120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Mark Nebel, who is with the St. John's Lutheran Church in Red Bud, Illinois. Reverend Nebel is the guest of Representative Costello. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and pagers and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Mark Nebel."

Reverend Nebel: "Let us pray. Oh, Lord, God, Heavenly Father, Your holy word urges us to pray for all those in authority. That we may live peaceful and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness. This pleases You, Oh, God, our Savior, for You want all to be saved and to come to a knowledge of Your truth. Please bless this Assembly, as a governing authority which You have established as Your servant for the good of our state. We ask for Your eternal wisdom to be present among us, trusting in You as the God who is with us as the way, the truth, and the life. We plead for Your forgiveness when and where we do wrong. We pray for Your blessings when we seek to serve others in their time of need. We celebrate Your guidance as the actions of this Assembly benefit the citizens of Illinois. We thank You for this opportunity for public service. These and the thoughts that we bring to You in the silence of our own hearts, we pray in Your most precious and saving name, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Robyn Gabel, would you please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Gabel 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. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Gordon today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Representative Leader Bost, status of the GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives McAuliffe, Representative Jerry Mitchell, Ramey, Tracy and Rose are excused on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 110 Members responding to the Roll Call, we have a quorum. We're prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted and do refer to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4513. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4110, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4314; recommends be adopted as amended is House Joint Resolution 69 to House Resolution 706. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: do pass as amended Standard Debate is House Bill 5277; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5134, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5633. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Flowers, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Availability and Accessibility reports the following committee action taken on March 29, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 174, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3867, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4662, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4663, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4665, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4749, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5332, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5434, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5586. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: is recommends be adopted House Resolution Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4324, Floor Amendment #1 House

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- 5531. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on March 29, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 930, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 5624. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Adoption Reform reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4028. Introduction of Resolutions to the Rules Committee. House Resolution 8... correction. House Resolution 906, offered by Representative Mussman. This is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham, do you rise for a point of personal privilege?"
- Cunningham: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask you and the entire chamber to join me and Representative Kelly Burke in welcoming the fifth-grade class from St. John Fisher Elementary School to our Capitol. They're behind me..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, St. John Fisher. We're proud to have you here. Enjoy your day at the Capitol. Representative Karen May, I believe you have a Resolution, House Resolution 754."
- May: "Thank you, Speaker. And I would ask our guests in the gallery to stand up, please. House Resolution 754 resolves

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

that the General Assembly designate this week as Pediatric Cancer Survivorship Week in the State of Illinois. And it urges all of us, here in the General Assembly, to show our respect for the... what these brave children have gone through. With advances in medicine, many of these children are survivors and I stress, it is survivors. At age a year, 15 months, 2, 3, 8 years old, they have been diagnosed with cancer, gone through countless surgeries, but there are a dozen of them here today to show us that they are survivors thanks to the advances of medicine. So, we are here to support them, to honor them because they all have shared their stories of what they've gone through, but they've come through it. They're here. They are wonderful, happy, upbeat kids and we owe them a debt of gratitude to show us what honor and what resolve they have to beat this disease."

Speaker Lyons: "God bless you. You're an inspiration to all of us. God love you. Representative May moves for the adoption of House Resolution 754. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. And in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 754 is unanimously adopted. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, as I've been trying to all week, just to remind you, we've got your lists, Republicans, Democrats. We have the list that you submitted to your Leadership. We'll be going down it, basically, alphabetical, if I can find everybody on the floor, some Seconds, some Thirds, some Seconds that we'll put on Thirds that we'll vote on right away. So, pay attention. I'll do my best to keep it in alphabetical

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

order. That's a challenge as you all know. Representative Dan Beiser, on page 10 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Second Reading, you have House Bill 5028. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5028, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was a read 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 Hollman: "House Bill 5028, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois Community College President's Council and it amends the Public Community College Act. Provides that after the effective date, one of the 11 gubernatorial appointees to the Community College Board must be a president of a public community college."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 5028 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In... 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, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Biss, on the Order of Third Readings,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Dan, you have, on page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 5444. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5444, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Biss."

Biss: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an agreed Bill that takes a pretty modest step toward a fairly interesting long-term project. The Department of Employment Security every quarter collects from all employers in the state a ton of extremely interesting data. It has lists of employees and wages and job classifications and so forth and embedded in that data is the opportunity for researchers to learn a lot about opportunities for the state to engage in economic development particularly in distressed areas. The problem is that releasing this data just wholesale would be а major breach at confidentiality, would be unethical and illegal and once you try to think about ways to release it that would not violate those confidentiality restrictions, you find that it could potentially be expensive to the state to do so because of the computer and IT needs. So, all this Bill does is it sets up a task force to study this issue and make recommendations to the state about how to best release this data in a way that's both legal, ethical affordable. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Leader Jim Durkin."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, we have a number of these Bills which we create task force which we ultimately will make recommendations to state agencies and many times I find that the state agency is fully in support of these... of this initiative. Why is the Department of Employment Security neutral on this legislation?"

Biss: "Well, I'm unaware of why they're neutral. I know they drafted the Bill, actually."

Durkin: "Our analysis states that it's... that they have a neutral position."

Biss: "Okay."

Durkin: "Do you know whether or not they've made a public position in committee or they've made a verbal statement to you about their..."

Biss: "Well..."

Durkin: "...position on this?"

Biss: "They slipped in support at a committee..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Biss: "...I'm told."

Durkin: "All right."

Biss: "And I will reiterate that this was actually drafted by their general counsel."

Durkin: "All right. Well, then... let's just say it was an error within our analysis. Thank you very much."

Biss: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I thought this data was already online, if you walk into an Employment Security office and go into their kiosk and pull it up on the computer."

Biss: "Well, Representative, it depends on what you mean by this data. Certainly, of course, the public couldn't get access to individual records and have, you know, names and addresses of employees. There are certain chunks of the data that are available even online aggregated by county or in some instances by zip code. But, the goal of this task force would be to find ways to make publicly available to researchers data that is aggregated in smaller geographic regions so as to enable researchers to help guide those neighborhoods in developing their local economies."

Mulligan: "I thought they were already divided into regions and that you could get the data for your region currently. Have they changed that policy?"

Biss: "I'm not sure of what regions... what... I don't know the definition of region that you're describing, but it is not the case that it's possible currently to get current data on small neighborhood areas."

Mulligan: "I'm of the opinion that this was being done already and that you could do it if you wanted to and there's different... depending on who wants to put it out there and how much it's going to cost for them to give it out. I'm just not sure what your Bill is trying to accomplish that isn't already accomplished or wouldn't cost money to people who are part of the network but are not from the state or

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

would have to do a lot of extra work in order to put the data together."

Biss: "Well, Representative, this data is definitely not available. This Bill arose out of a discussion... a series of discussions I've been having with the department for slightly over a year now about the question of whether there is an extremely inexpensive way of making the data available. They would be the first to acknowledge that the data that we're looking for is not currently publicly available."

Mulligan: "Well, I hope that under this administration that that department has not regressed so that they're not putting forth the data they used to. I would certainly take a look at it. How much do you think this is going to cost?"

Biss: "Do you mean the task force or do you mean the recommendations of the task force?"

Mulligan: "Both. First of all, you have a task force. Are you paying anybody on the task force anything other than travel and when they do the report, who does the report? Do they give a contract for someone to do the report? Well, how much will they give them?"

Biss: "No, there's no..."

Mulligan: "Will it be a performance-based contract? So, what would the cost be?"

Biss: "Nothing. There's absolutely no funds, no... no funds whatsoever neither for renumeration for the members nor..."

Speaker Lyons: "Your time has expired, Rosemary. We'll give you another minute to finish the line of questions. Go ahead, Representative Biss."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Mulligan: "All right. Well, my last question is more of a statement. Nothing never costs... there's not anything that doesn't cost something. This won't cost nothing is my understanding of anything that's happened since I've been here, so it would be interesting to actually know the amount."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Biss to close."

"Thank you. Just... just in response. There are certainly no funds appropriated for this. There's nothing besides the mildest of travel incidentals for which anyone would be reimbursed for this. And the point of the task force, to be clear, and I want to be very clear about this is to find ways that are essentially free to make this data available partially 'cause the state has no money but also partially because the funding mechanisms for the department basically wouldn't allow money to be spent on this. The department is funded almost entirely by federal funds which may not be used for this. And so the goal of the task force will be to find mechanisms such as external grant money to cover whatever costs whatever it be incurred according to recommendations of the task force. I think it's an exciting opportunity to do really good economic work for the state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on House Bill 5444. 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? Representative Mell, Representative Yarbrough. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. We have 110 Members voting 'yes', 0

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Dan Burke, on page 4 of the Calendar, Dan, you have House Bill 3812. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

- Clerk Hollman: "House... House Bill 3812, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Clerk, we'll take that Bill out of the record on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Dena Carli, you have, on the Order of Second Reading, on page 7 of the Calendar, House Bill 49... 4393. 4-3-9-3. Out of the record? Out of the record. Leader Dan Brady, on page 18 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5109. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5109, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 5109 is an initiative of the Delta Dental to ensure greater independence of the governing board of dental service plan corporation and greater flexibility in selecting potential trustees to serve. One of the things it provides that those designated are as dental trustees shall comprise at least one-third instead of a majority of the trustees shall be participating dentists of the corporation instead of only dentists licensed in Illinois to practice dentistry. It adds the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

requirement that such trustees shall be residents of Illinois. And I'll be happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm not sure what this Bill does. I'm not sure I understand what you're trying to accomplish."

Brady: "Sure. What the Bill does is provide greater flexibility in changes that haven't occurred since the board was put together for Delta plan in 1965. It allows them the flexibility to not have only participating dentists who may be part of the plan serve on their board. So, it's a process in which it gives the board greater flexibility to seek trustees to serve."

Franks: "What is Delta Dental?"

Brady: "Delto... Delta Dental is a service plan and dental insurance."

Franks: "I'm sorry. Say that again?"

Brady: "Delto... Delta Dental service plan is a plan of insurance for a program for dental care by dentists throughout the state and the country."

Franks: "So, why is the state involved in this, then? This is a private plan, correct?"

Brady: "Well, because of the way it was set up in 1965 and the rules of which they have to go before the General Assembly in which to make changes to their governing board."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Franks: "Is there... is there someway they can change their bylaws where they don't need to come to the General Assembly to make these kind of changes? I just don't understand what our interest is here and perhaps I don't have the institutional knowledge that you do on this, but I just don't understand why the state's involved at all."

Brady: "Also, I'll also yield to Representative Mautino who might be able to answer that more specifically for you, Representative."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino on the question."

Mautino: "Certainly. Well, in the Bill itself and to thank Representative Brady, there's a couple of things that this does and we're changing the composition of the board. Under the other law and as you well know, Sarbanes-Oxley says you shouldn't have people who are receiving money getting paid from an operation on their... as a majority of boards. This does that. It basically changes it so that we wouldn't have a majority of dentists in this plan who are participating in the plan and it was a request that came basically from the... from Delta Dental to help them operate within the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Representative, can you explain... I still don't understand why this is in front of the General Assembly. Why does a private corporation, Delta Dental Plan, need the okay by the Legislature of Illinois to change how their trust... who their trustees can be? Why can that... why is it in front of us?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Mautino: "Well, we created the statute which provides these services to those who are less fortunate. They do a lot of the Public Aid, Medicaid work that draw all of our counties..."

Franks: "Are they not-for-profit?"

Mautino: "Under the… I'll have to get… I'll get back to you on that, what the… what the structure, I believe it is. The… but they have operated throughout the State of Illinois for years and they come in and they provide services under our program and what we're trying to do here is say that not… There was a requirement, the majority of the board members be dentists from Illinois participating in the plan. So, that's what we're trying to rectify."

Franks: "I... Okay. I just... are these paid trustees and if so, who pays them?"

Mautino: "No, no they aren't."

Franks: "And how much they get? What's that?"

Mautino: "No, they're not paid trustees."

Franks: "They're not paid."

Mautino: "No."

Franks: "So, they think it's in their best interest not to have as many practicing dentists so they're trying to expand the board."

Mautino: "Not a majority of dentists who are participating in the program and being paid by the program deciding how the program should run."

Franks: "Okay. I'm still not real sure why it's here except because of our statute. I figured there'd be some way that they could change bylaws. This seems very cumbersome to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

have to require corporations to come to our... the General Assembly. Maybe Mr. Brady has an answer."

Mautino: "Yeah. It's been... it was set that way in 196... They've been here actually providing for the poor since 1965."

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Representative Brady to close."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you,

Representative, for your questions. And I ask for an 'aye'

vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brady and Mautino move the passage of House Bill 5109. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? du Buclet, Skip. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 104 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cassidy, on page 18 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Third Reading, Representative, you have House Bill 4725. Out of the record. Representative Bill Cunningham, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, Representative, on page 12 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5280. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5280, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Committee... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cunningham, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bill Cunningham on Floor Amendment #2."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Amendment was drawn up and adopted in committee on... based on some criticism of the Bill from the Illinois Department of Corrections who thought it was too broadly written and would include people who were not convicted of sex offenses. And I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5280, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "This House Bill 5280 is an initiative of the Illinois Attorney General's Office. It seeks to lengthen the time that sex offenders who are convicted of luring a minor spend in mandatory supervised release, after they are released from prison. It will not extend their prison stay but will keep them on parole longer. It would give the Parole Board discretion to keep them under supervised release from a minimum of three years to a maximum of life depending on their... the severity of their crime. Be happy to answer any questions."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Chair recognizes Representative Jim Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, do you... have... what would this do to the population... the prison population?"

Cunningham: "I spoke with representatives from IDOC. They don't believe it will have any impact on the prison population. The thing to focus on here is this doesn't really change their sentence. It changes the amount of time on supervised release. So, it won't affect the population. Could it potentially increase the burden on parole agents? It could, but IDOC has indicated to me that they don't think we're talking about a very large universe of individuals here."

Watson: "And they're prepared to address that with that extra need should, you know, if we do this which I assume and hope we will."

Cunningham: "If you're asking whether or not they're preparing to add parole agents. I don't know, Representative."

Watson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham moves for the passage of House Bill 5280. 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, Feigenholtz, Senger, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Will Davis, on page 7 of the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Calendar, Will, under House Bills-Second Readings, you have House Bill 4466. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4466, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

  Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 are approved for consideration. Fl... Floor Amendment 4 is offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis on Floor Amendment #4."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #4, relative to the Bill, just simply takes licensed truck stop establishments out of the Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. All 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. And Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Will Davis, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis on Floor Amendment #5."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #5 simply takes the penalty procedures out of the Bill. The objective with the overall Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, is to take the way that we structured the last gaming Bill whether... with regard to provisions for minority contracting and apply it to the rest of gaming that we have here in Illinois. And there was a penalty put in the original Bill. Floor Amendment #5 simply takes that penalty out and it'll

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

be subject to the various boards that will make those determinations whether or not a license could be revoked if certain goals are not met in an appropriate fashion."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Floor Amendment #5. Representative Reboletti wants... to the Amendment or I'll wait 'til we put it on Third? Thank you, Dennis. We'll wait 'til we put this Bill on Third. So, Floor Amendment #5, all those in favor of the passage of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #5 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4466, a Bill for an Act concerning

gaming. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As was previously discussed with regard to one of the Amendments, House Bill 4466 is an attempt to take... to take with the regard to all of the remaining of gaming that we have here in the State of Illinois and to put minority contracting requirements on that. One of the things about this Bill that may be a little different is that because we are concerned and sensitive to putting arbitrary goals on some of those contracts, we leave it up to the various boards that will ultimately make those decisions so that appropriate goals are put on the various contracts where they exist. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "I'm sorry, Representative Davis. I was interrupted. Are you finished? Okay. We have some people who want to speak to the issue. Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Just a couple questions, if I can. I was noticing, now was Amendment #2 actually adopted to the Bill or not?"

Davis, W.: "Amendment #2, if I'm not mistaken, was adopted."

Bost: "Okay. Can you tell me the concerns? We had several people that were... our analysis is showing that there were several concerns from people involved to Amendment #2. The Illinois Chamber, what were their concerns? And also... also, we had the Racing Board, the racetracks, what were their concerns?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I did not speak to anyone from the Chamber. They did not come to me directly and talk to me about their concerns. With regard to the boards, I think that the challenge though was the fact that the original Bill put a percentage in the Bill and I think there was some concern about whether or not those goals could be met or not met and what may happen as a result. So, again, the way we changed the Bill was that we said, well, we'll let the boards because they will have more information, more knowledge may..."

Bost: "The boards themselves can set the percentage."

Davis, W.: "...set the percentages so it's appropriate to the... to the various industries."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Bost: "Do then... do then we have to... or does someone have to approve their percentage because they could actually set, you know, a fairly low percentage..."
- Davis, W.: "Well, it doesn't have to come back to the General Assembly. Again, we're allowing them to make those choices. Again, the idea of this Bill is not to be onerous in any way. We're simply saying that when we passed the last gaming Bill there were provisions in the Bill that helped or created opportunities for minority contractors and we wanted to simply put essentially the same type of provisions on the rest of gaming here in the State of Illinois."
- Bost: "With the Amendments that you've got, is... are all parties fairly neutral or are there still opposition to it?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, again, I'm not... the only, and I won't even call it opposition, but the only thing that I heard about was the penalty process, the penalty proceedings in there 'cause the original Bill said a license could be removed if you don't meet the goals. So, in effort to try to be sensitive to that, again, instead of having that specific provision in the Bill, the last Amendment removed that and made it just like the last gaming Bill."
- Bost: "Okay. So, my question, I guess, whenever we're understanding that the… that the Racing Board and the racetracks, their opposition would be that they just felt like it was going to cause them more work or…"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I don't... I don't think anybody likes goals, to be quite honest with you, Representative. And... but nevertheless, because sometimes we have those challenges

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

here in the State of Illinois, which is why we ask that we do things like that. So, again, instead of setting an arbitrary percentage, not knowing whether or not it could or could not be met, that's why we amended the Bill to allow the boards to be able to make those kind of decisions but yet we still want to have some level of minority participation goals on..."

Speaker Lyons: "Time's expired. We'll give you another minute to finish this conversation, Representative Bost. We have three or four other speakers, so go ahead, Mike."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the information.

Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Rentle... Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, you have answered a couple of my questions. So, the Racing Board or the Gaming Board will determine if the goal has been met towards, I guess, a maximum participation or highest participation so there isn't an arbitrary number that, in any particular contract, that has to be reached but try to maximize the effort of reaching out for minority contractors?"

Davis, W.: "Absolutely."

Reboletti: "And this would be for all of our existing gaming facilities and racing facilities and then if we ever do pass an expansion of gaming, this would then be our baseline for whatever happens going forward, right?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Davis, W.: "Well, in the expansion Bill, there are some of these provisions already in there. And so, again, the objective was to say if we can put it in the expansion Bill but it doesn't exist in the rest of the industry, let's put something on the books that impacts the rest of the industry."

Reboletti: "And I guess I'm also looking at expansion as a potential future casino development. This would be part of that as well. Is that... is that fair to say?"

Davis, W.: "I... I believe so."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative Davis, could you tell me specifically what types of gaming acts are going to… will be affected by this legislation?"

Davis, W.: "What types of gaming acts?"

Durkin: "Are we talking horseracing, riverboats, what?"

Davis, W.: "Horseracing, gam... riverboat gambling and video gaming."

Durkin: "Okay. Does this apply to off-track betting operations?"

Davis, W.: "We're not quite certain if it does, but if that's something that you would like to see happen, we can certainly work on that in the Senate."

Durkin: "No, but I think that we need to be very careful when we're going to and no disagreement with me on minority participation, but of the trickle affect that this may have

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

on other types of operations that are related to horseracing. So, I think it's something we need to be very clear about. Now, this is basically, I think Dennis Reboletti made this comment earlier, but I want to make... make it perfectly clear. Is this law... if this Bill is to go into law, will it have a retroactive affect upon existing gaming operations that we... you previously described?"

Davis, W.: "Will it have a retroactive affect to previous... I believe that's the intent is to impact the other gaming that currently exists in the state, not so much based on the expansion."

Durkin: "So, if this Bill goes into law, it would have an affect... it would have the rivers casino, the racetrack in the Metro East and all the riverboats would have to abide by this law and perhaps would have to go back in and rework their contracts with their vendors."

Davis, W.: "No, no. Moving forward, I'm sorry."

Durkin: "All right. Let's... all right. This has no retroactive application. This is strictly prospective, correct?"

Davis, W.: "Moving forward."

Durkin: "All right."

Davis, W.: "No retro in that respect. So, I'm sorry."

Durkin: "All right. Thanks. Thank you."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Sacia: "Representative Davis, just a couple of questions for clarification. I know on some of the earlier Amendments the chamber was opposed. Has... has all of that been removed?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, again, Representative, unfortunately with regard to whatever opposition they had, they actually never came and spoke to me about their opposition. So, I'm not real clear on what their opposition is, but what I've attempted to do and as you can see by the number of Amendments..."

Sacia: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...we tried to be sensitive to just about anything that anyone brought to the table that they felt might have been onerous because the objective is not to be onerous. In the... in the gambling expansion that passed this chamber or that we passed, has yet to be signed, but we passed, we put minority contracting goals in that Bill."

Sacia: "Yeah."

- Davis, W.: "So, the objective is to try to match the rest of the gaming industry to that particular expansion."
- Sacia: "I respect that, Representative Davis. In my district in Northwest Illinois, I've had a significant number of contractors contact me. When I say a significant number, something over three have contacted me individually about minority contractors getting the majority of bids on state contracts and a great deal of this was being orchestrated by IDOT. As far as minority contractors, I'm certainly sensitive to them having a place at the table, but I'm also sensitive to contractors that are out there trying to make a living and find themselves literally being pushed aside

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

because of a significant higher number of minority contractors. And I think you and I would agree, Represent... Representative Davis, we're looking for some equality. Is that fair?"

Davis, W.: "In a matter of speaking, yes."

Sacia: "I don't understand in a matter of speaking."

Davis, W.: "Well, I mean, if you want to talk history, Representative..."

Sacia: "No, I don't want to talk history. You're the one that just talked about going forward. I'm all about going forward."

Davis, W.: "Well, but... but that history explains why we have to do things like this, Representative. That's all I'm saying."

Sacia: "Well, you know, I can't help it if ancestors had slaves. We're way beyond that, way beyond that. And we're living in a time when there should be equitable fair contracting opportunities."

Davis, W.: "Well, Representative, I don't think I was quite going back that far with history, but I mean, unfortunately, past practices have shown how minority contractors have been traditionally left out of contracting opportunities here in the State of Illinois. I mean, I think..."

Sacia: "Well..."

Davis, W.: "...I think that's something we all..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your time expired. We'll give you another minute to finish this line of questioning."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Sacia: "Thank... thank you very much, Speaker. I appreciate that. All I'm saying, Representative Davis, is based upon the number of white contractors that have come to me in the past year... two years and have said, you know, I think maybe that piece of history you're talking about might be just the past several years, but they feel that they're being pushed aside and I want to see that they have a place at the table also."

Davis, W.: "Well..."

Sacia: "That's all I'm saying."

Davis, W.: "...well, one thing I will add relative to what we're doing here, Representative, I can't necessarily speak to IDOT and if you'd like that to sit down and have a conversation about that, I'd be more than happy to. But what we're attempting to do here which is why we put that onus on the boards now, I could have argued and said, you know, that I wouldn't accept anything less than, say, 20 percent of the contract which might adversely affect what you're talking about, but at the very least, we've amended this Bill to allow the various boards to look within themselves and to make determinations as to what those percentages could be..."

