased, that the entire state budget was pared and adopted by Members of the Appropriations Committee first and then adopted by the full House, as I said earlier, the first time since 1991. All of you should be very pleased with that. You should be complimented and congratulated. I will just wish all of you a very happy and productive summer. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Speaker. Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to all of you on the House Floor on both sides, thank you. It was a pleasure working with those of you on the other side of the aisle. I want to thank our side. I want to thank our staff that always amazes me. I say this that the amount of time and energy that goes into making this place work and there is absolutely no other way in the world we could get any of this done without both sides having incredible staffs. So, we owe them, I think, a great big round of applause. I want to... the Speaker talked about a balanced budget and that is a remarkable feat based on what we've seen over the last 10 years. But think about the fact that not only was it balanced, but it was a document that was driven from the bottom up by you as Members. That's the way it should be. It's pretty remarkable. It's a great product. It was not

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

without some difficulty. It's never easy to cut, but we may ultimately and hopefully be turning this ship around to where we need to go. We had good success in education reform, Medicaid reform. We tackled the tough issue of unemployment insurance. There are other issues left: retiree health care and pensions, we've talked enough about them in the last few months, but something that will not go away. So, to all of you in this chamber, I think you all are owed a lot of credit for what you've done and I think we're starting, as I said, moving in the director... right direction. I, likewise, hope you have a great summer. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader Cross. Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was somewhat remiss. The Clerk of the House, Mark, is moving on to a local position in the City of Springfield. I would ask all of you to rise and thank Mark for his fine work."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say that my seatmate when she returns in the fall will be a married woman as of June 17. So, let's give her a hand."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to change my vote on House Bill 3184 to 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions.

Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "And in the same vein as Representative Yarbrough, I would like to indicate that when we return in the fall my

70th Legislative Day

5/31/2011

seatmate will also have been married to her love... the love of her life, Christin Baker. So, we're very thrilled about that."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Imagine this. My seatmate is also getting married.

We will... there will be another Hendren in Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Certainly to say I'm not to be outdone. My seatmate, Representative Adam Brown will be getting married on July 2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My seatmate's not getting married, but I don't think he's coming back but we're going to miss him. Let's give a big round of applause for Representative Dan Reitz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues and everyone for your cards, your letters, your prayers on behalf of me and my family and my new granddaughter, Madison Jolie Perry. And I just want to say thank you all. Thank you, thank you and thank you. I appreciate you and keep us in your prayers."

Speaker Lang: "And now, pursuant to the Adjournment Resolution previously adopted, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned to the call of the Chair, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. The House stands adjourned. Have a good summer."