Davis, W.: "...to try to help maybe deal with some of what you're talking about."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative Davis. I appreciate it."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise to support the Gentleman's Bill. In the process of negotiating gaming

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bills over the years, we've had many conversations about minority ownership, but only in the last several years have we ratcheted up to include minority contracting. In fact, in terms of the economy in the State of Illinois, in terms minorities in including the process, contracting is far more important than the ownership. There have been people, some in the Senate particularly, who have been pushing for years for minority ownership only. But, issues regarding bringing minorities into the contracting process to give a small businesses the chance to be involved, to grow, to hire people, that's what we need to do. We all know that small business hires many more people in our state and in our country that all the large businesses do. And so, this Bill creates opportunities for small minority-owned businesses to be involved in a way they weren't involved before. I applaud the Sponsor for working so hard on this Bill. And I'm proud to join him as a Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Representative Ken Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, here it is 2012 and we're still talking about opportunity, equal opportunity or at least in this case, 20 percent of an opportunity. I rise in strong support of House Bill 4466 because it... it's a goal. It's not a mandate; it's not a requirement. It's a goal to encourage the private owners of casinos, riverboats, here in our state, to allow women, any woman, minorities, as defined in the Legislature, or just... or a disabled contractor an

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

opportunity to participate in an enterprise where everybody participates in the casinos. You go to a boat or casino, land-based or not, it's quite diverse with its patrons. And so, this is merely and simply a goal to ask private owners just to set aside an opportunity for folks who are traditionally isolated or kept out of this opportunity. Government folk, as we know, act as a partner or a facilitator of the private industry at all levels: banking, insurance, farming, even casinos. We have subsidies all across the state for agriculture and the farming business. We are merely asking that we facilitate an opportunity for private businesses to have a goal. That's it. This is the safest legislation you will be able to vote on. This is not forcing anybody to do anything. It's suggesting encouraging a goal. And I would rise in strong support and encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "There... Will Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that I truly appreciate all of the comments that were made on both sides of the aisle with regard to this. And for Representative Durkin, I just want you to know that it's our understanding that OTBs are included in this as well. And... but particularly I want to thank Representative Sacia because I want him to know that I'm very sensitive to exactly what he is suggesting, but it's unfortunate that the history here in the State of Illinois has kind of pushed us in the direction where we have to inquire and fight. But I want him to know that it's really not about asking for something that folks aren't deserving of or that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

they should receive something that they aren't deserving of. It's always been about fair share and opportunity for minority companies to have a bite at the American dream, so to speak. But, unfortunately sometimes, particularly in transportation, that hasn't always been the case and we've had to fight for Bills like this one to try to help create that opportunity. But again, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 4466 is simply attempting to mirror the last gambling expansion Bill that was passed here and to ask that contracting goals be put on the remainder of the gaming industry. We've been sensitive to all of the objections that we were made aware of and we've filed Amendments to try to deal with... deal with some of those objections. I think we've covered all of those. Again, the idea here is not to be onerous in any way, but to try to create opportunity so that businesses here in the state that happen to be owned by minorities and women will have a fair shot at the Illinois dream of ownership of a business and helping their businesses grow. I ask for your support. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis moves for the passage of House Bill 4466. 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, there are 63 Members voting 'yes', 45 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Dan Brady, I

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

believe you need to acknowledge somebody on a point of personal privilege."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's indeed my pleasure to welcome to the State Capitol today the senior nursing class from Illinois Wesleyan University and their director Susan Swanlund. She's up there in the gallery. Ladies and gentlemen, please stand up, our senior nursing students from Illinois Wesleyan University, the alma mater of Leader Tom Cross, Bloomington, Illinois. Good luck to all of you."

Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, one and all. We're proud to have you at your Capitol. Representative Lisa Dugan, on page 19 of the Calendar, on Bills-Third Readings, you have House Bill 5336. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5336, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lisa Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, House Bill 5336 just streamlines between the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity the OSHA program. Right now the Department of Labor and DCEO, they each do part of it. We believe that it makes more sense for the Department of Labor to switch it over to DCEO and have one agency doing it. So, this is from the Department of Labor and DCEO an agreed to Bill to codify what they already do now. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

passage of House Bill 5336 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? Jim Durkin. Representative... Sandy Pihos, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sandy Cole, on page 4 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Second Reading, you have House Bill 3890. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3890, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bellock, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock on Floor Amendment #1 to Representative Cole's. Are you going to give the… Representative Cole, are you going to do the Amendment?"

Cole: "Yes, Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cole."

Cole: "House Bill... Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. I'd like to ask that it be moved to Third."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3890, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cole."

Cole: "Thank you. House Bill 3890 calls for ... it's intended to ensure that visible identification numbers, VIN numbers, are on trailers that are pulled by automobiles. This came to our attention when... during for garages or storage areas they have these trailers that are supposed to be licensed and registered in the State of Illinois, but they don't have a visible VIN number. If no one returns to take that trailer back, the garage owners need the ability to be able to call the owner for pick up. This does not apply to farm any vehicle vehicles or that does not identification or registration. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Cole, this is the first opportunity I've seen your Bill and simply put, it really bolds me over.

Owning a dealership that sells well over a thousand trailers a year, most of them... the vast majority come from manufacturers and we receive a list of VIN tags when they come in that are not affixed with anything other than adhesive."

Cole: "Right."

Sacia: "The vast majority of those within a matter of a year, two years, that VIN tag is simply gone. I'm... I'm not saying it's right, but all of a sudden here's a Bill saying that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

probably half the Bill... the trailers on the very lot that I own are perhaps illegal or certainly the used ones that have been out there for a period of time. Did you talk to anyone, any trailer manufacturers about this? Has there been..."

- Cole: "I did. Representative Bellock did and she worked with those manufacturers as well as the Secretary of State and the Truckers Association. And they came up with... rather... it originally started with and it had to be permanently affixed with a stamp like you do on a regular vehicle within the... within some part of it."
- Sacia: "And I don't disagree with that. I think they should have an affixed tag, but all of a sudden you're making thousands of trailers illegal in Illinois."
- Cole: "They just simply have to have a tag that is permanently affixed but not necessarily stamped. So, if there's a way for your dealership to help those..."
- Sacia: "I'm not worried about my dealership, I'm really not. What I'm concerned with is all of these trailers that are out there in the big scheme of things and Representative Cole, I certainly agree that we should have a way of ensuring the identification of that vehicle and I know over the years when we've gotten some of those trailers in, we've attempted but we can't keep up with it because on a Saturday we might sell 15 trailers and some of them have come in on Friday and they're gone on Saturday. That being said, yes, we've affixed the adhesive tag, but suddenly it's gone. I guess, all I'm asking here is could you ask that this be addressed in the Senate, at least in a way to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

deal with those that are already existing. I could see where if you said, you know, vehicles dated 2012 and going forward. I would have no problem with that, but all of a sudden we have these thousands of trailers and if that's already in your Bill, then I'm wasting a lot of time here."

Cole: "No, it's not. Currently, from the way I understand it, that..."

Speaker Lyons: "Folks, time's expired, but we'll give you another minute to finish this conversation."

Sacia: "Yeah."

Speaker Lyons: "Go ahead, Sandy."

Cole: "The way I understand it is starting in 2013, January 1st of 2013, those... those trailers that need to be registered, because they are pulled by a vehicle, they will have to have an affixed other than a..."

Sacia: "Right, a stick-on one."

Cole: "...temporary 'cause you've... 'cause you've talked about the problem. Those temporary affixed VIN numbers fall off. So, that there has to provide a way in which they are affixed more permanently either wired or..."

Sacia: "Agreed, agreed."

Cole: "...other than being stamped right up to..."

Sacia: "Have no problem, but would you just ask them in the Senate..."

Cole: "I will. I can get those ... "

Sacia: "...to address those that are... that are already out there and being pulled up and down the road. I wouldn't want to see somebody get dinged and they have SOS or the State

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Police pull in their trailer. Anyway if you do that, I'd be more than happy..."

Cole: "...The unintended consequences. I understand. You want to make sure that the ones that are out there..."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Cole: "...aren't getting unnecessarily ticketed. Thank you."

Sacia: "Thank you so much."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, what problem are we trying to fix?"

Cole: "The problem that's trying to be fixed is that there's a number of these trailers or boat trailers even that get left at a facility, either it's a garage or a storage facility, that there's no... that get left there for years and years and there's no way for the owner of those facilities to find out who owns them 'cause there's... the VIN number's gone."

Franks: "Well, they'd be abandoned, if they were sitting there for a long time, I'm... There are rules and the UCC, that if people leave things for a certain amount of time, the owner, who is storing these; has created a bailment, can charge them a certain amount for storage and then after a certain amount of time, they can go to the Secretary of State, declare them abandoned and sell them, correct?"

Cole: "But my understanding is the Secretary of State needed this clarification so that the VIN number makes it easier

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

so that there... so that the owner can be notified before the vehicle is impounded or the trailer is taken away."

Franks: "The problem with your Bill, what Mr. Sacia had just talked about, and I'm reading it. It's a very short, very short Bill."

Cole: "Yes, it's very short and it's agreed language."

Franks: "I think it's poor public policy for a number of reasons. But number 1, you are going to be making everyone who owns a trailer, right now, in violation of the law because this is... this is... there's no grandfathering of existing trailers. Not only are you requiring a medical... I'm sorry... a metal identification tag, you are also, on top of that, also requiring that the steel frame also be stamped."

Cole: "No, that's not true."

Franks: "That's what it says."

Cole: "Not in the Amendment. With all due respect, Representative Franks, you're not reading the Amendment."

Franks: "I am reading... Okay. Let me go... I apologize. I'm reading the text."

Cole: "That's okay. And I agree with you that that having to be stamped has been a difficulty, but once that was removed and that a permanent affixed tag was added that all parties that were in disagreement are now in agreement."

Franks: "Okay. Well, that... you took out the stamp and I did not see the Amendment."

Cole: "That was..."

Franks: "That does..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Cole: "...that was a problem and everyone's willing to work with the... the affected bod... agencies to make sure that that was clarified. I think you would agree that it's important to have a vehicle identification number on a licensed and registered vehicle in the State of Illinois."

Franks: "I actually don't. I see how it works in Wisconsin, for instance, and in Wisconsin, the trailers don't even have license plates."

Cole: "But we..."

Franks: "What I'm concerned about..."

Cole: "But we do."

Franks: "I know and I'm concerned that we are totally overregulating people and I'm concerned... And I'll go to the Bill. And I appreciate what you're trying to do and I know you're saying it's agreed, but what we're requiring now is an affirmative obligation for every trailer owner in the State of Illinois to go and get a VIN number put on which is... it's a hassle, maybe it's not a big hassle, but it's going to be a cost. And I don't know what these things cost and I don't know what it's going to cost to actually put it on there because the adhesives that they're affixed on aren't working. So, perhaps we have to do something else, but..."

Cole: "That's the whole point to the Bill."

Franks: "I don't know why we continue..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Franks, your time has expired.

I'll give you a minute to conclude your remarks."

Franks: "Thank you. And I'm just going to the Bill. I just don't know why we need to continue to overregulate the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

citizens of Illinois. I think we've... we've done enough to them with our... our state being insolvent. We're not paying our bills. We're essentially bankrupt. And now, we're going to put another mandate on them that, in my opinion, is useless because the problem... I think we're looking for a solution to a problem that does not exist. There is no chance... We're going to make people breaking the law on day 1, should this pass. I think it's a Bill that does not need to be passed. It's a Bill that we ought not to pass. And I'd encourage everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "To the Bill."

Bellock: "This was brought by a lot of people in my area, also adds to a problem. I had over 16 people come in just on this issue alone that they're car repair places, they're garage, they're gas stations and they get left with these trailers on their... a piece of property for over a year, year and a half, and they can't find the owners. They can't dispense of the trailers and so there's no way for them to do anything with these and so that's why a lot of the people in my area were in support of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Representative Dwight Kay. Representative Kay."

Kay: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Yeah. Representative, a quick question. If somebody
manufactures their own product, their own trailer, I'm
curious as to how those are licensed today."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Cole: "Representative, this doesn't affect farm vehicles, for example, when you make your own... for your own. This would only be for trailers that are required to be registered or licensed in Illinois..."

Kay: "Well..."

Cole: "...and not..."

Kay: "I..."

Cole: "...we think that you use for your own personal use, that people put them together, that sort of thing."

Kay: "Well, let me give you an example."

Cole: "If they're not required to be registered..."

Kay: "Yeah."

Cole: "...they won't be required to have a VIN tag."

Kay: "Here's my example. We have a number of landscapers in our area who make their own trailers and I guess I'm curious. How do they license those trailers today?"

Cole: "That would be through the Secretary of State and I don't know what the re… and I honestly don't know the requirements for when a trailer needs to be registered. Those are already within State Law and I'm not familiar…"

Kay: "Well..."

Cole: "...with the Secretary of State's requirements."

Kay: "Okay. Let me... let me ask a different question. With tags, and I'm somewhat familiar with the tag issue, when those tags are removed, what will be... the law do then to the party that under... under this law, what will that do to the people that have equipment? Will they have to retag them?"

Cole: "The whole idea is to identify the vehicles as being yours, but I would assume, yes."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Kay: "Okay."

Cole: "And that's why, first of all, in the Bill, we want to at the manufacturer level to be able to stamp it permanently on to some part of metal portion of that trailer. That was not acceptable to the Trucker's Association. They felt that that was kind of going to be infringing on what they needed to do, but they have recognized as. Representative Sacia said that those... that those adhesive vehicle numbers are disappearing, that adhesive doesn't last forever. So, the idea is whatever besides adhesive you can use, wire, an extra clamp, that sort of thing, that needs to be applied so that that vehicle does not... the trailer does not lose its VIN number."

Kay: "And are... are... did I hear you say that there is a
grandfather provision in this Bill or there's not?"

Cole: "I will check on that before..."

Kay: "Okay."

Cole: "...for a Senate Sponsor. I think that's a really good point. There's no intention here to punish anyone that has a vehicle that, in other words, it's... I have a trailer that I personally use. I don't know if it's got a VIN number; I have to look. If I have to have some way in which to find one or to get one or to receive one with my license, then I'd like to do that, but I'd like some time... find time to do that too."

Kay: "Okay."

Cole: "I don't want to be inadvertently affected."

Kay: "Okay."

Cole: "So, we will try to fix that up in the Senate."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Kay: "All right. Thank you, Representative."

Cole: "I think that's a very good suggestion."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cole to close."

Cole: "I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 3890 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? Coladipietro, Cunningham, Krezwick, Morrison, Turner, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 30 Members voting 'yes', 78 Members voting 'no'. The Motion fails. Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #1, we have House Resolution 706. Speaker Madigan has House Resolution 706. Representative Bradley will present the issue. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "This was a Committee Amendment, correct?"

Speaker Lyons: "Pardon me, Representative?"

Bradley: "This was a Committee Amendment, correct? So, we're on the Bill?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #2 was adopted in committee."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly..."

Speaker Lyons: "John, wait a second. Ladies and... would you please bring the noise level down. It's a pretty serious issue, not that all of them aren't, but this one is budgetary. I'd suggest that we shhh. Representative Bradley."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, my colleagues and friends, and people of the State of Illinois, a few weeks ago we adopted a revenue estimate which was passed overwhelmingly by this chamber and later adopted by the Senate. As a result of that revenue estimate that we put forth, previously, we have now gone back into the process of budget making, met with the Appropriation chairs, met with the chairs of the Revenue Committee, also with the Republican spokespeople for all these committees and in addition, key budget people from both of our caucuses. We have put forth an allocation appropriation measure similar to the same process that we did last year. As you can see from the Resolution, this is going to be a very difficult process. This is going to be the beginning of many difficult choices that we're going to have to make. We should not take this lightly. We should not take this cavalierly. The decisions beginning today are going to be hard, but it's my belief and those that worked in this committee and group that we can do these things working together. This is a bipartisan effort. This is an entire state effort. There will be sacrifices throughout this state and the only way we can get through this is beginning today with a bipartisan allocation appropriation of state resources. Specifically, this Resolution would fund the pensions at the level that the actuarials estimate we owe. Now, let's be clear on this. The actuarials changed the pension funding level by almost a billion dollars. So, we have in a billion dollars of additional revenue that we have to put in the pensions because of an actuarial

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

adjustment. This proposal would fund the group health insurance at the Governor's proposed level. This proposal would provide for the debt service. This proposal would allocate for statutory transfers. This proposal would fund Medicaid at the Governor's proposed level, but still will require significant cuts to the Medicaid program. As a result of funding all of those items, as we might say above the line, we then have a sum of money available to appropriate to the five Appropriation Committees. Elementary & Secondary Education would receive \$6.49 mil... billion, General Services will receive \$1.165 billion, Higher Education will receive \$1.97 billion, Human Services minus Medicaid will receive \$5.08 billion and Public Safety will receive \$1.57 billion. This is all the money we have. This is all the money we have. We are allocating after the payment of approximately 1.3 billion in unpaid bills, off the top, all the money the state has to the Appropriation Committees. Our job begins today. I ask for an 'aye' vote. I ask for us to join together and begin this arduous difficult process of crafting a budget that lives within our means."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Mr. Speaker, if I may defer for especially Representative David Harris and I wish to speak. Could I follow him if he's..."

Speaker Lyons: "If that's your preference."

Harris, G.: "Yes, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Fine. Representative David Harris, with a friend you'd like to introduce to the Body."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Harris, D.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 706 with Amendment #2 is tough stuff. There is no other way to say it. The Governor said in his budget message that we have a rendezvous with reality. House Resolution 707, which was the revenue estimate of \$33.7 billion that we passed three years... three weeks ago was the first step in that rendezvous. This is step two. It is a big step and it is a hard vote to take. The downstream consequences of this Resolution as we fashion our FY13 budget are huge. I do not think anyone in this House should feel good about House Resolution 706. It reflects the terrible situation that our state is in yet it is the right thing to do. Over the past nine years, we have put this State of Illinois in a terrible hole and the first rule of holes when you are in one is to stop digging. Last year this House put together a budget that stopped the digging of the hole. This year, with House Resolution 706, we begin to climb out of the hole. You may remember that last year we passed a budget... excuse me... passed a revenue estimate and from that revenue estimate we took right off of the top certain commitments: pension obligations, group health, pension note debt service, other transfers out. We do exactly the same thing this year with 706. There are, however, two significant changes in this Resolution. The first change is that because of our Medicaid situation the funds to pay Medicaid like the other commitments I just mentioned are reserved right at the top, \$6.6 billion. That \$6.6 billion figure presumes... presumes that we were able to cut \$2.7 billion in liability as the Governor in his budget

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

message asked us to do. And Governor, we will work with you to achieve those savings. The other big change that was made this year over last year is that we put a line in here for old bills. All of us in this House know that the state has about \$8 billion in old bills that we have to pay. Last year we passed House Resolution 158, sponsored by the Gentleman from Madison County, that said any revenues that come in above what we appropriate will be used to pay old bills. Well, this House was right on target last year with our budget revenue estimate and guess what, there were no extra revenues that we anticipate coming in. So, we're not going to pay down our old bills. Well, this side of the aisle believes it is critically important that we make a meaningful... a meaningful payment to eliminate our stack of old bills. Thus, House Resolution 706 contains a line reserving \$800 million to pay old bills. Three hundred million of that will be used to pay non-Medicaid bills. Five hundred million will be used to pay Medicaid bills, which because of the federal match we will reduce our back bill of Medicaid by \$1 billion effectively giving us \$1.3 billion to pay old bills. We have to pay them. There is a phrase with drug addicts that because of their addiction they have a 'monkey on their back' and they won't be normal until they get rid of that monkey. My friends, the State of Illinois has a 'monkey on its back' and that monkey is \$8 billion in old bills. We will not be able to restore the State of Illinois to its rightful place of preeminence among our 50 states until we get rid of the majority of the old bills. Some would argue that we should borrow to pay

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

the old bills. That doesn't solve the problem; that adds to our debt service and just pushes the problem further down the line. We have to address it now. House Resolution 706 does that. We've got to get this monkey off our back. We don't have a printing press like they do in Washington, D.C.; it can pump out dollar bills. We don't have a Federal Reserve Bank that can create fiat money from virtually thin air. No, we have to pay our bills from the \$33.7 billion in revenue that we anticipate coming in to our Treasury. And rather than spend every single penny and see what may be left over, we're going to make that payment upfront. As I said earlier, this Resolution has downstream consequences. Resolution 706 means that the Appropriations Committees will have roughly \$900 million less... \$900 million less for FY13 day-to-day operations than they had last year. So, as we go into the appropriations process, we're going to do it with our eyes wide-open fully aware of what lays ahead of us. State Government provides many needed services that people rely on. We all have programs that we do not want to see reduced or cut, unfortunately, many of those services are going to be reduced and the programs are going to be cut. We have painful decisions ahead of us. It is not going to be easy. House Resolution 706, however, is the only route that will help restore our Land of Lincoln to fiscal stability and a positive future.

I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley awaits your questions."

Harris, G.: "You know, Representative Bradley, for those of us who were unable to be in the Revenue Committee hearing this morning because of other committee assignments, just want to clarify some of your... understand some of the thinking that went into this Resolution and you and Representative David Harris, you know, made very, you know, you know, clear and precise comments about the state that our Medicaid budget is in, in particular, where we're faced with a pile of unpaid bills and the liability will just continue to grow exponentially. And we're faced with a situation here that those of us who wish to, you know, protect Medicaid for the future have to be sure that we're protecting it for the most vulnerable now and we may have shift some other costs or make some other cost reductions to do that. So, in your discussions this morning, if additional non-GRF funds became identified related to the Medicaid program as the committees do their work, related to the healthcare or hospital provider relief funds or other Medicaid related funds or by generating additional savings or finding new revenues, is it your intent that those moneys be used exclusively for Medicaid related purposes and to redu... and to maximize our federal match?"

Bradley: "Well, I certainly don't have the authority personally to grant that request, but I think the discussions that took place in the group is that everything is going to end up it appears with cuts. The Appropriation Committees are all taking cuts. Medicaid, as proposed, is taking a

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

significant cut. If the hypothetical that you put forth comes true, there would be the discussions of this Body in a bipartisan manner to try to determine where to put those moneys back into the budget, whether it be Medicaid, whether it be in the five Appropriation Committees. That would be my guess as to where they would go, but it would be our decision and our job as Legislators to make that decision."

- Harris, G.: "Okay. So, the Governor's proposed budget anticipated we would cut Medicaid populations, eligibility, services and rates in the amount of \$2.7 billion in liability in this coming year. Is that your understanding?"
- Bradley: "That's correct. And we funded Medicaid at the Governor's proposed funding level. Now..."
- Harris, G.: "And did it..."
- Bradley: "...the other thing though I would say is in the unpaid bills, and I didn't mean to interrupt you, but on the unpaid bills because of all this pressure that's on the system a... the majority of unpaid bills to be paid are Medicaid related. So, there'll be about a billion dollars of the unpaid bills of the 1.3 will be Medicaid related bills. We did this to try to minimize some of the blow on the providers and on the people of the state."
- Harris, G.: "And the Department of Healthcare and Family Services submitted to the Joint Medicaid Committee between the House and the Senate of which I'm a member, a menu of options that if we enacted each and every one would only amount to about 3.01 billion. And I think many of us would agree that items on that list can be unrealistic in their

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

harshness in addition to the potential to shift sick people into more expensive settings along with losing some federal match. As the committee, the Joint Medicaid Committee does its work, if the committee develops a list of solutions to the Medicaid liability problems that includes some or all of the reductions or eliminations proposed by the department, or other savings were to come from stricter utilization reviews, recapture audits or savings from elimination to be their provider or eligibility fraud and additional non-GRF revenues such as enhanced or additional provider taxes and their result in federal match, would it be your intention that those would count toward the 2.7 billion in liability reduction?"

Bradley: "I would hope so and obviously, I personally would be open to that and I think the Members of the General Assembly would, but that would be a decision that we would have to make jointly. And I have great faith in your committee, personally and in your abilities and those that you're working with and we're very hopeful that you can do that, Greg."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're at a... we're at a terrible decision point here and we're going to have to make some very difficult cuts that are going to have a great deal of impact in each one of our districts whether we're from downstate, Central Illinois, suburbs or the County of Cook, but these decisions have to be faced and they have to be made. For every day that we do not make these decisions, the liability is only going to grow and the scope and the nature of the decisions we'll be forced

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

to make will only be worse. I compliment Representative Harris, and Representative Bradley and their committee for doing the work they've done on this Resolution and I'm encouraged in my discussions with Representative Harris yesterday and the discussion here on the floor with Representative Bradley today to know that we will have a lot of flexibility as we try to meet this \$2.7 billion liability cut in Medicaid that we will, you know, be able to use the most realistic assumptions. That we will be able to use the most realistic estimate of cuts, that will do the least harm to the people of Illinois, that will protect those who are in the most need and the most vulnerable and the most dependent on us for their healthcare that will allow us to be sure that we do not unintentionally shift folks from a lower cost setting into a setting that will only cost us more money because it looks like a cut on paper. That we will be able to go after fraud and abuse both by providers and by recipients to be sure that the dollars are going only to those that they... that deserve it and that those savings would apply to the \$2.7 billion in cuts. Ladies and Gentlemen, the task we have before us and the choices we will have to make coming down the road are going to be truly, truly unpleasant ones, but I would ask people that we vote 'yes' on this Resolution and we begin to make these choices now because if we make them six months from now or a year from now they're only going to be worse. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Robyn Gabel."

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Gabel: "I was just wondering how you divided... can you... well, can you describe how the allocations were divided among the various appropriation areas."

Bradley: "Certainly."

Gabel: "I'm concerned that Human Services is taking a bigger hit over the last few years than other areas and I was hoping that perhaps this year they would be doing a little better."

Bradley: "As the previous speaker indicated, that's a very pertinent question. Excuse me. Last year we set forth a process of allocation by percentages and so once we arrive the total of revenue available after paying mandatory spending items, which we would call above the up with historical percentages. line, we came appropriation chairs met at that time in conjunction with our friends across the aisle and came up with the to various... historical percentages given the appropriation areas. We took a six-year average at that time and we took a six-year rolling average at the request and suggestion of one of your colleagues that sits over by you. We couldn't agree on that, so then we averaged the averages and we came up with these percentages. We used the same percentages this year because we've obviously set allocation percentages; however, we've changed percentages because we took Medicaid out of the Human Services allocation and put it above the line at the Governor's introduced level. So, by doing that, last year Human Services was around 50 percent including Medicaid. As

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

a result of it being reallocated and Medicaid going above the line, the percentages were adjusted so that Human Services without Medicaid is at 31 percent. So, the other 19 percent went above the line, direct payment to Medicaid."

Gabel: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Representative, was there ever any conversation about where we might be able to find additional revenue that we could have a conversation about versus simply taking money off the top to do this particularly to pay old bills?"

Bradley: "Well, to your credit, every meeting that we were together in you brought it up and I've also had discussions personally, personally, with the Governor's Office. And in the Revenue Committee, we are always looking for potential additional revenue sources. You raised the issue; it was brought up in the meetings and so, it's out there and it continues to be out there. The Governor's Office continues to ask for us to look at that as well."

Davis, W.: "So, but if we pass this Resolution, doesn't that in a sense... doesn't that in a sense prevent our opportunity at putting new revenue on the board because if we... we pass this, then doesn't that mean that if we were able to find new revenue that we might actually go above our spending limit?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bradley: "No. No, it does not, but the burden or the limitation on additional spending by the state is not as a result of this Resolution. It's the result of the inability to do that within this chamber. And so, whether or not there are sufficient votes within this chamber to do additional revenue of whatever source it might be, that's the impediment to the additional revenue not this Resolution."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I think you hit on something important.

You said the inability to do that in our chamber, so in other words, you don't feel that there are enough Representatives in this chamber who will be willing to engage in the discussion..."

Bradley: "I..."

"...about more revenue so that we don't have to Davis, W.: necessarily make some of the cuts that we're talking about. Will there be a need for cuts or might we have to make some? That's always a possibility based on how much money you're able to find, but you're saying there's not enough of us willing to do so. We can't get enough of us in this chamber to stop this process long enough to talk about additional rev... wherever it comes from ... wherever it comes from. In our meetings, one of the Representatives from that side said, well, why don't we raise the premiums for All Kids, as though that would scare me? Well, it didn't and I suggested we put the Road Fund on the table, but that scared him. He didn't want to hear that, but I was willing to put something as dear to me on the table to have this discussion."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bradley: "Representative, and I know that's not directed at me, as someone who voted for the income tax..."

Davis, W.: "Absolutely."

Bradley: "Okay. Right. I'm standing here saying this is all the money we have right now. I don't know if this chamber has the stomach to do additional revenue at some point on whatever level, but that's where the impediment would be not this Resolution. The impediment would be whether or not this chamber wants to do anything additionally. I don't know the answer to that. I'm not saying it will; I'm not saying it won't. I don't know the answer to that. This Resolution doesn't prevent that."

Davis, W.: "So, then, is it possible that we might be able to halt this train so that we can have that discussion? And for me it's a simple question; either you are or you are not. Now, in our working group meeting, apparently there was no appetite for it and I'm okay with that, but did we have that discussion amongst all the Members? Did we put that question to everyone in this chamber whether or not we should or should not have the discussion about additional revenue? And I understand it's a conversation that probably scares a lot of them, quite frankly, if it scares you, you really don't need to be in this chamber because there are tough decisions that need to be made in this chamber and sometimes we have to do those tough decisions and this is one of them. This is one of them and all I'm suggesting is the end result of this is that all Appropriations Committees are going to see less money... are going to see less money. Now, for some reason, I think that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

those who aren't looking at or don't want additional revenue, I don't know if they don't care about the cuts that are going to be made or who's going to be impacted by Presumably, cuts. they're going disproportionate to communities like mine and you're right, I wouldn't expect them to care about my community the way that I would. I wouldn't expect that, but at the end of the day, we're going to have less money to spend in our Appropriations Committee which means that we're going to make cuts. And if this is the path that we're going down, then fine, this is the path we're going down and I just want whoever is in my committee to know that they're not going to like what's going to come out of my committee. It's not... they're not... it's not going to be pretty. In my committee, everything will be on the table in terms of making cuts. Last year, I had to make cuts to General State Aid. I certainly didn't want to do that. I had to make cuts to Early Childhood Education. I certainly didn't want to do that. But, believe me, if this is what's adopted and this is the path that we're going down, anybody in Elementary & Secondary Education-Appropriations Committee is not going to be happy with the decisions that are going to come out of that committee. So, I hope you're prepared to vote for that since we can't stop this process long enough to talk about additional revenue then let's just be prepared for the pain that's going to come in these Appropriations Committees. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley."

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Bradley, in... in all of your discussions especially with regard to setting the 2.7 Medicare reduction number..."

Bradley: "Med..."

Riley: "...and I see that there are some Amendments..."

Bradley: "Medicaid."

Riley: "...to remove the language. You're talking about the tiered system. I mean, we're going for it all, I guess. Was there any discussion at all that talked about the disproportionate impact that this might have on the so-called safety net hospitals?"

Bradley: "Yes. There was discussion about all aspects of that and obviously, this is a starting point and those discussions are going to continue. And as the Appropriation Committees work through the budget with the available revenue that we have currently, which this is all the revenue we have currently, as they work through those issues there's going to be more discussions and people are going to see exactly what the results of this kind of fiscal crisis is going to have on real people. And so, that discussion started weeks ago; it continues today and it will continue until the Legislature adjourns."

Riley: "Because I think it's important to note and we talk all the time, as a matter of fact it's gotten to be sort of a mantra. Everybody has to feel some pain, et cetera, et cetera, and I think that all thinking people understand that. The problem is some folks are going to feel it disproportionately especially those people who are charged

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

with taking care of the least of these among us like those safety net institutions. They're really going to be hurting much more than the collective pain that we... that we say that everybody has to... has to take. And I think that that's a very, very important thing to look at."

Bradley: "Well, and I trust that the Appropriation Committees, and we all have to trust that the Appropriation Committees in the process of working with the money that we have available right now are going to do everything they can to try to minimize the disproportionate impact that the fiscal crisis of the state may be having. And that really is an Appropriation Committee level decisions to be made as to how to spend our money we have available as wisely as possible."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative Bradley, were in the negotiation committees?"

Bradley: "I'm sorry?"

Mulligan: "Were you in the negotiation committees that we've had both last year and this year?"

Bradley: "I've been in a lot of negotiations. I don't..."

Mulligan: "No, no, the ones that we're sitting down in like one Room 100 where..."

Bradley: "Yes."

Mulligan: "...the first time the Democrats and the Republicans came together. I was there; I don't remember you being

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

there. I agree with Representative Davis. I think they're not going to be happy with what's happening. I don't like how Human Services has been cut across... apart from Medicaid and I don't like coming up with numbers before we're even there. And I don't like the fact that there was a Resolution filed yesterday that the Republicans had nothing to do with and the Democrats didn't see although the Democrats filed it. Don't you think that's an unusual way to carry on business in order to do a budget?"

Bradley: "This Resolution passed out of the House Revenue & Finance Committee on a... on leave this morning."

Mulligan: "Well, this is a new one because the one yesterday was incorrect and nobody..."

Bradley: "Well..."

Mulligan: "...bothered to do anything about it."

Bradley: "...it passed out of..."

Mulligan: "They just filed it."

Bradley: "It passed out of Revenue & Finance by agreement of the Parties on leave."

Mulligan: "Wasn't the budget based or the simi... and the... as far as we've started out that the budget was based on the budget as introduced not the budget that was passed with the Supplemental added on to it which makes for a different base and so, that we've been working on the wrong system of the base for the whole time this year?"

Bradley: "Unfortunately, you're incorrect in that statement. We looked at the revenue estimates. Representative David Harris and myself, working with the Revenue & Finance Committee and the Senate, as well, had a joint Revenue

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

hearing and we took evidence from three different sources. We invited the general public and any other sources. We got estimates from the Governor's Office, OMB, Department of Revenue working together. We got an estimate from COGFA. And we got an estimate... and we got not really an estimate, but we got remarks from the University of Illinois, Dr. Fred Dirks. We then took that information in conjunction with the Senate Democrats and Republicans in conjunction with the House Republicans and Democrats and came up and reached consensus on a bipartisan revenue estimate. That is the basis for our budget not last year's budget."

Mulligan: "I tend to disagree with you because that's not the figure that we started off with."

Bradley: "Well, in fairness, you weren't in those meetings that we were in, so..."

Mulligan: "Which ones?"

Bradley: "The Revenue meeting."

Mulligan: "Name one that I missed, but not..."

Bradley: "The Revenue meeting. So..."

Mulligan: "Well, the Revenue meeting is different than the actual dividing up of what's going to be put into the budget. Revenue is always discussed differently and with all due respect to you and Representative Harris, I don't remember that number coming up as far as what we did and this year you've totally excluded the Governor's people. One of the best people in that meeting is Representative Hannig, he used to be the negotiator on the Democrat side for years. At least we all put together of what our ideas were and we came up with what would be a reasonable budget

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

for last year and what would be the discussion of how we would cut and maneuver, not a... just this is what it's going to be for Human Services, cut apart from Medicaid, which is a whole different issue than how we've done it in the past. I've been doing this for over 20 years and this is the worst process I've ever seen. The estimate was that this would be the worst budget year in the last 20 years and my feeling is that we're doing a really poor job on that budget; we're not coming up on how we're going to support people. And I resent the fact that some people think that Republicans or people like me do not look at the overall picture of the state and whether it impacts Representative Davis or whatever, I always look at how is it going to impact my district and how is it going to impact the people of Illinois and I try to be very fair particularly when I'm working on budget. I think this is a very complex situation to be reduced to this kind of minutia that we put out with a Resolution that says this is how we're going to do it. And this is how we're going to do it as we go home, before we have a two week break where you can go out and tout the people how you're doing this great job when what you're really doing is you're basically wrecking the budget for the people of the State of Illinois as we go forward and I definitely resent how we're doing it. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this."

Bradley: "Thank you for your help."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mary Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Lady yields. The Gentleman yields."

Flowers: "Representative, you know, I really commend the hard work, and the long hours that you put into this and I know what you're doing here is really rather difficult, but I really am trying to get a understanding as to what it is that we're doing. So, if... if we were to vote for this budget, then what?"

Bradley: "Well, what we're doing..."

Flowers: "Let me just ask..."

Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry, you first."

Flowers: "Will we be able to pay off last year's bills... or the bills that's due?"

Bradley: "The total unpaid bills in the state are estimated as much as \$8 billion. That's going to take, without some type of... of other drastic measures, it's going to take several years using this methodology to pay off those back bills. Now, the bills are not getting any worse hopefully because we've turned the ship around and we're getting our fiscal house in order, but it's going to take some time, as you know, to actually get there."

Flowers: "Okay. So, we will not be paying off all of the overdue bills."

Bradley: "That's correct."

Flowers: "We will be paying some bills."

Bradley: "That's correct."

Flowers: "And despite the fact we will be paying some bills, there will be more new bills coming in. Am I correct?"

Bradley: "Well, those bills should not be greater than the appropriations that we make."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Flowers: "But the bills may not be greater than the appropriations that we make, the new bills that's coming in, but the outstanding bills, are they greater than the appropriations that we're going to make?"
- Bradley: "Not for the next fiscal year. So, you have the carryover... you have the backlog of bills which is not getting worse."
- Flowers: "How could the bills not be getting worse? Are there not going to be interest on those bills?"
- Bradley: "Well, we're paying interest, yeah, but you're..."
- Flowers: "Well, let me just ask you this. How do you foresee that the... that the incoming bills won't be getting worse?"
- Bradley: "Because we're not... the state is not going to spend money it doesn't have."
- Flowers: "Okay. So, now, with that being said, are we still going to have Medicaid in this state?"
- Bradley: "Yes."
- Flowers: "Is this not mandatory in order for this state to continue to get Medicaid that there are certain requirements that we must meet?"
- Bradley: "My understanding, yes."
- Flowers: "And so, if we violate the requirements that we must meet in order to get the Medicaid, in order to get the matching dollars, will we continue to get those Medicaid dollars?"
- Bradley: "My understanding is you have to comply with the program in order to get the appropriations."
- Flowers: "So, if we're not meeting the needs of the people that qualify for these programs, are we not in compliance with

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

the program to meet the needs in order to get the matching federal funds? Are we in violation?"

Bradley: "That would be the case if the committees do not follow the requirements of the Federal Government. We would have addit..."

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

Bradley: "We would have additional issues. I trust that they will."

Flowers: "So, by not complying with the people who have these needs, we are not in compliance with the Federal Government because the Federal Government says that there are certain things that you must do, state, if you want our dollars. You must deal with the children. You must deal with the elderly. You must deal with the disabled. You must provide prescription drugs. Will we continue to be able to do these things?"

Bradley: "We hopefully can continue to be able to do as much as we can with the money we have and that's going to be up to the committees, the Appropriation Committees, to spend the money as wisely as possible. And look, Representative, you and I are members of the Flower Caucus, right and I don't like doing this. I mean, I don't like the situation we're in. David Harris got up a while ago and he said the same thing. This is all the money we got. And as we stand here today, this is all the money we have."

Flowers: "But... but..."

Bradley: "And it's going to be up to the Appropriation Committees to spend it as wisely as possible."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Flowers: "But Representative, you stated it, we're the members of the Flower Caucus and so we want to grow. Flowers are here to grow and to spread all around us. So, we have to come up with a way to grow more moneys in this state, but we're not doing that. What we're doing is the same thing that we've been doing and we're going to continue to get same results. So, that monkey that the Representative Harris back is going to stay on his back. It's never going to move. And if... if we don't do something, we haven't got any type of waiver from the state to forgo these new pregnant women, to forgo the new elderly, to forgo the new disabled. So, what changes are we going to make in this state in order to grow more money, to create more jobs, so we can do what it is that we're suppose to because if we're cutting people off Medicaid then we're cutting off our nose to spite our face because we're losing moneys that we could be gaining. If we were doing the right thing, Representative, we should be trying to figure out a way how we can get maximi... maximize the dollars on Medicaid. Can we bring in the prescription drug company people and have them to negotiate the prices down? Can we bring in the hospitals ask them to negotiate the prices down? Can we ask businesses to add more jobs? Can we... What else can we do but we cannot continue to do the same thing because we're only going to lose in the end and we're going to... ought... and at the end on the other side of all of this, Representative, we are going to have sicker children, more elderly people, more people that were not able to get their prescription drugs and as a result, they, too, are going to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

be sicker. And by the way, Representative, there are going to be more people that's going to lose their insurance, more people that's going to lose their jobs because we're not doing anything any differently, Sir, to be bring jobs and revenue back into this state. So, until such time we step outside of our comfort zone, do something differently, we will continue to have the same problems that we're having and this is a failure. We should not go down this path. We should not balance this budget off the backs of poor people. We should not balance this budget off the backs of education. Thank you very much. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had eight people speak to the issue and I certainly know it's a very important issue that should be fully debated. I'd ask you if you could keep your remarks, if you plan on giving a five-minute dissertation, maybe make it four and a half. We have six more... six more speakers to go: Feigenholtz, Bellock, Dunkin, Kay, Arroyo and Dugan. And then we'll hear from Leader Cross and Speaker Madigan. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Resolution although it is, as previous speakers have mentioned, a daunting task. But I don't have a monkey on my back like Representative David Harris does, but I do... I did... I have been getting visits by a lot of chickens who have come home to roost on behalf of our Medicaid budget. The... the Medicaid budget has gotten very out of control in this state. I know many of you have been hearing from HFS,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

the Medicaid department, as well as the Civic Federation about our... our potential \$21 billion problem. That if we don't begin to address the liability in Medicaid, we are really going to be in a system that has collapsed. The previous speaker was talking about whether or not we are going to be able to take care of the most vulnerable people in the State of Illinois and people are wondering why are we paying bills when we have poor people and people who have needs. Well, that's why we are dealing and looking at the Medicaid monster right in the face. We really have to address this liability issue or our Medicaid system will collapse and the people who need these services the most will not have them. We have been working around the clock. I'd like to assure the Representatives who have larger populations that depend on these services that what we're attempting to do is restore and maintain the integrity of these programs for the long-term so that they are sustainable. It is going to be a painful, painful year, but we have the future of these children and the future of the poorest and most vulnerable in our hearts in committee meetings and we are hopefully going to be coming up with efficiencies so that we can sustain this program. Please do the best you can to support this. I, too, am very open-minded to revenue comments that other speakers made, but right now this is our reality. As Representative Bradley said, this is all the money we have and I really think we need to start paying our providers. So, please vote 'aye'."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock, Dunkin, Kay, Arroyo, and Dugan will be the last speaker. Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I just want to go over a few things, Representative Bradley, but especially regarding the payment of the old bills of which several people have spoken today that unless we pay these old bills, there's no way that I think that some of these agencies that we deal with on an ongoing basis, especially those of us in human service, I'm afraid those... some of those agencies will not be around next year if we don't pay those bills, especially some of the nursing homes, some of the social service small agencies throughout our state that deal with the disabled, the autistic, a lot of those agencies. So, I want to make sure that we clarify that in the 800 million for the old bills that 500 of that will go towards Medicaid so we can get a Medicaid match to pay down those Medicaid bills."

Bradley: "That is correct."

Bellock: "Okay. And what about the other revenue that COGFA has suggested that may come in new. Did we designate that in the Resolution..."

Bradley: "I... I don't..."

Bellock: "...where that was going to go?"

Bradley: "... I don't... We're just prioritizing the money that we've estimated available. I'm not... I don't know what you're referring to with additional revenue."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bellock: "Well, COGFA had suggested that there might be some additional revenue and I was a proponent of putting that towards Medicaid."

Bradley: "COGFA thought there was going to be additional revenue last year by about a billion dollars... sorry I was eating a mint, by about a billion dollars and they were wrong. So, if we get additional revenue that comes in, if our number is low, then we'll have additional decisions to make as to how..."

Bellock: "Okay."

Bradley: "...to prioritize that money."

Bellock: "Okay. All right. Thank you. And to the Resolution, I just wanted to make a few comments. I want to make sure that this whole Body understands that the administration asked us, on the Medicaid working group, to come in with 2.9... \$2.7 billion worth of cuts on Medicaid. And in reference to some of the other comments, some of those options are optional. They are not mandated by the Federal Government and that is what we have been asked to look at. So, you're talking about options such as all adult pharmaceuticals, all adult dental. You're talking about hospice, podiatry care, medical surplus things. All of those are on the table. We do not want to have to make those draconian cuts. We do not want to have to make those all the populations, the draconian cuts on populations, that we know need that money. So, I am asking you, this is why I know a lot of people are concerned about the Education Committee. Of course, I'm concerned about all that especially Human Service, where I've served forever,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

but I'm telling you, if we don't make some of those cuts on top, those committees are going to get less on the bottom. And so, I'm asking all of you to work with us on this issue because if you've been through what a lot of us on the Medicaid and the Budget Committee and especially those of us that had to go to the closure of the institutions and see 182 disabled people in wheelchairs finding out that they're going to have to be out of their home in 12 weeks, that's when you see the most fragile populations in the State of Illinois. And what we're trying to do here is pay some of the bills and have enough money to have those providers get paid. Right now, you have your hospitals and doctors delayed by 180 to 300 days right now and if we go to next year and we don't get those cuts and pay 1.9 billion in Medicaid bills and pay off some of our other bills, we're going to be at 5.4 in Medicaid bills that we won't be able to pay. So, that's why we don't want the draconian cuts, we don't want to hurt the populations, but we need to do something and put this state back on a stable fiscal footing. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, as one of the chairs of the Approp Committees, maybe I missed this part, but I'm not a Member of your Revenue Committee... Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes."

Dunkin: "I'm not a Member..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bradley: "Uh huh."

Dunkin: "...of your Revenue Committee nor did I attend the meeting today."

Bradley: "You're welcome, though, to come."

Dunkin: "Thank you. I'm going to hold you to that. Did we get some indication or clarification, and maybe Speaker Cross will speak on it or some of the other budget leaders that I sit in the room with, to start having a discussion on revenue and revenue enhancement?"

Bradley: "Well, that was brought up at every meeting that I was in. There have also been other meetings on that and that would be up to the will of Body."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Bradley: "This Resolution doesn't deal with that and it doesn't preclude that."

Dunkin: "Absolutely. You know, because it's... it's tough, but it can be... it's easier to make the cuts compared to generating the revenue to run our State Government, right?"

Bradley: "I don't ... I don't know. I don't know. I don't think either one of them are easy."

Dunkin: "Well..."

Bradley: "And... and we're beginning the process today where we're going to find out, right?"

Dunkin: "Absolutely. Because, you know, most of us have an idea of what we don't like or what we... are not familiar with or don't know and we want to start going through... swinging the machete throughout the state's budget. Irrespective of, in some cases, not all, but of who it's going to have a direct impact on and I have a real problem with it only if we

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

can't come up with a revenue enhancement. So, I want to ask my colleagues on the Democratic and the Republican side the of tough auestion revenue enhancement that involves borrowing as an option. If we could make a tough decision on cutting Medicaid by \$2.7 billion that we know will have a calamitous effect all across this state. We've looked... we're looking at cutting Elementary and Secondary Education by a tremendous amount of money that's going to impact everyone in the state. So, borrowing should also be on the table as an option. We can't run away from what it is that we need to do to pay the bills, even if we're making certain reductions. Now, here's another one for us. income tax expires in another year from now. Do we have the appetite to sustain or keep the income tax increase that we went from 3 percent to 5 percent? Is that going to be a serious option for us as well 'cause we can't cut our way out of this? We have to make some additional moves to really pay for the bills. And by the way, we can borrow \$8 billion this Session if we have the will and fiscal responsibility and guts to make the tough choice of borrowing the money. And by the way, of the incomes tax that we have for two years, in there there's a little provision, a little known provision, that pays off debt to our bondholders. So, I want to make sure that that is out there and on the record and a challenge to my Minority Leaders that sit on the Appropriation Committees to look at that option as well. Finally, the Road Fund, the sacred cow in the State of Illinois south of I-80 where we receive where the Road... the fuel tax, the Road Fund, 90 percent of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

those dollars come from the County of Cook or within the Chicago metropolitan area. But if I'm not mistaken, only 55 percent of those dollars that are expended go to the Chicago area. Now, someone correct me if I'm wrong, but the Road Fund has to be on the table. The extension of the income tax has to be on the table. The borrowing... we can... we can solve a lot of this right now if we borrowed \$8.8 billion and paying it off within 14 years by way of our income tax. We could solve this right now. So, I want to make sure that we have that as food for thought as we look at trying to get the monkey off our back to help pay for just this year alone, given the fact that we haven't even gone into the 2013 or 2014 budget. So, those are some of the other challenges as we vote on this tough decision that we have to make for all of the citizens here in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dwight Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields, Sir."

Kay: "Thank you. You know, I've heard some really great speeches today and before I talk too much, I just want to say this that I didn't come to this Body to politically litigate matters, although sometimes that happens, it's kind of a nature of what we do here. But I think as a practical matter we need to stop a second and realize that Speaker Madigan and Leader Cross and David Harris and John Bradley have worked very hard to fix a problem. And I think, you know, we ought to… we ought to be in recognition of the fact that we can sit here and we can politically

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

litigate these issues about how we got here and why we got here and the best way to get out or stay where we are, but the simple truth is that I think what I'm hearing today is that we have some people who finally in State Government understand that there's a difference between a debit and a credit. There's a balance sheet in this state and there's a bottom line and if you don't hit a bottom line number, you have debt. Well, frankly, I'm very thankful to Speaker Madigan and Leader Cross and the work that Representatives Bradley and Harris have done because it sends a very strong signal to people who have lost hope in this Government. They have lost hope; they have no belief that we can do the right thing. There's no integrity when it comes to this House because they don't think we can the right thing. Now, I think we can. I think it's become apparent, it's become crystal clear, that if we don't move off of debt center, like these Representatives and the Leaders in both Parties have suggested, that all we will end up with is failure. And I've heard today that we need to go out and borrow more money. Well, I don't think that's the answer. And I don't think any of us in here want to make unreasonable cuts. I don't think we do; I don't. But I think there is a time when we say enough is enough when it comes to taxes. We just went through a terrific tax increase, which may or may not be necessary, I don't know I wasn't here, didn't vote on it, but I think the truth is that we move forward now and we establish some trust with those people who have sent us here, we do the responsible thing and we build some integrity back into this State

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Government. And I think if we don't do that we fail. This is a giant step in my opinion; it is a business step not a government step. It is a business step that we need to take and my hat goes off to Speaker Madigan, Leader Cross, David Harris and John Bradley. I'm going to support this Bill. I'm going to support this Resolution because it's not only the responsible thing to do, but it's the right thing to do. Let's stop politically litigating this issue because all it's going to do is bring failure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Luis Arroyo."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Arroyo: "I'm not happy with this Resolution, but apparently this is the only Resolution we have in front of us. I'm going to vote for this Resolution 'cause I want to get to the business of the exercise with the oth... with the other side of the aisle to be able to get to the number that was given to us to be able to do the work to pass this budget at the end of the day. At the end of the day, my job as Appropriations Chairman is to pass a budget for Public Safety. We got cut \$84 million; I'm not happy about that, but we have a job to do and that's what I intend to do. I got a good relationship with Dave Reis and we had a good exercise and we did a good job last year. Everybody applauded us, everybody was happy. This year I don't know if there's going to be any applause because nobody's going to be happy. The buzz word this year is going to be haircuts. Everybody in this chamber, everybody in this

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

district is going to get a haircut. Maybe we're going to need a barber after we all get through here, but I think that this is what we have on the table. And a lot of my colleagues were talking about the Road Fund; everybody's talking about the Road Fund. I tell you, in Public Safety is where the Road Fund sits and there's nothing off the table in Public Safety that includes the Road Fund. How we get there, where we move the money, how we do it, I'm going to ask Dave Reis to be able to help on that. If we don't have to touch it, we won't touch it, but last year we paid mass transit with a portion of the Cook County Road Fund, our Road Fund east... on the east side, so maybe downstate's Road Fund would be moved around a little bit. Back again, if Corrections, all these 25 agencies I appropriate, they all going to get a haircut. So, you know, we're going to be able... I'm going to be able to look on the other side to be able to sit down together, do the same exercise, nothing's going to change. The only thing that's changing is the amount that we're going to have to trim from the budget. And I will be voting for this Resolution, John. It's not perfect, but this is the one we have in front, so this is the one I'm going to vote for. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Final speaker will be Representative Dugan and then Leader Cross and Speaker Madigan. Lisa."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Representative Bradley and of course, I think we've had this conversation. And I just, again, want to ask, last year as we came up with this plan and of course, we started

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

this last year with this new and it's not that I disagree with what we're doing. I think it's finally time that the state does it in a way that we do it understanding how much money we have and that's where we go. But my concern last year and of course, I think you know that I serve on Approps-Human Services, so as we continue to look at the figure, I was told of course that the percentages were given just by taking averages. So, now that we're in this year and we know that it's even going to be a tougher year, my question is still the same. Why or how was it determined as far as the percentages or again, was it just averages? And I say that and I know other Appropriations chairmen, of course..."

Bradley: "It was math."

Dugan: "...want as much as they can too."

Bradley: "It was just math."

Dugan: "Just math. And I look at it as we have to make the cuts and I have no doubt we have to make the cuts and I've been telling my people that since last year. There are going to be cuts, but it's the priorities here that I'm a little bit concerned about because we are just using math."

Bradley: "Well..."

Dugan: "As a Legislator who, of course, has communities that let's just say, for example, uses the OSLAD grants, right, for parks and recreation, something very important in my district. But as a Legislator who has to make a distinction and a decision with the cuts that we have to make this year as to whether or not possibly parks and recreation and again, I know the ones that are Appropriation Members of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

that committee won't like this. I'm just trying to look at..."

Bradley: "Yeah."

Dugan: "...the importance of what's important in the state. And when we look at the \$2.7 billion reduction in the Human Services Appropriations and have to make those kinds of cuts, I have a little bit of a difficulty just saying we use an average..."

Bradley: "Well, Representative, I oversimplified that and maybe my response was a bit curt. We use the historical allocation amounts. So, over the last six years, right, this was the percentage on average that Human Services got."

Dugan: "Correct."

Bradley: "Over the last six or seven now, right? Over the last seven years, this was the average percentage Education got. So, we took the historical averages. So, this is what... the only way to do this as fairly as possible, there's nothing good, easy or really nice about it, was to find out... figure out on an average how much we'd allocated percentagewise to the five Appropriation Committees and then appropriate money based on that percentage and also to reduce the amount of money this year based on those same percentages."

Dugan: "And I understand how we did it and I... and maybe that's your answer. I mean, we just use an average. I guess..."

Bradley: "It's historical, but it's..."

Dugan: "It's historical."

Bradley: "This is what we normally do. We normally appropriate..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Dugan: "Well, and historically it's right."

Bradley: "...including maintaining around 50 percent to Human Services."

Dugan: "And I understand it, but I think if we are going to say that, historically, then historically I think we then have to look at today and with the economy and the downturn and what has happened to where there are people who never felt they were going to have to need the services that our state provides for those. Then, I think, could just say, well, historically Human Services has always only had this percentage that... that's why I'm just concerned. I'm not saying it's wrong; I'm just saying I just want it on public record I'm concerned that we're not ... priorities in the state. I'm going to be on Approps-Human Services. I'm not going to be on where the OSLAD grants are. So, I'm just saying if I had to make a choice, I would rather, as a Legislator, say parks and recreation may have to wait a little bit and maybe we need to put some in before we're going to have to take drugs away from seniors or those types of things. So, that's all I was trying to find out was I know we use an average. I'm just not sure that I agree with that."

Bradley: "I'm sure..."

Dugan: "But I understand you worked hard to try to do that."

Bradley: "Thanks. And I'm sure if one of the Appropriation Committees feels like they need to give some of their money to another Appropriation Committee say you'll take it."

Dugan: "That's what they told me last year, so I'm just... I'm just saying from the perspective. I know nobody wants to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

give anything up. I'm just saying I think because we are hurting and the cuts we're going to have to make, I think another step this state needs to make is to really prioritize and the only problem I have is the way we do what we're doing and as we said last year in silos. I'm not... you know, I only have this much money in Approps-Human Services and even though, yes, I would have to, you know, I don't get the money, the chairman woman would, but yes, if another committee would say, hey, Human Services, we think we want to keep the drug program in place for seniors that would be great if they did. We didn't see that last year; I don't know if we'd see it this year."

Bradley: "I think the Appropriation Committees, we all work together, most of us are friends, the Appropriation Committees certainly have the rights and the abilities to have discussions among themselves."

Dugan: "Right. And I hope..."

Bradley: "And I don't..."

Dugan: "...that maybe that conver... those conversations are held more this year. So, I thank you for the work you guys did. I know it's tough. I know we're going to have to make cuts and I'm not saying that I'm not willing to make them in Human Services, I'm just saying I think we all need to think about maybe our priorities in spending needs to possibly be maybe switched in some of these percentages that we now have. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "I announced on several occasions that Representative Dugan would be the last speaker.

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Representative Bradley, before our Leaders speak would you like to have a last word."

Bradley: "I would just say that I appreciate the discussion today. I want everyone to understand that this is a very difficult task that we've been asked to do. This is a very difficult task that I've been asked to do today because what's going to happen with this budget is going to be very, very difficult and this is not easy. I don't like this; you don't like this. None of us like it, but it's reality. It's the hand we've been dealt. It's something we have to deal with and we're going to do our very best working together to get through this very difficult fiscal crisis and that's what it is. It's a fiscal crisis. We're trying to get the state back on solid financial standing. We're trying to run it more like a business. We're trying to pay our bills. We're trying to set up a program where we can get out of this, but in the meantime, it's going to be very, very tough and the only way we'll get through it is working together, helping each other out, picking each other up where necessary, standing our ground and making sure we do the best thing possible for the people we represent and for the State of Illinois. I'm honored and humbled to be a Member of this Body. I never thought I'd get to work in a place that has chandeliers, but this is going to be a difficult process and we're very, very, very difficult in the days to come. So, I appreciate the courtesy and I appreciate the questions and I look forward to the Leaders, Leader Cross and Speaker Madigan, who I

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

compliment for their work as well as my good friend Representative David Harris."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen, for your very well done attention to all the speakers. Republican Leader Tom Cross."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to all of you in this Cross: chamber. It concerns me a bit, before I get to the Resolution, to somewhat of the tone I've heard from some folks in this chamber and maybe even on both sides in that it's become almost a threatening tone and a threatening approach that is not helpful and constructive as we go down this road. Nobody, as Representative Bradley said, enjoys this; nobody takes glee in this; nobody takes delight in this. This is very difficult and we find ourselves at a very difficult time in this state's history and we need to get through this and we're going to need to do it without threatening and without suggesting that if we do this, this region's going to get hurt or this fund is going to get hurt because of your approach to this. That's not helpful. That's not a cons... as I said earlier, a constructive approach. And I think a lot of it stems, as I listened to people on the other side of the aisle, about the cuts in Medicaid. The cuts in Medicaid are going to be done in a bipartisan way, in a bipartisan way. It is the Governor that suggested \$2.7 billion in cuts in Medicaid, a Democrat Governor who said 2.7 cuts in Medicaid. Representative Bellock, Representative Feigenholtz and Representative Leitch, are all sensitive to the concerns that many have on Medicaid. They are not people that want

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

to hurt other people. They are realistic and aware of the people that benefit from Medicaid who need Medicaid, but they want to stabilize the system and to take the approach that someone wants to do this just to hurt certain folks is inaccurate and it's not ac... it's not ... it's not fair to those folks that are engaged in this whether it's Julie Hamos or the Governor's Office or Legislators. There's been a lot of talk about revenue increasing to solve this problem. We just had the largest tax increase in the history of this state; it hasn't solved our problem. It's not working and for us to think or anybody to suggest that we are going to go back to the people of the State of Illinois whether they're business owners, large or small, homeowners, taxpayers and say, we hadn't gotten it yet; we need more money from you, isn't a route that many of us want to go down and will not go down. We're at a time when we're going to have to confront these problems with some fiscal discipline, some cutting and some reforming, try to be fair across-the-board to certain regions, all regions, but it's not going to be solved by raising more revenue. We can't do that. Now, this Resolution, in my opinion, is a roadmap, it's a starting point of where we'd like to get and it contains some... it's predicated on a number of things happening and they're not all going to be easy, but for us to get to where we need to be and for us to be a... long for on this journey, if you will, we need to... we need to fulfill this document and what it calls for in totality. I wish you could have been in our caucus yesterday and I listened to folks from outside interest in this state who

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

say to us as Republicans, why do you want to be involved in this. Why are you even engaged in this? And it's a fair question when you think about, for the last 10 years, we've been pretty much blocked out of the process. We talked about the fact that you shouldn't short pensions, we talked about the fact that you were spending money you didn't have. We talked about the fact that you borrowed money and created huge amounts of debt and we talked about the devastation of the tax increase. And so, they ask a fair question and it's a legitimate question, but I think many of us feel that it has gotten so bad, as a state, that we are at a tipping point that we have no choice but to be engaged in this process and it's our state. Representative Kay basically said, Ι don't want paraphrase, the finger pointing times are over and that the folks in this state that aren't elected expect us all regardless of Party to solve this problem and to work together, but to do it in a real, real substantive way. This Bill and Resolution calls for Medicaid reform. requires that we take on the issue of retiree and active health care reform and it requires that we cut across-theboard, all very, very difficult things. One of the things that we will hear in the next few days, in the next few weeks is, from a variety of sources that comes before us, that you're cutting education or you're looking at cutting education or you're cutting this or you're cutting that. I think it's fair to say to them and you don't have to do it in a smart way, but we are now facing the reality of the crowding out problem of pensions. We neglected the pension

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

issue for a long time. We had an opportunity last year; we didn't do it. And when you have to pay \$7.5 billion on pension related items and couple that with Medicaid and other growth, you find yourself in a position of having very little choice, very little choice, but to cut. And if TRS, which we think they will do, changes their assumptions on the interest rate that the other four systems did, we'll have an additional pressure next year of as much as... could high as another billion dollars. You Representative Bradley talk about the fact that the pension pressure jumped a billion. It's because we have changed the assumptions. It's going to happen again. We have got to address pensions this year, as tough as it may be. We don't have, in my opinion, very little choice. This is a very good first step. It is the first time in a long time that we will be spending less than we took in. We started that last year. We did a pretty good job last year. I would argue we could have done a little better, but we are spending money... less money this year than we did last year. We will pay off a billion and seven in bills, if we follow this. And I want to make sure that something that's said that I think Representative Bellock and Representative Bradley covered that, but I'm just not sure that it sunk in. And it's just Representative Harris' idea and it was good one. We are going to take care of the bills. We've got \$800 million put down that are going to be attributed to bills, 500 of that is going to go to Medicaid, but this whole bill number is going to be treated as if it was a pension payment, treated as if it was debt service, treated

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

as if it was a... a transfer out where it will go directly to either the Comptroller or the Treasurer. I think we'll have it going to the Comptroller so nobody has the ability to take that money and spend it somewhere else. It will go specifically to paying old bills. It can go nowhere else. I think one of the concerns a lot of people had is that we're going to have ... is put up \$800 million out here and it'll be spent on new projects. That's not what's going to happen. It will go specifically to bills. So, you're going to take 800 million, 500's going to go to Medicaid, you'll get a match, that'll give you a million to take care of bills then you'll have 300 million for General Revenue. On top of that, we have \$200 million over... we believe we'll get \$2 million... \$200 million more than the Resolution we passed a few weeks ago that acknowledged how much we're going to have. This Resolution also says that will go to bills. So, if you take that 200, match that with Medicaid, you'll have another \$400 million going toward bills... toward Medicaid bills. That, at the end of the day, takes a billion seven down on bills. That is remarkable. If we get to the point on Medicaid where we get to... where we... where we hope we'll get and it will be a challenge, it will be tough, we will Medicaid by 25 percent. That's amazing; that's astonishing. And again, we want to find a way to do in a... in a... as fair a way as we can, but it stabilizes the system that also like the pension system is putting so much pressure on us that it forces us to cut. We fully fund the pensions under this Resolution and would also say, under employee contracts, and for elected officials, there will

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

salary freezes. If we implement this document totality, we will, next year, for the first time in a very long time, have more money, more revenue than we will spend. It will be for the first time we will be on a... on a road to recovery, if you will, if we fully implement this. Imagine if we do pension reform and imagine if we follow this document, we might actually have the credit rating agencies up our number. This is what they've been asking for. There are going to be a lot of people that will criticize this. They'll be a lot of people that will say you haven't gone far enough, but you can't improve the business climate in this state if you don't do this along Medicaid reform and pension reform. You eliminate the tax increase if you don't start with this product. You can't pay your bills if you don't do this. So, for those that have different ideas and want to say that we need to go further, we welcome those. We'll take those, but you have to engage in this process to make a difference and I think we all have that responsibility as an institution to make sure that we move forward with this. I assume we'll pass it today. I think we have to recognize Representative Harris and Representative Bradley along with Representative Bellock, Representative Cole, Reis, Rose, Pihos Mulligan and those of you on the other side of the aisle. This is going to be very, very difficult. This is going to be as difficult a year as we've ever had, if we do it right, but we have no choice. And I'm hopeful that when we come back in a few weeks and get into May, toward the end May, that we will fulfill this document's of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

responsibilities, if you will, and get us to where we need to be. We want to work with you and we accept that and we appreciate the opportunity to do that, but we need to do it all and we need to make some very, very difficult decisions as we move forward. So, Mr. Speaker, thanks for the opportunity and obviously, I support this and would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker of the House, Michael J. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the matter on the record is House Resolution 706. The next matter to be considered by the chamber will be House Joint Resolution 69. The Resolutions are identical. And I would request leave that we consider both Resolutions on the same Roll Call."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker Madigan requests leave to do both Resolutions at the same time. Seeing no objection, leave is taken."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. First, I want to compliment those who worked so hard and so well on this matter. Five chairs of Appropriations Committees, five Republican the spokespersons on those committees, Mr. Bradley, the chair the Revenue Committee; Mr. Harris, the Republican spokesman on the Revenue Committee; Representative Bellock, Representative Mautino, Representative Cross, we all worked together. We worked cooperatively. We met together. exchanged ideas. We did this over several weeks. This is not something that is the result of a quick judgment. This is something that was done in a very deliberative manner, a very deliberative fashion. Not everybody is happy with the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

numbers in the Resolutions because some people would like the numbers to be higher and some people would like the numbers to be lower. And so, this is a compromise, a compromise predicated upon the best information available to the General Assembly. The information comes from the Bureau of the Budget in the Governor's Office, it comes from COGFA, it comes from other economic forecasting agencies and there's little dispute about the numbers themselves. The dispute relates to whether in someway they ought to be higher or someway they ought to be lower. Some have said why today, why so early, why don't we wait a little longer, why don't we talk about it even further? Well, one reason for today is that we're scheduled to take a two-week break and when we return to Session, there will be only seven weeks left in this Session. Now, given the difficulty of this task, seven weeks is not a long time. Seven weeks, given the difficulty of the task, is a rather brief time. And so, we're all well-advised to take the vote today to move ahead. Mr. Cross has explained in his remarks it's a good start, it's a good outline. It's an outline that will help us fashion our debate, help us engage with each other so that we can adopt, pursuant to Constitution, a balanced budget and a balanced set of Appropriation Bills that will authorize spending over a 12month period beginning July 1. As I said, I'm going to be very brief. We've had a very good debate today. compliments to all of those who were engaged in the process, my compliments to those who engaged in the floor debate today. This has been very well done. Mr. Speaker, I

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

rise in support of the Resolution and request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Speaker Madigan and Leader Cross ask for the adoptions of both House Joint Resolution 69 as well as House Resolution 706. So, both issues are on the same Roll Call. 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? Currie, Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 91 Members vote 'yes', 16 Members vote 'no', 3 Members vote 'present' and House Resolution 706 and House Joint Resolution 69 are hereby declared adopted. Leader Cross on House Bill 3969. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3969, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Tom Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a fairly straightforward Bill. It deals with pensions and this applies to anybody that has been in the General Assembly prior to August 22 of 1994. For those people that leave, there's no limitation... salary limitation or limitation on their pension... on the pension they're going to receive. Meaning, they could go somewhere else, get a higher salary and their pension goes up, sometimes considerably. This Bill gives... provides two options for those people prior to August 22 of '94, not retired, but currently... that would apply to current Members and that says you can: 1) opt to have a limitation based on your General Assembly salary or in the alternative, if you

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

go somewhere else and there is an increase in your salary, which means an increase in your pension, that new employer... new employer's Pension Fund will pay for that increase. So, the General Assembly system does not take care of that increase. So, you could be a Member of the General Assembly prior to '94, go work for a municipality and in the event you get a higher pension, that municipality pension system will be on the hook. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. And if you have any questions, be glad to try to answer those."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Nekritz: "Leader does this... tell me to whom this applies."

Cross: "Yes. Just any current Member of the General Assembly that started prior to '94 and we did not apply... this does not apply to retirees 'cause the... we think the statutes that prohibits that are in an earlier statute. But it would apply to anybody in the General Assembly that started prior to August 22 of '94."

Nekritz: "'Cause I... 'cause..."

Cross: "It's a small, fairly small universe."

Nekritz: "I would think so and I just wanted to make sure that the Body understood that that's not... 'cause it would not apply to those that are... that are already retired."

Cross: "Correct."

Nekritz: "So, that we would blow yet another hole in the budget that some of those agencies that are going to be really harmed by this by what action we just took."

Cross: "Correct."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Cross to close."

Cross: "I'd... I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 3969 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? Acevedo, Camille Lilly. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back to the regular Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of the alphabet, Representative Hays, on page 9 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4753. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4753, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Hays, has been approved for consideration."

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

Hays: "I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Lyons: "On Floor Amendment #1."

Hays: "Okay. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. This Bill simply provides language for a law that we passed last year that allows a renewable energy production district to be established by front-door referendum. The language in this Bill sets forth the specifics of how the district is established, parameters for conducting business, how it would be dissolved, rules and regulations for proper

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

recordkeeping. And I would be happy to entertain any questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I believe we're just adopting Floor Amendment #1. So, we'll adopt the Amendment. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And Representative, I think you just explained the Bill on the Amendment. Are there any questions of Representative Hays regarding House Bill 4753 as amended? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4753, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "How is this authority funded?"

Hays: "The... the district would be established by a front-door referendum of land that would be contiguous within a single county. The mechanism for establishing the trustees would be that the county board would appoint the trustees, if the front-door referendum were established. The funding for the district would be the individuals would come together to establish the district would be responsible for the funding."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Franks: "So, this has not come into fruition yet? This would be allowing via tax dollars through a referendum to create this district."

Hays: "Yes. And the… and the folks that are looking to do this, of course, the notion would be that this… there would be a profit affiliated with this kind of a district and I think their ultimate intent would be for a vehicle to help lower property taxes."

Franks: "Why do you want to have these trustees to get additional funds because right now you're expand... this Bill would allow the trustees to be reimbursed for actual expenses but also current travel expenses, et cetera. Why do they need the additional expenses?"

Hays: "I think the only expenses that would be anticipated would be those nominal expenses, to and from meetings, et cetera. I would hope that those would be extraordinarily minimal in that the district itself, as required by statute, could only be within the confines of a single county. So, there should not be extraneous travel expenses, et cetera."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just wondering why we would need that 'cause I was thinking if they're going to be within the county the people are serving that they wish to do... to do this, I don't know why they would need reimbursements if their driving to a meeting of something they're doing on their own..."

Hays: "Sure."

Franks: "...free will."

Franks: "And I'd be happy to look at that, absolutely."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Franks: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chad Hays moves for the passage of House Bill 4753. 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? Kelly Burke, Dunkin, David Harris, Jackson, Morthland, Unes, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 88 Members voting 'yes', 16 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Arroyo, on page 12 of the Calendar, on House Bills-Second Reading, you have House Bill 5454. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 5453. Out of the record. Representative Esther Golar, on the Order of Third Readings, Esther, on page 19 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5655. 5655. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5655, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Esther Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's a pleasure to talk about House Bill 5655. It is an initiative of MS and this Bill will really make and correct some of the issues that are going on. There's been some alarming numbers in nursing homes and those numbers are startling in terms of patient safety, also for the health care workers that are there. And this Bill will address and actually take care of the safety of the residents there, safe

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

lifting, safe lifting teams. It is... it is a comprehensive initiative by MS to address some of the egregious things that's going on in nursing homes. Some of the numbers are like 20 thousand that... alarming numbers, that will be affected by this change. And so, I would ask for your consideration of this particular measure. And I would be happy to take any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on House Bill 5655. Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 5655 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? Coladipietro, Dunkin, Fortner. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Durkin, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4116, on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4116, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was tabled. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Durkin."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Durkin on Floor Amendment #2."

- Durkin: "Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to proceed with Floor Amendment #3. Floor Amendment #2 is... do not wish to have that part of this Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Do you want it to go away, Representative? Do you want it..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "That would be wonderful."

Speaker Lyons: "Do you want to withdraw Floor Amendment #2?"

Durkin: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Durkin wishes to withdraw Floor Amendment #2. The Amendment is withdrawn. Is there anything further,

Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Durkin."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Durkin, how about Floor Amendment #3."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill which relates to the College Illinois Program. In the initial form, in the previous Bill which we passed out of the Higher Education Committee just last week, it addressed three things. Two of them there was a lot of discussion on. One of them was regarding the use of the trust fund to pay salary and benefits but also the use of the trust fund to pay management fees. I've withdrawn those from this Amendment and strictly all we're dealing with right now is requiring members who serve on the Investment Advisory Panel within Illinois Student Assistance Commission to now require them to file an annual economic interest statement. They provide great guidance and support to the Commission on investment decisions. This is a \$1.5 billion fund. I think this is, again, this is an issue of transparency, but I will just... There are going to be future Bills coming up. I plan... excuse me... I plan to pass this over to the Senate. I know the Auditor General will be bringing out their report before Session comes and I think there'll be more

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

information related to College Illinois, but I... this is a good aspect of what we're trying to do to increase transparency in the program, but I believe that we will probably find additional Amendments when we move it over to the Senate. I think I've spoken enough."

Speaker Lyons: "The Representative 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 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: "House Bill 4116, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Dur... Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "I'll rely upon my previous statement and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 4116 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, in back. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lisa Hernandez, on page 18 of the Calendar, on House Bills-Third Readings, you have House Bill 4531. 4531. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4531, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Lady from Cook, Representative Lisa Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 4531 makes some changes to the Illinois Identification Card Act. The Bill changes the Disabled Person Identifi Card... Identification Card to Illinois Person with a Disability Identification Card. It also removes the ability for the Secretary of State to issue ID cards without photographs, also alters the I... the definitions for certain types of disabilities, removes a disabled person from receiving the regular state ID card free since the Illinois Persons with a Disability Identification Card is provided for free. This is an initiative of the Secretary of State for the purposes of addressing a... in a more respectful manner people with disabilities. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Seeing no discussion, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 4531 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 du Buclet, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 93 Members voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on House Bill 5182?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5182, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Amendment #1, offered by Representative Monique Davis, has been approved for consideration."

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

Davis, M.: "Yes, Representa... I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Floor Amendment #1 was recommended do adopt it in committee yesterday. And it talks about the fact that if a person is a first time offender and has not committed a violent crime, that the judge could consider releasing them on their own recognizance. So, this already occurs, but we're codifying it. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Amendment. Representative? Okay. We'll adopt the Amendment. 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. And Floor Amendment #1 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: "House Bill 5182, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment becomes the Bill. It's... It addresses the fact that if a first time offender who is employed is charged with a crime the judge can consider allowing them to be released on their own recognizance. The judge, of course, has that discretion. And it also asks that... Well, nonviolent crimes also include the burglary or sex offenses and so forth. So, I ask for a favorable vote."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dennis Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I want to thank Representative Davis for taking the time to work on this issue. I know we worked on it for probably about a month or so and the issue of bond is a relatively complex issue, but one of the things that the courts need to take into consideration is the ability of the defendant to post a reasonable bond. And each defendant will be found at a different economic status and many of those people have jobs and we want to make sure that if we're able to that they're able to maintain employment. So, as we look at the lower level felonies, especially in drug cases, it would make sense to give somebody recognizance bond or a very low bond, if they can prove that they have a job to go to. And so, I know that the Sponsor has indicated that she will work with the Senate Sponsor, so this Bill will come back, that would require if a person's released on a recognizance or a very low bond that they would have to show proof of employment at their next court date otherwise bond could be revoked or whatever other issues the judge could deal with it that way. So, I think this is a good step towards making sure that we're not having issues like Cook County does with people in custody with overflow and at the same time making sure that people can still maintain employment while they're dealing with other issues. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "To the Bill. I usually don't disagree with my colleague who just spoke, but I think we may have just have

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

a difference of opinion. I don't know why we need this Bill, but I also know we need... every once in a while we need to be conscientious of the separation of powers. We remember we are the Legislature and I believe when we start crossing the line and getting into determin... telling judges when or when not and how to impose bail, I think we have made a violation. I don't think it's our place to be able to put conditions on a court to determine when or what types of conditions should be set for bond and certain offenses. That is something that's inherent within the judiciary. I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Davis to close."

Davis, M.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Representative Reboletti and also Matt Jones from the Prosecutor's Association and all of those from the Sheriff's Association, the president of the county board for their support of this legislation. And I have promised that we will continue to work with the Senate to include the line that they have to prove that they are employed. This is to keep people with nonviolent offenses from being kept in jail for a long period of time or a couple of weeks and then be released only to have lost their jobs. So, that's what this purpose... the purpose of this Bill is. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5182 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? Carli,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- D'Amico, Lang, May, Senger, Thapedi. Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 51 Members voting 'aye', 58 Members voting 'no'. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Postponed Consideration, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, put this Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration on the request of the Sponsor. Representative Esther Golar, on page 15 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5771, on the Order of Second Reading. 5771. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5771, 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."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5771, a Bill for an Act concerning certificates of good conduct and relief from disabilities.

  Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Golar, do you wish to leave that Bill on Third Reading or do you want me to take it back to Second? Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Mr. Speaker, would you move it back to Second, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, on the request of the Sponsor, move House Bill 5771 back to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Michelle Mussman, on page 5 of the Calendar, Michelle, you have House Bill 4083, on the Order of Second Reading. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4083, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mussman, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mussman on Floor Amendment #3."

Mussman: "Floor Amendment number free... 3 is simply a technical change that's an agreed upon language between AT&T, Comcast and Yahoo."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And 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."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4083, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Michelle Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4083 creates the Internet Dating Safety Act. In recognition to the fact that 30 percent of Internet users utilize online dating services and that the Internet creates a unique environment where users have a false sense of security via the illusion of anonymity but are extremely vulnerable to disclosing personal information that could put them in a variety of dangerous situations. This Bill would require the Internet dating service providers to post a safety awareness notification to all Illinois users. It also provides that if a dating service provider does not perform a criminal background check on its users that information needs to be boldly and clearly disclosed with Illinois members. If a dating service does perform a background check, it needs to disclose under what

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

parameters it prevents or allows potential users with a conviction history to participate. It also needs to provide a clear disclaimer that a background check is not a foolproof guarantee of protection. I'd like to clarify that there is no company is required to perform a background check in order to do business in our state. It is for the safety of our citizens we think it is vital for them to have important information to help them to be more of aware of dangers online and how to take steps to protect themselves. I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, just a few questions and I want to say that, you know, as we move forward with this technology and as we try to... to influence the things that normally we had control over. How... how do we actually enforce this law?"

Mussman: "The law's actually voluntary and you'll see that actually within the last couple of days the three largest providers actually are taking it upon themselves to do this voluntary in the State of California. There are numerous other states where this is being implemented."

Bost: "Okay. But... but still, I know that it's... you're saying it's voluntary. So, let's say that their base is not even in the United States, but yet... now, there may... the people who are dating on those sites they're obviously here, you know, that's how they make those connections. But... but how do we hold them accountable to this? I mean, when we draft a law, it's usually... it's got to have some teeth in it.

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

We've got to make sure that the company then follows through. Who becomes punished if we don't get this done?"

- Mussman: "And think again, we're asking for voluntary compliance in deference to the customers that they serve. This is a very unique environment. These businesses are making a profit off their Illinois users and we're asking them in consideration, that use this, to simply be posting disclaimers."
- Bost: "Okay. Will it... does this then put those who are maybe located inside the State of Illinois at a disadvantage and let me tell you that I think we should keep it safe. I'm being very, very clear with that. All of a sudden someone is not complying. Is there an advantage or disadvantage to complying or not complying other than the fact that I'm showing you that I'm a creditable company?"
- Mussman: "And I think that's what it comes down to. I think it's consumer protection and I think, as consumers see this kind of information on multiple sites that they're using, it's going to influence whether or not they choose to use that site or contact that site and ask them for that information."
- Bost: "Okay. And I'm going to ask you this because... First off, and I'm going to vote for the Bill, okay. But really, wouldn't we have done just the exact same thing by putting it in a Resolution?"
- Mussman: "Perhaps. We... we obviously traveled a lot of ground to get to this point and I again think that this information has a little more teeth in it or a little more substance

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

doing it this way than through a Resolution. So, I think this is an appropriate method."

Bost: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do want to tell you that I believe that we're trying to do something right here. But it's a problem that we run into in every piece of legislation as we've tried to deal with the Internet. There is not necessarily any way that we can enforce it unless they're inside the borders of the State of Illinois and/or the borders of the United States and luxury of the World Wide Web. So, I appreciate your efforts. We want to make it safe, but unfortunately the reality is is that those participants themselves..."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader, we'll give you another minute."

Bost: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those participants themselves have to be very aware of the problems and maybe working with our constituents to keep them aware through the AG's Office or whatever then maybe that would help as well. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "All of this to get a date?"

Mussman: "I'm a happily married woman."

Durkin: "How about one of your friends? All of this... you've got to jump through all of these hoops for an Internet provider to be able to get a date, right?"

Mussman: "I think that we need to keep them safe."

Durkin: "Why, because California did this."

Mussman: "The Internet is a very unique situation."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "'Cause they run such a great ship out in... great shop out in California, we're going to say that California did it so Illinois has to follow in place."

Mussman: "No. Actually, numerous states are examining this legislation. California is only the most recent. It actually already exists in New Jersey, New York and Texas."

Durkin: "For the past seven years, there's been attempts to, let me, I get one more question before I make a statement, are minors or youths... youth, sound like my cousin Vinny... allowed to date on the... do Internet dating, participate in Internet dating or is this strictly adults who are?"

Mussman: "I honestly don't know. I assume that's within the purview of Match.com or eHarmony or however it chooses..."

Durkin: "Okay."

Mussman: "...to make those decisions for its own clients."

Durkin: "All right. Well, for the past eight years, there's been numerous attempts to try to regulate the Internet dating world. At some point, adults have to take responsibility for themselves if they are going to participate in this type of social networking. They have responsibilities to perform their own due diligence. Again, this is over... overstepping, I believe, what is necessary. Because other states do it doesn't make it right. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Costello."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Costello: "So, if I understand this, Representative, at the end of the day this is just a disclaimer, correct? This is about a disclaimer."

Mussman: "It is absolutely just a disclaimer. And actually, the initial disclaimer is supposed to provide information that would help you become more savvy and take better steps to protect yourself. A lot of people underestimate how sophisticated some of these users are and how a lot of them are not just another nice guy looking to meet a nice girl. This is a predator looking for prey and they're going to look for somebody who's vulnerable and they're going to trick you into revealing information about yourself that they can use to their advantage."

Costello: "Thank you. A keyword, disclaimer."

Mussman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative... Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know that you're not an attorney, but I have some concerns that this might violate the interstate commerce clause because you're treating consumers of a product that goes beyond our state differently than you treat other consumers coming from other states. So, I know that that's not within your purview, but I think this could potentially violate that because you're going to have consumers on there from... throughout the entire world. So, that is my first issue. Number 2, don't you think that even though we say they do do a background check that the bigger issue is, what if

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

people lie on one of these service providers and they say that they're 38 years old when actually they're 12 years old or vice versa. And so, now, we have a situation where we think that there's a background check, we think that all the information has been validated, but in reality, it isn't. Aren't we actually giving people a false sense of security by saying, oh, yeah, they do a background check and here's the information and now, Illinois consumers, they should be okay. Do you have any comments about that?"

Mussman: "Again, that's part of the disclaimer. Is that they have to explain all the ways that you can still slip past, that any sort of background check is never at any time a foolproof method and it gives them advice about how to be more careful about not putting out public information that will get themselves in trouble. Absolutely, you are right. We are not going to catch every single person and one of the reasons we're doing this is because we know people do lie on the Internet. But true.com says that they feel they weed out at least 5 percent of their users using these background checks and that's millions upon millions of users. It is an attempt to keep people safer."

Reboletti: "If I... and I..."

Mussman: "Not being able to catch everybody is not a reason to not take any step forward."

Reboletti: "I can appreciate that, but we're going to tell a company that may not even be domiciled here how they have to put up a website. Where does this disclaimer have to be? Is it on a link that they can click on that nobody's going to pay any attention to?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Mussman: "If you read through the details of the Bill, it has to be prominently displayed in certain colors in certain font sizes through a click through process that they will see as they progress through the website."
- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that. People go on dates all the time without the aid of this Match.com or true.com. We don't have any requirements for those individuals, so I don't know if you can ever guarantee anybody anything with respect to that. And I don't know if this actually is going to do exactly what you're... you're trying to accomplish which is to provide people with more information. And I don't know if it gets there because these disclaimers, different background checks, they don't do a LEADS background check. They're not doing a FBI background check. So, even though they do a criminal background check, it's not going to be as all encompassed..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, your time expired.

  We'll give you another minute to finish your discussion."
- Speaker Lyons: "I just wanted to say... Thank you, Speaker... that it's not... it's not going to be as all encompassing as a law enforcement agent could do, so I think people may, again, I said have a false sense of security. So, I appreciate what you're trying to accomplish, but I cannot support your legislation. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Representative Mussman to close."
- Mussman: "I would just like to point out, again, the business does not actually have to do a background check in order to do business in our state. They simply have to state whether

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

they do or they don't and give our customers more information about how to protect themselves from particular vulnerabilities that they had exposed themselves to on the Internet. I certainly appreciate the concerns, but I think this is an important step to keeping our residents safer with the changes of technology. And I would appreciate your support."

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

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Brauer, Mr. Schmitz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."

Williams: "Today, I introduced a Resolution designating March 29 as the Cambodian Day of Remembrance to acknowledge and remember one of the most horrific events in human history. Many of us learned about the atrocities which occurred during the Cambodian genocide in the 1984 movie 'The Killing Fields'. From 1975 to 1979, the Khmer Rouge systemically attempted to destroy Cambodian society subjecting the people to unfathomable violence and brutality. Millions of people were executed, tortured, starved or worked to death and many bear the deep scars from these crimes against humanity. I recently visited the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Cambodian-American Heritage Museum and Killing Fields Memorial, which is in my district. I toured the museum and met many survivors and my visit haunted me for days. I was struck by the unfathomable disregard for human life and the shocking brutality of those years, but I was so moved by the survivors that I met that day and the willingness of these refugees to share their stories of survival yet go on with their daily life and find hope in the future. Often these events seem so far away, but I would guess if you spend any time in the area of Lawrence and California Avenues in Chicago, you will run into someone that survived the killing fields. I hope you will consider coming to the 11th District to visit the Museum and Memorial someday, not only to learn more about this terrible time in our history, but also to experience a bit about the rich culture and history of the Cambodian people who I found to be generous, kind, and peaceful. Today I ask you to join the Cambodian-American community on this Day of Remembrance. And I request a moment of silence to honor the memory of the millions lost and pay tribute to those who survived. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons back in the Chair. We've had a request for a moment of silence for Ann's request on the Cambodians. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Back to the Calendar. On page 10 of the Calendar, Representative Lang, you have House Bill 5019. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5019, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lou Lang on Floor Amendment #1."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment removes all opposition and I would move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. 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 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5019, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This deals with the issue of monitors in nursing homes and requires that the appropriate state agencies share information with the nursing homes so that they can actually clean up their act. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I would ask your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Leader Lang, how does a monitor get placed into a nursing home? Is that... Who makes that determination as to when a monitor goes into a nursing home or does a monitor have to go into all of the nursing homes throughout the state?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Lang: "I... no. The monitors are not in all nursing homes. The Nursing Home Care Act provides for the placement of monitors to advise the administration on bringing the facility into compliance with state regulations. I guess, the... DPH makes the determination, I believe, as to when a monitor is necessary."
- Reboletti: "Okay. So, what DPH does… and the other thing I want to make sure is this is not… anything that the monitor is doing in the nursing home is not subject to FOIA. Is that correct as well?"
- Lang: "I believe they are not subject to FOIA. And so, at the beginning the department wasn't really so hot on this Bill, but with the Amendment, it's taken away their opposition.

  But I do want to read something for legislative intent."

Reboletti: "Sure."

- Lang: "And thank you for the opportunity. Although the Bill requires a monitor reports be submitted to DPH on the first day of each month and the department wishes to require a monitor to file reports more frequently, this legislation is not intended to preclude that. That wasn't your question, but I decided I would read that at that moment, Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Well, I... you had a perplexed look on your face and so I wanted to make sure that you got all your thoughts out, Representative, so."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further recognition, Representative Lang to close."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5019 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's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "They're not saying 'boo'; they're saying 'Lou'.

House Bill 5179, Representative Mell. Please read the... Out
of the record. House Bill 3945, Representative Nekritz.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 3945..."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk, sorry. House Bill 5146, Mr. Sacia. One moment. We'll come back to you, Mr. Sacia. House Bill 4819, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4819, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sullivan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "So, Floor Amendment #1 simply allows for crossbow hunting season the same as bow hunting season. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Mr. Clerk."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4819, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "I previously explained the Amendment. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill say... 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, 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5495, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5495, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5495, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5495 would apply to government sponsored defined contribution plan such as 403(b) and 457(b) plans for counties, municipalities and townships and school districts. It requires the unit of local government, the employer in this case, to conform to the prudent investor rule. Currently, many of these employers make the decision to allow any vendor to come in

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

and offer their services to manage these plans on behalf of employees. It is up to the employee to select a plan and in many cases, because the plans offered by these vendors don't comply with the prudent investor rule, the fees and other charges are higher and sometimes significantly higher and therefore, the return to the employee is not maximized. The consequence of this Bill is to require the employer to go out and find a single vendor that would manage the defined contribution plan for all their employees. They can do this by going through their own procurement, joining an existing plan that already meets this standard of join... of the prudent investor rule or joining with other units of government to build their own plan. There is no cost to the state or the unit of local government to comply with the prudent investor rule. Nongovernmental defined contribution plans already comply and must comply with the prudent investor rule and the state also complies with the prudent investor rule in operating its deferred compensation plans. I'd ask for your support."

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

Reboletti: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry, Sir."

Reboletti: "Does this preempt Home Rule and need 71 votes to prevail?"

Speaker Lang: "We will get an answer for you, Sir. Any additional inquiry at this time?"

Reboletti: "Not at this time. Thank you."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Representative Nekritz, do you have a comment on that while we await the parliamentarian?"

Nekritz: "I can't imagine how it overrides Home Rule, but..."

Speaker Lang: "We will be at ease waiting for the parliamentarian to answer your question, Sir. Mr. Reboletti, are you aware that there's a Home Rule impact note where DCEO has said that it does not impact Home Rule? Is that sufficient for you?"

Reboletti: "Is... is... Beside that, is there a ruling from the parliamentarian?"

Speaker Lang: "Not yet. I just thought I'd ask you the question."

Reboletti: "Well, I'm fine. I just... I'd still like a ruling from the parliamentarian."

Speaker Lang: "We will be at ease waiting for the ruling."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, the parliamentarian has advised me that while there is language regarding Home Rule in the Bill, it does not preempt Home Rule and it is a 60-vote Bill."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, our notes indicate that you feel that not all of the governmental pension funds are complying with these fiduciary responsibilities. Do you have any incidences that have caused you that concern?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Nekritz: "Yes, Representative. There's a number of units of local government and I think the most common example I could give you is school districts who don't act as the fiduciary on behalf of their... their employees and they simply allow any vendor to come in. And so, the employees then have to select between the vendors and they're really, I think, ill-equipped to do that. And the fees are, again, higher in that instance because there's no negotiation and there's no af... there's no ability of the individual employee to be able to get the best rate."
- Pritchard: "So, what you're suggesting is... is that perhaps the school district is actually selecting vendors and limiting competition?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I would say it's actually enhancing competition because you... they could go through a competitive bid process to actually get the best deal on behalf of the employee. So, I think it enhances competition rather than decreasing it."
- Pritchard: "So, is that the nature of the opposition from the life insurance folks?"
- Nekritz: "Well, it's a little puzzling to me that the life insurance folks would be... would be speaking to this, but I suppose it could be."
- Pritchard: "Well, I just have some concerns though that if for whatever reason a school board or other unit of local government is limiting access that there may be other things other than just cost that may be attractive to the employee. And I have a concern that if we're limiting that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

choice of the employee that we may be, you know, disrupting their personal liberties."

Nekritz: "Again, Representative, I don't think... well, again, the State of Illinois does this on behalf of its employees and private employers are required to do this by Federal Law on behalf of their employees. So, I think that we're actually doing a disservice to our teachers and other employees of local government by not allowing the competition at the... with someone who actually has some extra teeth and is able to compare bids and not allowing the competition at that level and rather just opening it all up and saying it's, you know, it's a free for all and you do what you want. But you have no mechanism to... to judge it and to get the best deal for yourself."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, how does this impact self-funded school districts? Like District 207 in our area self-funds, so they..."

Nekritz: "They self-fund their deferred compensation plan?"

Mulligan: "I'm not sure how they put that out, but I know that they do… like their insurance, they underwrite everything themselves and give it out to somebody, you know, but it's… it's their own. They don't do like the state or…"

Nekritz: "Representative, these are... these are deferred compensation fund plans, so I don't believe that they... that they take employee... employer contributions. These are

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- simply employee contributions that are being managed by this... through these system."
- Mulligan: "So, that would mean that the teachers... will the teachers not have that happen?"
- Nekritz: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, Representative."
- Mulligan: "If the teachers were paying in and they were going to a regular fund as opposed... and it's self-insured, would they just designate who the person... the fund that they were going to have handle their money?"
- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I'm not sure I understand your question, but as I really understand what happens now, you know, the school district will have a day when like the 30 vendors that are interested in helping teachers invest these funds come in and the teachers have to talk to them all and figure out what's the best one rather than having the district competitively bid it, figure out which is the best one, you know, which has the lowest rates and then presenting that to their employees."
- Mulligan: "So, would they have to choose one for all of them.

  Would it be like a vote or could they do their own... and can
  you divide it up the way you'd like whether you want a
  different mix of safe and a little more risky and a little
  more competitive."
- Nekritz: "The vendor offers a number of different levels of investment risk and you might even have a, you know, someone... they want to do an environmental, you know, an environmentally focused investment plan. Those kinds of options are generally available through the vendors..."

Mulligan: "All right. So, everybody would be..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Nekritz: "...through a single... through a single vendor."

Mulligan: "Would they do their own then, each individual employee would do their own on the day that these people came in or would they have to go with one plan for the whole school?"

Nekritz: "They would go as one plan for the whole district."

Mulligan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "We'd just like to speak to the question asked by the last speaker. Even though it's one... even though it's one vendor that vendor offers a variety of different investment vehicles that the employee could choose. You know, again, this is something that's... that private employers do. They're required to do it. The State of Illinois does it. And I think it is best for the employees in this state, especially at a time when we are looking at impacting pension benefits, these deferred compensation plans are going to become even more important and more significant for the... for the retirement future of our employees and we need to make sure that they're maximizing their return. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo. Please... please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you. I'd ask the Body to please join me in welcoming Tony Churchill and other faculty, seventh-grade students at Morgan Park Academy. And among those students is Katie Treskow, the granddaughter of our great Majority Leader, Barbara Flynn Currie. Give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Thank you for being here. Barbara, keep pointing. We'll figure out who the right one is. Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in..."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, excuse me, Mr. Acevedo.

  Representative Davis is not finished with her introduction."
- Davis, M.: "Take just a moment. I wanted to ask Majority Leader

  Barbara Flynn Currie to just say hello because her

  granddaughter is in that class."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House, for your indulgence. I wish those wonderful seventh graders would stand up, so we can get a good look..."
- Speaker Lang: "Why don't you stand up for us."
- Currie: "...at the kids at Morgan Park Academy. Come on, guys, stand up."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Acevedo: "On the last vote that we had, House Resolution 706, I was voted as recorded as a 'yes'. I'd like to be recorded as a 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. House Bill 5749, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5749, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This is an initiative of the State's Attorneys Appellate Prosecutors. And the… this would allow these Appellate Prosecutors to get assistance basically have investi… have investigators or a contract for them for hearings and post-conviction proceedings. I know of no…"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Durkin: "Representative Mau..."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Durkin: "Representative Mautino, you said that the Appellate Prosecutor would be able to contract out for investigators, correct?"

Mautino: "Yeah. The current law says zero on this and basically it would be in these... in other matters they can go ahead and get assistance. On these two items, they can't."

Durkin: "Does the investigators currently... do they have investigators in that office? Do they have..."

Mautino: "No."

Durkin: "Would they be required to have full police power authority?"

Mautino: "It's not specified. I don't believe so, though."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "Okay. 'Cause I know investigators who are part of different prosecutorial agencies, they're law enforcement officials. They have the power to carry a firearm, power to arrest."

Mautino: "They wouldn't be changing any of their positions.

They would just be contracting with an investigator, so whatever powers they currently had under their licensing."

Durkin: "But they would not individually have that power to arrest or to detain someone or to carry a firearm, if that's the case?"

Mautino: "My understanding is no."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Will Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5616, Mr. Mautino. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5616, the Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. House Bill 5616..."

Speaker Lang: "Well, excuse me, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5616, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Mautino: "Thank you. This impacts the Will-Kankakee Regional Development Authority Act. And it increases the bond issuance indebtedness level for that authority from a hundred million to 250 million to fund economic development projects. It ends the state's moral obligation on all future authority issued bonds. So, basically, we're just... as we have done with all of the rest of the authorities throughout the state withdrawn the moral... the moral ob status of them. And be happy to answer any questions."

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

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourself, Members.

Mr. Bost, Brauer, Moffitt. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Order of Mautino, House Bill 4963. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4963, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This is a cleanup Bill. Last year we passed the Collateral Recovery and Rental Company Act and that basically for the first time licensed people who are in the recovery business. In doing so, we had inadvertently impacted the manufacturers and distributors. This came to us through Caterpillar and John Deere and asked that we clarify that in retrieving their own equipment from their

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

own distributors they don't have to hire a repo company is what it does."

- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Nekritz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4761, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4761, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Sullivan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

- Sullivan: "So, Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. Many of you had res... had voted on aggregate electric supply resolutions in your respective towns. We passed the ability for towns to aggregate electricity. What this does, it's a good government Bill to ask the brokers to disclose to the municipality and the ICC on a yearly basis any moneys paid by the alternate energy suppliers. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."

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

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4761, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "To what I just spoke of in the Amendment, we will be working to try and make this a better Bill. Those that were in committee know that there is some folks that came up and suggested a way to maybe do this a little bit better. So, in the Senate we're going to work on that. This is a good Bill as it stands. Any changes it might be would be to make it better. And so, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski. The Gentleman does not wish to speak. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Okay. Can you go over it one more time? I'm..."

Sullivan: "Certainly. We passed legislation that would allow municipalities to have referendums to go into electrical aggregation. So, many towns, probably in my county, there is upwards of 10 or 15 towns that passed these. So, what the towns are going to do is try to get a cost savings for their municipality by going out to alternate retail electric suppliers. On doing that, they will enter in agreements with brokers, if you will, that will go out and perform these functions for them. What we're asking is that these brokers supply the municipality and the ICC moneys paid to them in commissions from the electrical supplier. So, we want just good government transparency on what's being done and what kind of deals are being cut."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Bost: "Okay. So, basically, we're taking the wheeling law that we passed, which municipalities can participate anyway. And all this does is the brokers that they use they're going to be charged and they're not... it's not a fee, per se."
- Sullivan: "Well, there's moneys paid for the broker. The broker has to get paid somehow. We want to know what that is."
- Bost: "The broker is going to pay it. That's not a problem. I don't understand..."
- Sullivan: "Yes."
- Bost: "...I understand that. But as far as what the ICC monitors, what... what is it that they do?"
- Sullivan: "They... they will... This has nothing to do with any ICC monitoring. It's just a transparency Bill so the municipality can see what these brokers are making, if you will."
- Bost: "Okay. I'm... I'm trying to understand because at what...
  they're just... they're just needing... we're just saying that
  the ICC should monitor them and watch them and see what
  those charges are? Is that what we're..."
- Sullivan: "No. We're not asking the ICC to do anything other than to receive information from these brokers..."
- Bost: "Okay."
- Sullivan: "...as a clearinghouse, if you will. But, they also, these brokers must disclose to the municipality that they're doing business with. That's what we want to see."
- Bost: "Okay, okay. Is... does this expand to anything at all besides this uniment... the municipalities. I mean, is this... is it a county government? Is it other smaller township governments?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Sullivan: "It's any municipality, county that has entered into aggregation programs with a broker."

Bost: "Okay. Can our... can our counties do the same?"

Sullivan: "I believe that counties can pass referendums to have an aggregate program."

Bost: "Okay. Okay."

Sullivan: "Yes."

Bost: "Can the... can... I'm trying to figure out because I was involved with the wheeling legislation that was passed."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Bost: "I'm just trying to figure out how this ties together with it and I..."

Sullivan: "Well, one, the alternate producers are... so, Illinois Energy Association likes this idea; ComED, all these guys like the idea. Even the alternate producers like BlueStar... I guess they got bought out, but Mid-America and all them, they like this too. It's a sunshine Bill only. It doesn't require the ICC to do anything other than they're going to get this and they're going to store the data for public record. It's more about the municipalities understanding the relationship of their broker."

Bost: "Thank you for answering the questions."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan to close."

Sullivan: "I just urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Barickman,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Brauer, Dugan, Hammond, Osmond, Saviano. Please record yourselves. Mr. Brauer, Mr. Saviano. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5479, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill 4333, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4333, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "I'd like to leave it in Second Reading. Leave it on Second."

Speaker Lang: "You want to adopt the Amendment first?"

Soto: "Yes, I'd like to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Please proceed."

Soto: "I urge 'aye' vote. Okay. Amendment amends the State
Housing Act, makes it a technical change in the section
concerning short titles."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "This Bill shall be held on the Order of Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 5134, Mr. Unes. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5134, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Amendment #1, offered by Representative Unes, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. If it's okay, I'd wish to adopt it and discuss it on Third Reading."

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

Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5134, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5134 is agreed language with the nursing homes and IDPH and it simply states that if there is an informal dispute resolution, that the nursing homes will receive some sort of statement back from IDPH either positively or negatively. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. DeLuca."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the gallery on this side,
  Ladies and Gentlemen, please give a warm Springfield
  welcome. There's 86 students from Governors State
  University who are down here visiting Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. We're happy to have you here. House Bill 4110, Mr. Verschoore. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4110, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Verschoore, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you. On House Amendment #2, all that amounts to is a little cleanup. It allows for any building on the property of the Airport Authority to be exempt from taxes also. I would ask for concurrence."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4110, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. What this... this was brought to me by a local entity from the Chamber of Commerce and what it amounts to is there's a free based operation there by the name of Elliot Flying Service. They lease from the Airport Authority now. And what they do on there is they refurbish jets or any type of aircraft. They may also supply fuel for those old... aircraft... tie down aircraft that fly in. They have very limited service there. They basically are in the... the business of refurbishing airport... airplanes from all over the world. The Chamber put together a little study on what this impact would have for us in our area.. in my area. It's a potential of \$100 million economic impact assuming the new construction project of 40 million. It would create 367 direct jobs. It would have a direct payroll of 25 million. The average wages for these workers are \$66 thousand. The total value of the impact between 80 and a hundred million; the payroll is 35 billion-plus; sales tax, a million and a half dollars; personal income tax, a million six. And the reason I'm bringing this to the... the Body is because in Iowa and Nebraska and Missouri they allow these free based operators to be exempt from these taxes. So, with that, I would be glad to answer any questions."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, I heard most of what you were saying.

My question is, right now, is there a private company

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

providing aeronautical services as a fixed based operator at the Airport Authority in question?"

Verschoore: "That is this air... that is this business, Elliot Flying Service."

Franks: "And they're already there and they're already established?"

Verschoore: "Exactly."

Franks: "Okay. So, what this Bill seeks to do is to give a company that's already there a tax break in the sense of not having to pay property taxes."

Verschoore: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. Now, for instance those fixed based operators that operate in other airports such as O'Hare or Midway or Pelwaukie, I presume they're paying property taxes on their lease."

Verschoore: "I can't answer that. I don't know what they do there."

Franks: "I think... I wish the Majority Leader was on the floor because I think it's just yesterday or the day before we had a Bill that indicated that if it was a not-for-profit...

I'm sorry... a governmental entity leasing to another governmental entity then they would not have to pay property taxes."

Verschoore: "Right."

Franks: "But this would take this much... a much step further.

This would be saying that a governmental entity would be able to lease to a for-profit private company and to give a tax exemption to that company, correct?"

Verschoore: "That's correct."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Franks: "Okay. Thank you. I'd like to speak to the Bill and I appreciate what the Gentleman's trying to do certainly giving economic incentives to businesses is what this state ought to be doing more of, but it ought to be done on a level playing field. I don't think this is the best way to go forward and do it because I think this is quite a precedent that we would be setting. We had a conversation a few days ago that would allow the extension for a governmental entity to give its tax exemption to another governmental entity that would be leasing. This, I believe, would be unprecedented to be able to do this and it's an exemption for one but what it would mean is the EAV would still be the same for the rest of the people in that district meaning that everyone else's property tax would increase. I don't think that's the best way that we should looking at businesses to give one business that's already established that's already making that investment and increasing everyone else's taxes. I understand what the Gentleman's trying to do, but unfortunately, I rise in opposition and ask you to do the same."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, the previous speaker hit the nail on the head on the merits of what may or may not be right with the Bill. One question that we have on our side of the aisle, in our analysis it says the Taxpayers Federation is in opposition to this Bill. Are they still in opposition?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Verschoore: "As far as I know, but as you well know, the Tax Federations are in opposition to any kind of a tax freeze."

Sullivan: "So, they're in opposition because they believe, as the previous speaker said, that you giving a break to a specific company at the expense of everyone else and that this is going to cause a tax shift to all the other residential properties and farmers and so forth."

Verschoore: "Not necessarily. What they... they've entered into an agreement with the county that they are going to pay some taxes toward the county, so it's not totally taxexempt."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morthland."

Morthland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Morthland: "All right. Again, Representative Verschoore, would you express a little bit more about the actual impact of this and this... this is not a static situation. We're not just trying to prop up a business in the area but actually we're trying to facilitate an expansion that will provide much reward to the community."

Verschoore: "Exactly. Like I said before, it would create 367-plus jobs. The direct payroll would be \$25 million; the average salary for these jobs is 66 thousand. There's going to be a capital investment of new construction of between 25 and 40 million. The total impact on the area would be between 85 and a hundred million. The total jobs it would create is from outside sources would be around 600 jobs. It would create a million and a half dollars of sales tax. It

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

would create a million and a... .6 million dollars of income tax. And the reason I'm doing this is because they have a... another facility in Des Moines, Iowa, that they can move this to. They could do it there or they have a facility in Nebraska that they could do this project..."

Morthland: "And we have..."

Verschoore: "...and they have this; they have that break."

Morthland: "...and we have comparative tax at disadvantages to those states currently."

Verschoore: "Right, right."

Morthland: "Please to the Bill. I understand the concerns of the... of the other speakers and I think they are not completely unwarranted, but doing a good thing on a broad scale doesn't preempt doing a good thing on a small scale. It'd be interesting to work long-term to improve the general tax climate any time we can for the State of Illinois. We've already seen, in this state, many times the disadvantages of taxing things on wheels; let us not tax things on wings. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, just in response to your comment there. I take that, from what you said, we're really talking additional jobs. Even though it's an existing business, these are new jobs..."

Verschoore: "These are additional jobs, yes."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Moffitt: "...new jobs that are not there now that might go to Iowa, but this could be an incentive for them to come to Illinois."

Verschoore: "That would stay in Illinois, to stay in Illinois."

Moffitt: "To stay in Illinois."

Verschoore: "They're there now."

Moffitt: "But I mean, these are additional jobs."

Verschoore: "Right, be additional jobs."

Moffitt: "The business is already here."

Verschoore: "The business is already here."

Moffitt: "And I think some of the speakers about we need a comprehensive plan are excellent, but at some point we need to start and maybe this is the first step to actually going down that route and can build on a model that's... that's here. When we have a viable option of encouraging jobs, I really think we need to take a look at it. We're not... if these jobs don't come... don't develop, I mean, we're not really giving away anything. It's just do we want to add this opportunity, this economic development, these jobs, this tax base, this additional sales tax. That's really what we're deciding."

Verschoore: "That's... that's exactly right, Representative."

Moffitt: "Does this have a... is this for a specified length of time? Is this for..."

Verschoore: "Pardon me?"

Moffitt: "Is this a... does this have a sunset on it or is it for a spec..."

Verschoore: "No, no."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Moffitt: "Okay. Well, anyway, I think when we look at the possible economic development we really need to seriously consider passing this. And I commend you for bringing it forward. Thank you."

Verschoore: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore to close."

Verschoore: "Well, we're always in this Body talking about trading jobs or bringing jobs into Illinois. Here's... here's a company that's already here that employs a lot of people. They pay good benefits. They pay... an average salary is \$66 thousand. They pay pensions. And why would we want to drive them to Iowa and/or Nebraska. I just think that this is a great opportunity for us and with a minimal effect. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Representative du Buclet, Jakobsson, Pihos, Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5441, Representative Yarbrough. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5441, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Yarbrough."

Yarbrough: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5441 is a cleanup Bill of the State Appellate Defender Act. It makes changes to the Act making it consistent with the Public Act

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

eliminating capital punishment system in 2011. The changes including eliminating functions related to death penalty prosecution that no longer exist and amend the Act in order to clarify the role of the office of State Appellate Defender that takes in training and assistance. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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? Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Sacia. Please take the record. On this question, there are 77 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Hatcher."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."

Hatcher: "If I might, I would like to introduce some of the best part of my district, the Cross Lutheran Church and School is here today. It's about 30 of them and they're learning the legislative process. So, please welcome them."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. House Bill 4862, Representative Unes. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4862, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Unes, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, Floor Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. And I'd ask for it to be adopted and discuss it on Third Reading."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4862, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4862 is an initiative of the Midwest Equipment Dealers Association. It's really cleanup language from a Public Act that was passed a couple of years ago. And this legislation provides an exemption to low-speed vehicles manufactured before the Public Act took place. This language is agreeable with the Secretary of State's Office. I know of no opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Costello.

Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

House Bill 4809, Mr. Watson. Mr. Watson. Out of the record.

Mr. Mautino in the Chair."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Mautino: "Back by popular demand, Mr. Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The masher nation's up here, Ladies and Gentlemen. House Bill 4666, Representative Kelly Burke. Representative Kelly Burke, no running in the House chamber. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4666, 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 Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4666, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In March 2010, the General Assembly passed a pension reform Bill creating the Tier II pension benefits for new hires. Among other changes, the cost of living provisions were reduced for most of the systems to 3 percent or one-half of the consumer price index noncompounded. However, COLA provisions for Judges Retirement System and the General Assembly Retirement System participants were more generous, namely 3 percent or the... or the entire amount of the CPI and the COLA was also compounded. In the 2010 legislation, for most of the retirement system, the final highest salary for calculating a pension was limited to roughly \$106 thousand to be increased each year at either 3 percent or one-half of the CPI. However, participants in the General Retirement System or the Judges Retirement System have

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

their final highest salary limit increase each year by either 3 percent or the entire CPI. This legislation would reduce both the COLA and the increase on the highest average... the highest final salary and it would put future participants in the Judges Retirement System and the General Assembly Retirement System on the same footing as the rest of the pension systems in regard to those calculations. The Bill is very similar to the Bill we passed last year, House Bill 1447. I'm happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady's moved for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield, Mr..."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "I have... here's just a thing that I've noticed around this place in the years that we do anything with the judges' pensions. Do you think by the time it's all said and done they'll drag it to court and then possibly rule it, oh, unconstitutional or something, even though maybe it might not be."

Burke, K.: "It's only future hires, so I don't think there are any constitutional issues with it."

Bost: "So, you don't think the existing judges will get excited about this one?"

Burke, K.: "They might get excited about it, but it doesn't affect them. And I don't think there's any basis to claim that it's unconstitutional."

Bost: "Okay. I've seen many of these that passed out of here that I wouldn't have thought there was reason for

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

unconstitutional when we deal with judges before, but I'll support the Bill."

Burke, K.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Representative du Buclet, Feigenholtz, Mell, Nekritz, Pritchard, Sacia. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes' and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4673, Representative Carli. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4673, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Carli, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Carli."

Carli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would restrict an officer from receiving an FOID Card if he or she was involuntary admitted into a mental institution."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost. Third Reading? You want to wait for Third Reading, Mr. Bost? Those in favor of the Amendment shall vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4673, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Carli."

Carli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the chamber. This Bill will allow a law enforcement officer to maintain a valid FOID Card if he voluntarily checks into a mental institution to seek treatment for anything. There's no opposition on this. And I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "So, for instance, if let's say an officer feels like he is or has been through some post traumatic stress situation and he seeks counseling in a facility and checks himself, he or she, checks himself in. This just basically protects them from the case where we would automatically, any time you're entered into a institution would then..."

Carli: "Yes. This Bill, as long as you're in there for less than 30 days within a five-year period, your FOID Card will stay valid. And I strongly agree with this due to the fact that what we see... If I can give you a personal example. I was working the wagon... I don't know if you guys know what that is, but it's the paddy wagon... and one night I had to pick up over three dead bodies. And I did it, my job. I went out there, I picked them up, gunshot wound to the head, all the above. Pick them up, take them to the morgue. It didn't bother me the day of. A couple days later I felt I was struggling with this. I couldn't get it out of my mind. Thank God I have a law enforcement background and law

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

enforcement family who helped me get through this. A lot of officers don't have that. This is not something you talk about over Sunday dinner with your family. So, I want officers to know they can seek treatment and be okay and have their job and be able to go back to work. It's okay to ask for help. Again, I asked my family; they got me through it, not everybody has that. So, I really, strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Bost: "Thank you, Representative. I think it's a good Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, thank you for sharing that... the rationale, shock... and thanks. I'm right over here..."

Carli: "Oh, sorry."

Franks: "...Dena. I understand what you're trying to do and I think you make perfect sense. I mean, I'm wondering why we're just doing it for law enforcement because we have folks that are coming back from Afghanistan and people have come back from Iraq, as well and I think, and I understand the rationale, I think it should be probably extended to them as well and I'm not sure what your thoughts are. And perhaps that's something that we could look at in the Senate."

Carli: "Basically, I... this was brought to me from Fraternal Order of Police and it's basically so these officers can return to work. They need this FOID Card..."

Franks: "Okay."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Carli: "...in order to work. We are the only agency that mandates that, so basically they have no livelihood without this."

Franks: "Okay. Then I see why. Thank you."

Carli: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Cassidy: "Representative, is there anything in your Bill that requires that the officer, upon completion of treatment, be given a clean bill of health, be certified as having the stability necessary to carry a weapon. I totally understand what you're trying to accomplish here and I fully support the idea of officers having the ability to seek treatment when they need it. What I'd like to know is if there is anything giving us some security and knowledge that they have worked through their issue and gotten a clean bill of health."

Carli: "Yes. Their primary physician as well as the department needs to clear them for duty."

Cassidy: "But... but not the facility that they were checked into? I mean, if they were... if he left with... if an officer left against medical advice, if he checks himself out without completing treatment. Will..."

Carli: "Not the facility itself, but their own physician and again, the department needs to clarify them that they're fit for duty."

Cassidy: "But not a mental health professional?"

Carli: "No."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Cassidy: "I have concerns about that. I think this might be overbroad. I think that it's great to encourage... and I completely, fully support that officers should have that freedom and that security of knowing that they're not going to risk their livelihood by seeking treatment and I think the stigma we place on mental health treatment is unfortunate and huge and in particular with regard to law enforcement officers, but I believe that it should go that next step further to ensure that if you have a situation that requires treatment that a mental health professional that has given you the treatment would certify that you are... that you are safe to carry a weapon."
- Carli: "The facility doctor would have to give recommendations upon release of that officer. So, if they see that they're not fit to return to work, their documentation will show that."
- Cassidy: "But there's nothing in the Bill that would require a mental health professional to clear him or her?"
- Carli: "A mental health physician does clear them. Their doctor and the doctors from the medical section, our department, those..."
- Cassidy: "Not primary care. I thought you were saying his medical doctor, his primary care physician."
- Carli: "Primary care and the department doctor needs to clear them fit for duty."
- Cassidy: "But they're both medical doctors, not mental health doctor... not psychiatrists or mental health professionals."
- Carli: "I don't know their..."
- Cassidy: "I'm sorry."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Carli: "I mean, they are doctors. I don't know what their specialization is, but their both doctors. I don't know...

  They might have mental health underneath them. I don't know their... their credentials."
- Cassidy: "I would be more comfortable with legislation like this if it were clear that the mental health provider that they sought treatment from was the one providing clearance in some way."
- Carli: "They can give the recommendation, but because this is voluntary that's all then can do is the recommendation. After that, the department needs to clear them. Representative, in all due respect, the goal of this Bill is to urge them to seek treatment and not discourage it. They voluntarily check themselves in. So, they cannot go back to work until they are cleared by two physicians at least. And they get the recommendation of the mental health physician when they leave the facility."
- Cassidy: "I... I... As I said, I fully respect and support the premise of the Bill. I believe that it leaves a door open. The reason for the mental health issue on the FOID Card is about that stability and I don't want to do anything that would discourage officers from seeking treatment, but I think that if we're going to address it we need to address it completely. Without that clarity, I can't support the Bill."

Carli: "Okay. I'll take that into consideration."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lang: "He yields."

Durkin: "Representative, in Bills like this we got to be very careful about definitions. Now, this may sound like a funny question, but it's a serious question. Is there a definition for a 'mental institution' in your Bill or in that portion of the Act? And the reason is while coun... your able counselor to your right is looking it up. Is Northwestern Hospital a 'mental institution' if someone checks in for, they feel, some type of psychological problems they're experiencing and Northwestern admits them. It... would that be considered a 'mental institution'?"

Carli: "No, there's nothing in the Bill specifying what is a 'mental institution'."

Durkin: "Do you think it might be wise to maybe advance that.

I'll support your Bill, but I think, again, we have to be careful about definitions, of what exactly a 'mental institution' is 'cause, you know, it could be a variety of different facilities. All it is a recommendation; something for you to think about and if you could work on that, I will support your Bill."

Carli: "Thank you."

Durkin: "All right."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Carli to close."

Carli: "In closing, again, this Bill is primarily to help with officers who feel they need some assistance to get through some traumatic event that they have witnessed, observed or been a part of in general. These officers need somewhere to turn and I think we need to be strong for them. They're out

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

there every day for us. So, I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Hatcher, Lilly, Mayfield. Representative Hatcher. Please take the record. On this question, there are 102 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

Acevedo: "I'd like the House to welcome a grade school from my district. It's my alma mater, the grade school I used to go to, my sons all went to and my family all went to and that's St. Anne's Grade School, the seventh and eighth graders up here. Please, welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Enjoy your day.

Representative Dugan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point."

Dugan: "Yes. I just wanted... if you could give a warm welcome to Jennifer Goudreau, one of my constituents who's also here with GSU. Her mother and father are good friends and also, her father, of course, is the President of the Local AFFI in Bradley. So, Jennifer Goudreau, right behind me here. Thank you very much."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Next Bill is House Bill 4513, Representative Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4513, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Nekritz, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4513 is a solution proposed by the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District for their pension problems. Over the last decade, the funded ratio of the... of their particular pension system has fallen... has declined over 30 percent and it currently stands at less than 60 percent funded. And I, for one, am very grateful that they have made a very conscious effort to try to address that problem in a comprehensive way but in a solution that is tailored to their needs and to their particular financial situation. What they have come up with is an increase in the employee contribution that will, over the course of three vears, increase the emplovee contribution by 3 percent and they are also going to be dramatically increasing the employer contribution. Right now, in statute it is set at 2.19 times the employees' contribution. This will actually put them on a wh... an actuarially appropriate funding schedule where they will pay the actuarially required contribution, the arc, unless that contribution in any particular year exceeds 4.19 times the employees' contribution in which case it would be

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

capped. This will put them at fully funded by 2050. Oh, I'm sorry. Okay. I'm sorry. I forgot we were doing the Amendment. So, we just need to adopt the Amendment. The Amendment actually just rolls back the employer... employee contribution at such time as the ra... funding ratio achieves 90 percent."

Speaker Lang: "So, there's one light on. Representative Senger.

Does Representative Senger... do you mind if we just adopt
the Amendment and debate this on Third? Those in favor of
the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.
The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4513, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz..."

Nekritz: "What I said ear..."

Speaker Lang: "...who has already explained the Bill."

Nekritz: "What I said earlier."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger on the Bill."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just wanted to comment that this was brought to us, the General Assembly, as a solution to a pension position. And they worked it out without any significant big to-do and I want to say that we can, you know, we can solve problems in this state if we really sit down and put our heads to it. So, I have to say thank you for those who came in with the very good solution to their own pension problem."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just love it when I can join my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle. I think this is tremendous. I think it sets the future parameters for dealing with the pension system and to see that the unions and everyone got on board with this is a tremendous piece of legislation and I strongly support it. And urge everyone's 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Winters."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Winters: "In testimony in committee, I believe, we had one opposition which was the Teamsters Union. To your knowledge, what was the position of the other approximately 20 unions that have people working the Water Reclamation District?"

Nekritz: "I believe one of the other Legislators in the room testified he thought there were about 15 other unions, but I think that they were either neutral or supportive."

Winters: "That is the point that I'm trying to make that we met as a committee and heard that unions were taking what I thought was a very responsible approach to try to negotiate with the employer, the public employer, and reach a solution that would keep their pension funds properly financed for the future. I would say that of the approximately 2 thousand employees to the Water Reclamation District only about 20 are a member of the Teamsters Union. That would mean that if we support this Bill where the unions, except for the Teamsters, were in favor, we would

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

in fact be with the 99 percent. And I think that's a great place for every Member of this chamber to be is with the 99 percent not the 1 percent, not that I want to wreck my voting record with the Teamsters, but I'd be happy to vote against their position. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on the Bill."

"Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. This Bill Madigan: is an initiative of the pension system at the Water Reclamation District in Cook County. We're all, now, very familiar with the question of public pensions because we're consistently told that we have underfunded the pension systems. In Illinois, there are between 10 and 15 pension systems. They're all different. We have the state systems supported by the State of Illinois. We have systems like TRS, SURS where the employer at SURS pays nothing and the state pays the employer's share. We have TRS where TRS pays .054 percent of the employer's share, the state picks up the rest. We have other systems where employers pay what they're supposed to pay and this is one of those systems. So, with the Water Reclamation District in Cook County, employees pay in, the employer pays in. The funding ratio has gone down because of the change in the market and their system board of directors has developed a proposed solution to their problem. They brought it here. It's very simple. It simply says that the employees will pay in an extra 3 percent, 1 percent a year over three years, and then the employer will pay in on an arc. And that there will be an appropriate funding level down the road in the future. So, it's a situation where both sides have said there's a

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

problem; we want to solve the problem. Then we're both going to pay in more than we pay in today and what we both get out of it is good sound fiscal status for our pension system. I, personally, have spoken with the labor unions that represents people at the Water Reclamation District. There are 15 labor unions that represent employees of the Water Reclamation District. I've spoken personally with every one of them; 14 of the 15 either support the Bill, they want the Bill or they're okay with the Bill. There's one that would be in opposition to the Bill. The stated reason for the opposition would be they think that more money should go into the system that is being proposed by the Bill. So, I think that this is how we should move forward on pensions. As I said, there are between 10 and 15 systems in the state; they're all different. They all have different problems. This is a case where one of the systems has come to us and said, okay, we acknowledge, we have a problem and we, the people that are concerned and involved with the system, have the solution. It's contained in this Bill. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "What he said. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Franks, Lilly, and Williams. Please record yourselves. Representative Williams. Representative Williams. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- hereby declared passed. House Bill 5761, Mr. Mathias. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5761, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2... and Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill. The Gentleman wishes to hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. I apologize. That's what happens when too many people are speaking. Clerk, put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and we'll hold it there. House Bill 5480, Representative Roth. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5480, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5480, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Roth."
- Roth: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body, this Bill reduces the number of signatures a charity has to have in order to become a voluntary payroll deduction. Currently, if you're a state employee and there is a charitable organization that wants to be an option to be a payroll deduction, you have to have 4 thousand signatures. This would reduce that number to 500. It was a constituent request. My constituent works for the Fox Development

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Center in Dwight and he would like to have the parent organization that's a 501(c)(3) for the Dwight Developmental Center added to that. I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4642, Representative Senger. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4642, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Senger, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "I believe I need to adopt Amendment #4."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to adopt Amendment 4. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4642, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4642 is a Bill similar to what we worked on last year that passed out of the House on a vote of 113 to 2. It has

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

to do with basically identity theft on electronic communications; for example, on your Facebook networking website. If someone tries to become you, they can harm you in significant ways. So, this takes care of that then and basically has sanctions or penalties because of that. This Bill passed through the House. It stalled in the Senate because the State's Attorney in DuPage County working with a Naperville detective thought that the language could be written a little bit better. So, they worked on it over the summer and we brought it back in the spring here to pass."

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3782, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3782, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Ford, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

- Ford: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Floor Amendment #2. Floor Amendment #2..."
- 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3782, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Now, Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I look to move House Bill 3782 to passage. And if there are any questions, I'll take those at this time."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, when you originally passed this, there was a discussion about bringing an Amendment back.

Was that done?"

Ford: "Yes. It was just adopted."

Sullivan: "Okay. And so, this has removed any of the opposition?"

Ford: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. That's all I needed. Thank you."

Ford: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. One of the things that was not brought up in our debate, when this Bill was first brought before us, was... we focused on kind of some of the personal and individual issues of some of the constituents of the Sponsor. What's interesting is that this is really a national intra... issue and over the last couple of weeks many national cable outlets, in fact, even this week on the Today Show, there was a significant piece

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

about this legislation or not this legislation but this problem in that what we really have here is a conflict between what Facebook has as a contract with its own users which says that you're not... if you're a user of Facebook, you're not supposed to give this out. It's in the terms of service. At the same time, there's certain things that the employer would have an expectation of being able to request as part of that. With the Amendment, I feel that what this Bill does is it provides the appropriate balance so that the user of Facebook or any other social media, can keep those things that are intended to be private, private and those things that are public and would be out there and the employer certainly has a right to know as well as anything that the person might do with the employer's equipment or on the employer's time, the employer could and should be able to get access to that. This provides that balance, so that in a era, say, a decade ago, you might have a... an email account on one hand; you might have a Web page on the other and the distinction between what was public on the Web page and what was private in your e-mail was pretty clear. Now, with social media, these functions are often combined and yet we still, I think, have a need to provide that separation so that people have a sense of, okay, I'm using a private tool on my own time. Those that in the current Act... Privacy Act, that this is amending, there's already language that says thing, products... lawful products used by a person cannot be used by the employer to affect their terms of employment. Certainly the social media fall in that category of lawful products and as this new

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

technology evolves we, as a state, have a duty to stay on top of that. And I think with the Amendment we're able to do that, make clear the distinctions between what is private that's not on the employer's property, not with their equipment, not on their time and keep that protected, but for all other purposes allow the use of the public information for things that affect the employer. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joe Lyons in the Chair. The Chair recognizes Representative Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "So, Representative, how many times would you estimate... if you know this, and if you don't I understand... has there been instances where employers have asked for this information, for a password? Is it... is it mostly in instances of executive positions or entry-level positions or positions at certain types of companies?"

Ford: "No. I wouldn't say that... I don't know how many times, but I know I've been written by constituents about the problem a few times."

Zalewski: "And in those instances, when they were asked, did they refuse to give the password?"

Ford: "They were afraid to deal with the situation, yes."

Zalewski: "And at that time were they told they wouldn't be eligible for the employment?"

Ford: "They just feel that they didn't get the job because they did not provide the information."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Zalewski: "Okay. To the Bill. I commend the Gentleman on his Bill. This is the next generation of what we, the Body, are going to be dealing with when it comes to social media sites and information technology and what we decide to put on public domain versus what we decide to keep private. And I think that the Gentleman's worked hard on the Bill to ensure that there's a balance while at the same time ensuring privacy rights. I think this is a good Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Sponsor yield? Representative, last time this Bill was up I asked you a few questions about some of the language and one of the, specifically, the language that states it shall be unlawful for any employer to ask any employee to provide a password. If an employer asks... acts unlawful, what is the penalty or sanction?"

Ford: "It would be... it could be under a civil penalty..."

Durkin: "Could you speak... could you..."

Ford: "...as we talked earlier. It's... it's protected under right to privacy in the Workplace Act and there could be civil penalties involved not criminal."

Durkin: "What would those civil penalties be? I need to..."

Ford: "You could go to court and you could take that up with the court. It would be up to the judge to decide the amount of... that the suit could be rewarding."

Durkin: "Could you ask your able counselor to your left if there... what specifically would be the form of relief that..."

Ford: "There would be no..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "...and what would be the request? What would be the actual cause of action that would be..."

Ford: "I mean, I can answer that. I mean, that's why you go before the judge..."

Durkin: "Well, no, specifically it's a..."

Ford: "...to demand a request. You're not going to go in with a automatic agreement."

Durkin: "You have to plead out a case that you have violated certain... certain common law protection or..."

Ford: "It's a violation under the right to privacy in the Workplace Act."

Durkin: "Is there a criminal sanction against the employer for..."

Ford: "A petty offense is what counsel is saying."

Durkin: "A petty offense?"

Ford: "Right."

Durkin: "Well, is that the exclusive relief which is afforded to an employee who believes that an employer has acted unlawful or is... is that the only relief available? You said earlier there was a civil or right to privacy action. There's no... you're saying there's no civil relief, it's strictly a petty offense. They cannot go to the Circuit Court and seek damages for some type of invasion of privacy, correct?"

Ford: "They can still seek a civil penalty, yes."

Durkin: "And what's the... but that doesn't state that in the Bill. You said that your Act only provides for a violation to be a petty offense."

Ford: "Okay. You have..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "Well, it's got to be one or the other."

Ford: "There's... there's both. There's a three-step process in the process."

Durkin: "All right. I appreciate the… I long-respected the Representative, but I still see some confusion in the way in which this Bill would be administered. And also, when there's a situation, if there is any type of violation, but also, I have concerns that… about just basic property rights for an employer. This is… we're talking about telling an employer what to do with their own computers on their property. And again, this phrase has been used before time and time again in this chamber, but this is…"

Speaker Lyons: "Give you another minute, Jim. Go ahead."

Durkin: "All I'm going to say, this is a solution in search of a problem. I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dwight Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, if my recollection is correct,
you were going to take this back to the Labor Committee."

Ford: "We did what we were supposed to do to get this Bill on Third Reading."

Kay: "I can't hear you. I'm sorry."

Ford: "We did what we were supposed to do to get this Bill on Third Reading."

Kay: "Are you sure about that?"

Ford: "Yes."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Kay: "Well, I don't think that's right. I think you said you'd take the Amendment back to the Labor Committee and I don't think that happened."

Ford: "Which Amendment are you talking about?"

Kay: "The Second Amendment."

Ford: "No, we never said we were going to take this back to Labor Committee. We spoke about the First Amendment that we were going to take it back to the Labor Committee. I spoke with the chair of the committee and I spoke with the Republican spokesperson to make sure that we could bring the first Amendment to the floor."

Kay: "Well, one... one Amendment didn't go back to committee."

Ford: "Repeat... re..."

Kay: "One... one of the two didn't go back to committee. Some think neither went back to committee."

Ford: "This Amendment that we're... that we just adopted on the floor was brought then... pulled the Bill out of committee because, I believe, one of the Gentleman from this side asked me to pull it to work on an Amendment I did to it. I did not agree to bring this Amendment back to the floor or... I'm sorry, back to committee to be adopted."

Kay: "Representative, the only... the only thing I'd ask you to
do is go back and look at the status on your computer
because the status doesn't indicate what you're telling
me."

Ford: "Why don't you look at the status and tell me which Amendment was I supposed to bring back to Labor Committee and then I'll have an answer for you."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Kay: "Neither... Representative, neither went back to committee and you said you would take them back... you told me that."

Ford: "I think that you... if you could just answer the question,
I will give you a direct answer."

Kay: "Well, I did."

Ford: "Which Amendment did I..."

Kay: "Neither."

Ford: "...promise to bring back..."

Kay: "1 and 2."

Ford: "...to Labor Committee."

Kay: "1 and 2."

Ford: "#2, I did not say that I'll bring it back because it was my... I pulled the Bill off... out of the record myself because there was some disagreements with the Bill. So, I pulled the Bill."

Kay: "Well, Representative..."

Ford: "And I worked on it."

Kay: "Representative, you said the First Amendment would come back after you took it to committee. What happened there?"

Ford: "The First Amendment. I spoke to both sides of the aisle and I got approval from both sides of the aisle to not take it back and to adopt the Amendment here."

Kay: "Well, who did... forgive me, but I guess I was relying on
your taking this back to committee before it came back
here. Who... who agreed from..."

Ford: "But, you know, you had time when I called it last time to talk about that. Now, we've worked on it with your side of the aisle; we worked on it with this side."

Kay: "Well, who did you talk... Okay. Maybe I made a mistake."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Ford: "So, now, we're on the Second Amendment and you're talking about the first."
- Kay: "Maybe... let's say I made a mistake. Who from our side said
  it was oaky to move forward?"
- Ford: "Talk to your side. I mean, I don't want to say names right now. What's important right now is the Second Amendment, I mean, that we have adopted and let's... if you have questions about this Bill, we can talk about it."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay, I'll give you another minute."
- Kay: "Sorry. I'm sorry, Speaker. I think what's important is that we maintain some integrity here with the process and I don't think you're doing that and I think that's unfortunate because you told me that you'd take it to committee and I don't believe you've done that. I'm just going to... I was going to take some time and ask you about the Illinois Employment Law Council, but we don't have time to do that. But I think just because you did not follow up on what you said you would do procedurely that you owe us a few more answers as to what this Bill does. The penalties that Representative Durkin called for are not there. This is not a good Bill. Basically, you're forcing something in the workplace that's unnecessary, totally unnecessary and it's just another simple burden and a Bill that we don't need."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you very much. On Friday, Erin Egan, the Facebook Chief Privacy Officer on policy, stated that she supports this Bill and she supports Bills like this because she

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

believes that it is potentially exposes employers and... to legal liabilities. So, with that, I move to pass House Bill 3782 and I apologize for any misunderstandings that the other side may have about the Amendments that they believe should have been taken back to committee. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ford moves for the passage of House Bill 3782. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Berrios. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 78 Members voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Greg Harris, on the Order of House Bills—Second Readings, on page 4 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 37... 30... 5330. 5330. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5330, a Bill for an Act concerning sexually violent persons. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. And no Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5330, a Bill for an Act concerning sexually violent persons. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I hope I do this right. I picked this up for

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Representative Phelps 'cause he's doing some work for the people of Harrisburg and needed some time to work on the disaster recovery. House Bill 5330 is an initiative of the Office of the Attorney General and it does a couple things ver... regarding the Sexually Violent Persons Act. One is it makes some changes to the process by which notices are delivered to people who are incarcerated in state facilities for being sexually violent persons. It allows that notice to be served on the facility. And it also takes some steps to be sure that any cases for commitment... release from commitment by sexually violent persons are not frivolous or dilatory. I'd be happy to answer what questions I could."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of House Bill 5330 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 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hammond, do you have a point of personal privilege for us?"

Hammond: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 3782, I was recorded as a 'yes' and I'd like to be recorded as a 'no', please."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative. On the Order οf Third Reading, House Bill 4995. I Representative Cross has believe

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Representative Bost will present it. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 4995."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4995, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4995 does three things in it while amending the Humane Care for Animals Act. It basically increases the penalties for teasing, striking or tampering with police dogs or service animals. It increases it from a Class A Misdemeanor for the first offense to... and a Class IV for a second to a Class IV for a first offense and a Class III for a second. It also changes the penalty for aggravated assault of a physically handicapped person from a Class A Misdemeanor to a Class IV Felony. And then the changes of a penalty on aggravated battery against a pregnant or physically handicapped person from a Class III Felony to a Class II Felony. Be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "If you've heard the Gentleman's explanation, is there any inquiries? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 4995 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... Representative Biss and Lilly, would you like to be recorded? Take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Anthony 'Smokin' Joe' DeLuca, you have, Representative, on the Order of Third

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Readings... it's getting late in the day, Anthony, thanks for going along with it... Representative DeLuca, you have a Third Reading, House Bill 4018. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4018, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca on House Bill 4018."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is DeLuca: the business database Bill. And many of you have heard from the opposition on this Bill and it was being held up until today where we confirmed... when I say 'we', the opposition and myself... we confirmed that the information that the Secretary of State's Office has given us in regards to this is not the case. So, that's why I am calling the Bill today. This would allow a municipality to create a database their all... at their own expense. They would be responsible for carrying the burden of creating databiss... database and identifying all the businesses in town. It's very narrowly drafted. You can see it if you look at the summary of what questions the municipality would be able to ask of a business in town: the business owner's name, the address, the business phone number, the emergency contact number, the business e-mail, an Internet website address and the nature of the business. There is no fee; there is no cost for the business to register with the municipality. I ask for your approval. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is there some significant opposition to this Bill?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Sullivan: "There's actually so much opposition it'd take too long to read it all. Couple questions. If I have a home-based business where I'm... a little startup bus... is this something that I need to register with?"

DeLuca: "That would be the responsibility of the municipality to determine if they would identify you as a entity that they feel you would need to register. So, if they felt that for public safety rea... purposes or for zoning reasons, then, yes, they could identify you as someone that they would ask those seven questions to."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, this is going to be something that will go back to municipalities. Can a county do this?"

DeLuca: "I know the intention is for municipal government only."

Sullivan: "Okay. Reading the Bill, I think you are correct, it says any municipality. So, a municipality has to vote on an ordinance and within that ordinance they'll set up their own parameters. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Sullivan: "If I have a business that happens to be located wherever... I have a Chuck E. Cheese franchise and I have four of them in four different municipalities, the potential here is that I'll have four different regulations. Is that correct, for my one business?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- DeLuca: "Well, this doesn't regulate. So, the answer to the question is no because there's nothing in this legislation that regulates."
- Sullivan: "Well, when you're requiring me to register with the municipality, I guess in semantics, I believe that's a regulation, but... so I'll use your language then. If I am required to register with a municipality, I have four businesses in four different municipalities; potentially, I could have four different ways by which to register my one business."
- DeLuca: "That's true because a Home Rule municipality may be licensing that Chuck E. Cheese location, but a non-Home Rule municipality that does not have the authority to do that would only be authorized under this legislation to ask these seven specific questions."
- Sullivan: "I'm being harassed by your staff member. So, the penalty, and as you stated earlier that there is no upfront fee to do this just the time to make sure that I follow the various regulations that are going to be imposed here or registration options that are going to be imposed here. So, that's my one and only cost but no actual fee. If I somehow forget or didn't know that this one municipality, I open my fifth Chuck E. Cheese, and I didn't..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Ed, your time expired. We'll give you another minute."
- Sullivan: "Then they potentially could fine me \$200. Is that...
  they could poten... that would be the fine, 200, up to \$200
  would be my fine, if I didn't know that they had an
  ordinance?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

DeLuca: "No, because you would know because the fine only kicks in after two notices have been sent."

Sullivan: "Okay. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a verification, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Request for a verification has been made, so noted. Representative Dwight Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, why do need this piece of legislation?"

DeLuca: "We need this because in the municipalities that are not authorized to license and regulate them, primarily are non-Home Rules; Home Rule communities they do not have any ability to identify who's within their community. So, for public safety purposes, for zoning purposes, this gives them the ability to find out who's working in their town. One of the questions that they would be authorized to ask is the nature of the business. We want to ensure that a business is in compliance with the zoning. We don't want to have a chemical company in a strip mall. And in the event there is an emergency, this would be able to provide the municipality the emergency contact phone number."

Kay: "Would this information be subject to FOIA?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Kay: "Does it seem... I guess I'm talking as a guy who comes out of the business environment, but does it seem like we ask a whole lot of information very often about businesses to the extent that they get a little tired of it, it becomes burdensome?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- DeLuca: "I don't think it's too bad. I'm a business owner myself and most of the licenses that I have to fill out and submit are far more extensive than this and there's a fee involved. Now, this is neither one. This is... I would welcome a question that are like this. Answer seen questions, no fee. I'd fill it out and send it back."
- Kay: "Well, it seem... it just seems to me and I could be mistaken, I'm sure there's something here I'm missing, but it seems to me like you have a registered agent for a business and that seems to be all you need for anything that's terribly significant. So, why are we doing this?"
- DeLuca: "I didn't hear the first part of that question."
- Kay: "Well, I guess you can find out just about anything you
  need to know about a business vis-à-vis the registered
  agent. Why are we doing this?"
- DeLuca: "I thought I explained it. You want me to explain it again?"
- Kay: "Well, no. I think what I sense is that we're doing something we don't need to do because the information already exists and I don't know why we're, again, asking a business to submit this information."
- DeLuca: "Well, that's the reason why I'm calling the Bill today. That's originally why I was holding off on it. As I have said in my opening, we confirmed today, myself and the opposition confirmed today, we were under the impression that the Secretary of State's Office made the indication that they would make this information available to these communities that were interested in receiving it. We found out today that's not the case. They're unable to provide

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

all that information. So, it's not removing any of the opposition, but they acknowledge the fact that, you know, the impression that we were under that we'd have other means to give this information to the municipality is not the case. That's why I'm running the Bill."

Kay: "Okay. Why all the opposition?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay, we'll give you another minute to finish your remarks."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tony, why... why the opposition to the Bill?"

DeLuca: "Well, some of the opposition is to the fee, the \$200 fee that is in there after the two notices. So, one thing to keep in mind is only if you ignore the first two notices would there be any type of fine involved and there has to be some teeth to make this worthwhile."

Kay: "Okay. I gue... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think, again, this is just an unnecessary burden. I think the information exists and I think, again, we're... we're imposing an undue burden on business in Illinois. And we do a lot of that and unfortunately too much to the extent that we just turn people off in this state. So, I'm going to... I'm going to vote against this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, first off, let me tell you that you're a very respected Member in this General Assembly, but let me... let me tell you that I trust you, but I don't always trust law. And you're saying that there's not a fee right now,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

but do you... are you familiar with the NPDS that we are required... that companies are required to register with the state on their discharge fees or their discharge? Originally, there was a Bill created that any time you were in a business that it had any discharge, we just wanted to get you registered. All we wanted to do was register you. Now, we're not going to charge you a fee. Are you familiar with those?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Bost: "And during the years of Rod Blagojevich that... the no fee is now \$5 thousand, okay. Never were we going to charge a fee. We weren't going to do that. What we're doing here is is we're stepping down a path that we've never stepped before. This information is available if need be. If you want to zone in your community against whatever, you have local control and you can do that, or pass zoning laws. Now, what you're doing here is you're putting a registry in place and you're allowing the communities to do that and there's you're giving your word that no fee. Representative, you and I are not going to be here forever and next thing you know somebody's going to come up and say this is a great revenue stream for our communities. So, we've already got the law in place. Let's go ahead and just open it up to fees. And that's a concern I have. Especially when we already have the ability to get this information and certain controls are already in place and we know it. I respect you and I understand you feel you need to move forward with this, but I sure encourage the Members on both sides of the aisle to vote this down because something like

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

this will come back to haunt you. You are creating and going down a path we've never went down before. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Bill."

Riley: "I first fought this Bill or something like it last year. The intent then, you know, was not to tax businesses. It was all about public safety and registration. The Bill was brought about by the Mayor of Flossmoor. That is all that he wanted to do. This Bill is a much better Bill. It's a much better improvement to the Bill that I had and as you can see, all of the support from local councils of government including my own the South Suburban Mayors and Managers Association, the IML and the like. It's a much better Bill. It is very narrow and... in its intent. I support the Gentleman's Bill and I hope that you would do too. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sandy Cole."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Cole: "Thank you. Representative, you mentioned that the Secretary of State doesn't provide this information. Are you aware that the Department of Revenue does?"

DeLuca: "They provide..."

Cole: "On their website?"

DeLuca: "Not all of the information."

Cole: "What is missing from the website?"

DeLuca: "Any business that would be a sole proprietorship."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Cole: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry."

DeLuca: "Any business that would be a sole proprietorship."

Cole: "Well, I don't agree with that. Any business that has a tax ID number or business license is included in that database. And here's why. I just want to tell you why. To the Bill. My village actually did this and they sent out to every not-for-profit, every... including notices businesses, but every not-for-profit, anybody that had a business license that was a sole proprietor, actually which I'm one of them, to every... it went out to every licensed Mary Kay provider and Tupperware provider. It went to every one of them. And when I called and asked where that information came from because, of course, business, I'm district office and they said they received it off the website from the Department of Revenue because it's down there by business license and by zip code. So, they assumed everything that was in a 60030 zip code then they sent this notice to. So, I know the information is really available. And I'm just wondering if you are aware of that 'cause you did mention the Secretary of State, but this is available online that takes an individual just a little amount of time to coordinate it and to send out the notices of. My village actually was asking for a fee for that registration, just to let you know, but I know when Representative Kay mentioned that it was available, it really is. And maybe this Bill isn't necessary. Thanks."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kelly Burke."

Burke, K.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Burke, K.: "Representative DeLuca, one of the… one piece of information you're searching for with this is an emergency contact number and you're doing that so that if there were some problem in the middle of the night or after hours that the municipality would have a way to contact the folks who are in charge of the business. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "That is correct."

Burke, K.: "And this information is not something that's typically available from the Secretary of State nor the Department of Revenue. Registered agent for a corporation could be a just a corporate office downtown, it could be an attorney's office, those are typically not places that would be open after hours or on the weekend or have any way to actually get in contact with the business owner. Just so I'm... and so the emergency number would be something that's very beneficial for the municipality to have."

DeLuca: "It is and I actually confirmed today with the Secretary of State's Office that the emergency telephone number is one of the seven questions that they would not have access to..."

Burke, K.: "I think..."

DeLuca: "...and not be able to provide."

Burke, K.: "I think this is a good Bill for municipalities to keep tabs on their businesses and protect the public and protect the business owners and their property. And I support your Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Appreciate your questions and your comments. I certainly

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

understand where there could be some concerns and some opposition for this type of legislation and Representative Bost, some of the comments you made, but as Representative Riley indicated this is very narrowly drafted from where we were last year. There's no smoking licenses in this legislation. Let's be clear on that as well. All right, let's try that again, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is going to give municipalities the ability to get this pertinent information. The seven questions... they are only allowed to ask the seven questions. There are no fees. The emergency telephone number is not available through the Secretary of State's Office. I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "There's been a request by Representative Sullivan for a verification. Members are asked to please vote your own switches. Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. DeLuca. Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to pull this from the record."

Speaker Lyons: "You disappointed so many people. Take the Bill out of the record. Settle down. Representative Bradley. Let's see we have... Representative Brown, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Brown: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Adam."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to acknowledge some negligence on my part that I didn't notice. It was my seatmate's birthday. Until I saw it today, a note from

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Chief of Staff Tim Mapes sitting on his desk wishing him a happy 52nd birthday. So, I ask you to join me in wishing Bill Mitchell happy 52nd."

Speaker Lyons: "Happy birthday, Bill. Have a great year.

Representative John Bradley, on the Order of Third

Readings, John, you have House Bill 1986. Read the Bill,

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley."

Bradley: "We have a problem particularly downstate with ATVs not being licensed on rural roads. And this would give local governments or the Department of Transportation the ability to license and provide rules for rural ATV vehicles. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation.

Representative Jack Franks on a question. Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Thank you. I can never understand... well, maybe I just need more education. Could you help me understand this Bill and stand close to your mic."

Bradley: "No. And I don't have the energy to fool with you today, so."

Franks: "At least you're honest. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Norine Hammond."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Hammond: "Representative Bra..."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, take this out of the record, please."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Take the Bill out of the record. Representative Dan Beiser, you have, on Second Reading, House Bill 930. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 930, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendments #1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Number... Floor Amendment #1 has been offered by Representative Beiser."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser on Floor Amendment #1."
- Beiser: "Mr. Speaker, I believe we want to withdraw Floor
  Amendment 1 and we want to... we..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman wishes to withdraw Floor Amendment #1. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Beiser, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser on Floor Amendment #2."
- Beiser: "This is a very simple Amendment which becomes the Bill. And it simply states that any Illinois law enforcement agency that accepts federal funds for the sole purpose of establishing motorcycle-only roadside checkpoints. So, it prohibit that from happening."
- Speaker Lyons: "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 the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 930, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill was... I introduced it last year. We had some min... the language was not presented properly. So, this Amendment, like I said in the description, is very narrow in focus and it's simply to avoid motorcycle-only checkpoints."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Zalewski."

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

- Zalewski: "Representative, our analysis says that the Floor Amendment prohibits law enforcement agencies from accepting federal money for the purposes of establishing motorcycle checkpoints. Would that provision have any effect on our ability to accept federal money for DUI roadside checkpoints?"
- Beiser: "No. It simply says they can accept federal money, but if it's specifically just for motorcycle-only checkpoints, no others, than that's prohibited."
- Zalewski: "Have I... have we ever accepted that type of federal money prior to this... to this Bill being enacted? Are we a regular recipient of that type of money?"
- Beiser: "I was told by IDOT... well, I take that back... it's a... I don't know if we receive that money for this... for this purpose only. I think we receive money for, you know, safety checkpoints, but we're trying... what we're trying to say is you can't use it just for this. And that's a simple sol... the answer to it."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Zalewski: "So… so, what you're trying to do with the Bill and the Amendment is to avoid profiling, so to speak, of motorcycle riders only."

Beiser: "Yes. If we're going to do a safety check, do it for all types of vehicles under whatever conditions they do every third vehicle, every fourth or whatever."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser to close."

Beiser: "Simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 930 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? Monique Davis, Robyn Gabel, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mary Flowers. Representative Ken Dunkin, on the Order of House Bills—Third Reading, you have House Bill 3867, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3867, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the Bill that we discussed yesterday and..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, before you get going, there is a Floor Amendment that could be added. That, of course, is up to you, if you choose to take it back to Second."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Dunkin: "What's the status of the Bill, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Clerk?

  I'd like to adopt Amendment #1. Could you move it back to Second?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Okay, Representative. I'm going to move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. And I'll ask the Clerk to see what's the status."
- Clerk Hollman: "No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Dunkin, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin on Floor Amendment 1."
- Dunkin: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3867 simply sets out a criteria for who may petition for a reduced sentence. If the criteria are met, petition may consider... may be considered by the Circuit Court of the circuit where the person was convicted. Number 3) the Amendment changes Supreme Court to Circuit Court in which the person was convicted per our discussion yesterday with my colleagues on the other side. So, I would ask for a favorable support."
- Speaker Lyons: "Well, let's just do the Amendment first, Representative and we'll do the full Bill. All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3867, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin, 3867."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "As you explained?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields?"

Reboletti: "Representative, I saw you have your legal counsel there now, so maybe you'll have a little bit more success. I'm still trying to figure out, besides the fact that it's Circuit Court versus Supreme Court which makes sense, how is the court going to be able to distinguish which first degree murder cases would be eligible versus those that would not be eligible?"

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, per our discussion yesterday, there will be six criteria to meet. The first criteria was that the individual has to have been sentenced prior to 1992 before the federal Battered Women's Act."

Reboletti: "That's one."

Dunkin: "Number 2) the individual must have claimed abuse as a defense prior to 1992 as well. And they also have to present written documentation of the abuse which may include civil or criminal court records, proceedings, notarized statements, police reports, witness statements; number 4) murder his or her abuser; number 5) not previously convicted of first degree murder or a Class X Felony or a Class I Felony; and finally, number 6) that the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

term is more than the maximum sentence but not an extended term sentence. So, those are the six criteria for eligibility to petition the Circuit Court where they come from... where they were originally adjudicated."

Reboletti: "How many inmates do you think that this would apply to as of today?"

Dunkin: "About seven or nine."

Reboletti: "And I know that you... you might not... I'm sure you don't know this, but do we know what the status of their appeals has been over the last 20 years? I mean, I'm assuming that when the defense of battered wife syndrome came into play, I have to anticipate that an attorney or an Appellate Defender came in and petitioned the court for some relief for a new trial or for a reduced sentence. Are you aware if any of these eligible defendants under your Bill have tried to appeal for a new trial, a lesser sentence or something... some kind of combination, thereof?"

Dunkin: "To your point, Representative, we don't know that.

However, there is a statute of limitations to appeal, I mean, with you being a super star attorney and all. So, we don't know the answer. We don't know if the statute of limitations... We can assume that the statute of limitations probably ran out."

Reboletti: "But the other thing though is if there's newly found in... newly discovered evidence, you could always file a post-conviction relief. And I would be surprised as if the people wouldn't have already filed a post-conviction relief. If you're..."

Dunkin: "Could you repeat your question, Sir?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Reboletti: "I'm saying, as I'm assuming that once this new defense came... became available that it's considered newly discovered evidence or new defense and these individuals could have filed a post-conviction relief at that time once this became available. I'm assuming they would have taken advantage of that. But you don't know if they did or did not?"

Dunkin: "Yeah. We don't know that answer, Representative."

Reboletti: "I still have some concerns. I think the criteria are fine. I'm just presuming that many of these people either chose not to file based on this or they did not have any other defenses and so they did not... and maybe their petitions were denied. I also have to believe, unless the sentence was natural life, most of these inmates have probably been discharged from the Illinois Department of Corrections because at that point in time they were getting, I believe, they were getting day for day credit all the way up until the mid-'90s."

Dunkin: "Right. Representative, we can make assumptions..."

Speaker Lyons: "The clock expired, Representative. We'll give you another minute."

Reboletti: "I'm just saying, Representative. Without additional information on the status of those cases, I can't support your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Dunkin, is there any provision, I've been going through my synopsis and I see none, for family

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

members to have any input regarding this, family members of the victims?"

Dunkin: "This Bill doesn't address that. And again, keep in mind these individuals, Representative, are currently serving a life sentence. They're... they're incarcerated and have served since..."

Sacia: "I get that."

Dunkin: "...prior to 1992, so."

Sacia: "I get that, but let's say we have a husband of a young lady murdered or what have you or a family member, a mother or father, does the Prison Review Board... Prisoner Review Board or who deals with these folks?"

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, as you know, victims certainly have an opportunity to make statements when there is a petition being filed to review a case. So, absolutely, yes, they certainly do."

Sacia: "But there is nothing in this Bill specifically addressing the victim... the victim's family, if you will, note... The concern I have, Representative Dunkin, is... is the family members, you know, they know that this person was sentenced to, let's say, life and we're talking about a reduction in the sentence, a mechanism in this Bill. There's no addressing it whatsoever and that's where my concern comes from is the need, if you will, I mean, we're all aware of victims being blindsided when all of a sudden a person is released from custody. When a victim's family member learns of it, it's sometimes after the fact. Now, we, since you and I have been here, Representative Dunkin, we have actually passed legislation to ensure that that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

can't happen anymore, but when I didn't see it in this Bill that it was addressed, I guess my concern is we're just leaving it up to the Prison Review Board, if the sentence is commuted or whatever ends up happening?"

- Dunkin: "Representative, this is a first step for those individuals who have been... who have a history of being abused by an individual particularly their spouse for years and they develop this violence... this syndrome towards being on the receiving end of being victimized. And so, what this first step does is merely give those individuals who have served a minimum of 20..."
- Sacia: "Representative, your learned... your learned counsel just explained it to me and she did a fantastic job. I wish she'd have been pitted against you and that gun last night."
- Dunkin: "Listen, Representative Elaine Nekritz is one of the best here in this chamber."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia, your time has expired, but we'll give you another minute to finish your question."
- Sacia: "Just... just a half... 30 seconds is fine. But any of these situations have these individuals filed for clemency in the Governor's Office?"
- Dunkin: "I'm not a hundred percent sure that some may have, some probably did. But what this does, keep in mind, the intent of this legislation is merely an opportunity for seven to nine people who are currently serving a life sentence, a minimum of 25 years have been served already and we are simply allowing them what wasn't allowed prior to 1992 just to say, hey look, here's a history,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Representative Sacia, of years and years of abuse. We would like for it to be admissible in Circuit Court. That's merely what it is. I mean, it's not saying you were going to be released. It's a first step towards a petition to the Circuit Court to admit what was not admitted to prove that they were consistent victims of domestic abuse."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Oh, thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill, actually, we're in a very privileged position here to be able to help people here in the state. Some of those of us who have little to no voice, some of us who are situations where we may have just forgotten about them. These ladies, predominantly, have been in of... been in jail for well over 25 years and most of them never had any real true chance in court to present all of their evidence that was used against them to convict them for life. This is simply a first step in the petition process and it gives an individual who is serving a life sentence an opportunity just a mere glimmer of hope. And so I would encourage all of us who are concerned about those individuals in our lives that we know of currently and historically an opportunity to have their day in court to merely give them an opportunity to petition the Circuit Court where they started their case where they did not have all of the evidence admissible. I would strongly ask and encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin moves for the passage of House Bill 3867. All those in favor signify by voting

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

'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 Arroyo and Hernandez, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 45 Members voting 'yes', 64 voting 'no'. The Bill fails. Representative Dunkin, you need 47 votes to put it on Postponed Consideration. I'm sorry. Representative Mary Flowers, on page 17 of the Calendar, you have, on Third Reading, House Bill 2065. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Flowers, was it your intention to take that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the Amendment?"

Flowers: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, take it back to the Order of Second Reading. And what's the status on the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2065, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

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

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 the Bill ensures that the patients are entitled to coverage for observation care provided in the hospital setting when medically necessary. This is an agreed to Amendment by the insurance industry. And I'll be happy to answer any questions on Third."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there discussion on the Amendment? Rep... Representative Sullivan on the Amendment."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, with the final Amendment has that removed all the opposition?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

Flowers: "My pleasure."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo on this Bill... on this issue. I'll get back to you, Representative. 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. And 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."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2065, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2065."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should House Bill 2065 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Brady, Morthland. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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 taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5025."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the previous Bill, House Bill 3867, I was recorded as a 'yes'. It was supposed to be... I'd like to be the record to reflect that it was... I wanted to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your intentions, Representative. Representative Deb Mell, for what purpose do you week recognition, Representative?"

Mell: "Mr. Speaker, I have a quick point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Deb."

Mell: "I just got off the phone with my accountant and I'm... you know, I'm really kind of moved and very thankful to this Body because Kris and I are able to file a joint state tax return because of the legislation we passed. For a lot of people here that's not a big deal, but it means a lot and but you know, federally we still have to file separately. I have to lie and check a single box, but in my home state, you know, we could be who we are and I just want to thank the Body again, many of you voted for it, even if you didn't, I still love you. And thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on House Bill 5624?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5624, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative May, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May on Floor Amendment #4."
- May: "Yes. Thank you. Floor Amendment #4 just makes clear that all of this takes place in 2014, very technical. It was a gut and replace. And everything in Floor Amendment 3 which also sort of just put it in some different Sections of the law."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. She moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 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: "House Bill 5624, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May."

May: "Yes. Thank you very much, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body. I'm dedicating this to Bob and Michael Angone. Bob is the retired Chicago police officer who blew the whistle on the extreme amount of fraud and abuse going on with disability placards. His daughter, Michael is a disabled child growing up now, but he was just very angry at the cheaters who are taking parking spots. I also dedicate it to Chris Fusco of the Chicago Sun-Times

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

who really shed the light on what's going on. So, basically, this reform act says that we will increase the penalties for those who abuse the system by lying to get a placard or fraudulently using it or misusing it. And also, creating a two-tiered system closing the loophole that gives free parking anywhere, anyplace, anytime for someone with a disability park... placard. Instead, we're following the Michigan example of a two-tiered system with very strict criteria, who can get these meter-exempt parking. I would really like to thank the legal staff from the Secretary of State in the City of Chicago who helped endlessly in doing this and also for the disability community for providing sensitivity and input. So, from... while it's a sensitive area, there is absolutely no opposition to this. It is supported by the Secretary of State, the Illinois Municipal League, the City of Chicago, the MS Society, Access Living and the Illinois State Medical Society. So, when people cheat, the disabled suffer and when they cheat, taxpayers pay. I ask for your consideration and will be happy to answer any questions should there be any."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't even think this is necessary because I think we all are on board, but I applaud the Sponsor for working with the Sheriff's Association and the Illinois Association... or the Secretary of State and others and I just think she's brought a excellent piece of legislation and I'd ask that I be added as a cosponsor."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Don Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, in committee we raised a question with you and of course, this isn't the change that occurs, but this statute actually provides for the potential of a felony in the case of involving with the issuance of a handi... falsely issuing a..."

May: "Representative, yes. If I'm understanding your question and I appreciate it. If this legislation doesn't do that, that is already in the law right now. It's my understanding that the judges do give great... great flexibility in doing this. It is only for the fraudulent and misuse and lying."

Moffitt: "Haven't... we've added a category of who can issue the write... the... be able to sign the permit to get the placard.

Is that correct?"

May: "Yes. And that was at the request of the Med Society to also do the nurse practitioners and others who can do it. We believe it was already covered under another Section of the law, but we just specified, just as an earlier Bill that we talked about this year, specified that while it was already covered that it was a deceased person's placard couldn't be used."

Moffitt: "And one specific question that we were working on there that you were going to try to find out the answer. Since it... we're talking people of professional license and now, under this provision... under this statute they could be convicted of a Class IV Felony, right?"

May: "Yes. And... and we've..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Moffitt: "And then with that could that lead to revocation of a professional license?"

May: "Yes. I know that we talked to the state's attorney and we do have the answer for that. I'm just getting it now from staff, thank you. It would be a case by case basis. It would not be an automatic revocation of the license. They would look at. I think egregious things like sex offenders would be included, but I don't think that that has anything to do with disabled parking, so case by case. It's not an automatic revocation."

Moffitt: "Okay. I think we all agree with what you're trying to do. I just think, you know, just... I have that concern that we actually have the potential for a felony here on this issue. I mean, I stand with you in wanting to end the fraud and abuse of handicap parking, but I just was surprised at the..."

"Representative, yes, if I could just clarify further. May: It's only for a repeated offense. That's why the Illinois State Medical Society is supportive, not just neutral, they are supportive. They wanted to make sure that it wasn't inadvertent. So, we have their support and I appreciate the fact that I brought this to the Illinois State Medical Society because whether we have a one-tiered system or a two-tiered system, we need to help educate the medical community that by just signing on to something for someone who's been their patient for 20 years they are really hurting the disabled. They are really hurting the taxpayers."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Moffitt: "Well, I thank you for looking into that. I just... I know different parts of the state probably it's a more... more of a problem than others. But you know, when you start the potential of a felony conviction that was second or subsequent offense. Is that conviction?"

May: "Right. But the existing law already says that."

Moffitt: "Okay."

May: "It does not change in this legislation."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, with respect to the implementation of this, how... do we know how the Secretary of State is going to implement the... the placards?"

May: "Yes. They... the Secretary of State already has a subcommittee and my Sponsor, Representative Bellock, remembers, you know, committees and everyone looking at the abuse for years. They believe that they would use some sort of a coding, a color coding or something to do this."

Reboletti: "And I asked you this question yesterday, if a person is disabled because they have a hand injury, is... is there a differential as to how that would apply in this situation so how they can use their hand. Does that impact their ability to..."

May: "Yes."

Reboletti: "...pay or have to... not have to pay?"

May: "It's one of the strict criteria we've set up."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Reboletti: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative May to close."

May: "Yes. Thank you very much. And I've spoken to many of you individually and you share... you listen to your constituents. Everyone, everyone is tired of people abusing the system and keeping it so that handicapped deservedly get their parking space. I appreciate your attention to this matter and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 5624. 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, Representative Flowers, Representative Franks, Representative Saviano. Mary Flowers, Sandy Cole. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Evans, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Evans: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2065 I was recorded as a 'no' and I wish the record to reflect it as a 'yes'."

- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request,

  Representative. Leader Frank Mautino in the Chair, this

  time for more than a minute."
- Speaker Mautino: "On Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 5277, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5277, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar appears House Bill 5050, Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5050, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Leitch, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Leitch on Floor Amendment #1."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much. This is the Amendment that I promised to work out with the Department of Public Health.

  They wrote the Amendment relating to surgery centers. And I would ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5050. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5050, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you very much. As I mentioned, the Department of Public Health wrote this Amendment. It helps to clarify what can be accomplished in a res... in a recovery center as

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

well as a recovery room. It enables what products to be dispensed and it provides for sleep studies at the surgery center. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5050. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Colvin, Davis, Lilly, Lyons. Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 107 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 5050 is declared passed. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Purpose of an announcement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "State your announcement."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to just to take this time to thank everybody that came out and supported the Illinois Sportsman's Caucus last night. Appreciate Representative Jim Sacia being the great auctioneer that he is. We raised just under \$22 thousand last night to help the Conservation Foundation to promote outdoor activities. So, thanks everybody."

Speaker Mautino: "Congratulations. Page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4324, Representative Harris. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4324, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Harris, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Harris on Floor Amendment #1."
- Harris, G.: "Could we move this and then discuss this on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment

  1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of
  the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's
  adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4324, a Bill for an Act... for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is just simply a correction of a word that was discovered to be a typo in a Bill that was passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the Governor last year. Of course, the discovery was made after the Bill was signed by the Governor, so we just need to correct that one typographic error. I would... I would appreciate your support. 'Rust... the..."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Harris moves passage of House Bill 4324. All in... On that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

Franks: "What was the word?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "The word is 'rustaurant'."

Speaker Mautino: "No one seeking recognition, Representative Harris moves passage of House Bill 4324. All in favor will

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cavaletto, Flowers, Sullivan, Unes. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Cavaletto. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Harris."

Harris, G.: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Place this Bill on Postponed Consideration.

Page 28 of the Calendar appears House Bill 5025,

Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Clerk,

what's the status of House Bill 5025?"

Clerk Hollman: "A Motion has been filed to reconsider the vote by Representative Lyons."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Having voted on the prevailing side, Representative...

Mr. Speaker, I have a Motion. Basically, chamber, what I did yesterday, they have to undo. We adopted the wrong Amendment when I presented the Bill. We adopted Amendment #2. So, I'm going to take it back to Second Reading and I'll put the correct Amendment on it and we'll bring it back to Third. And if I need to, I'll explain it again. This is on the consumer protection issue from utilities. So, Heather, what am I doing wrong here?"

Speaker Mautino: "The question is, 'Shall the vote be reconsidered?' All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin, Tryon, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 109 voted 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and the Motion prevails. On page 5 of the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Calendar appears House Bill 4085, Representative Lyons. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4085, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment... Floor Amendments #3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment 3 has been offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #3."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 represents an effort to cover other procedures. It would expand the underlying Bill to all medical procedures to set a standard for medical care. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Ly... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons."
- Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to listen up to what's going on here with my Bill. I presented House Bill 4085 with the best of intentions. It's a prolife opportunity... Ultrasound Opportunity Act. Okay. I don't take these issues lightly neither do any one of us on the floor, no matter which side of that issue you're on. Abortions, guns, place gets quiet as it should, big issues. I respect anybody on both sides of this issue as I said in committee. I put the Bill through the process of getting it to Second Reading and being a Democrat in Democratic Leadership, my Democratic Leadership in the Rules Committee allow for five hostile Amendments to be placed in my Bill in another committee. Now, of course, it'll be argued that the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

committee went... my original Bill went through the Ag Committee and it didn't go through Human Services, but this, my fellow Democrats, if the Rules Committee will do this to me as a fellow Member in Leadership, think what they'll do to you if the will is there to try to hurt one of your Bills and sabotage it ... sabotage it in the Rules Committee. So, you're going to hear five different versions of what they think should be added to this Bill. committee, I asked all five of these Sponsors if I did adopt your com... your Bill... your Amendment to my Bill, would you be willing to cosponsor it with me and then vote for it on the floor. And to a person they said no or well, we don't know what's in the final version. Well, how can you not know what's in the final version. It's my Bill with your Amendment. So, what I'm asking you to do here for me, folks, if you're for or against what I'm trying to do in this Bill, I understand that. Put it on Third Reading, vote it up, vote it down, follow whatever you think you should do. Don't let my Bill be sabotaged by Amendments that don't mean anything. I ask you. I stand against this. You've just lit up a Bill I requested you on green lights. Please stand with me on red lights. Don't let this Bill be sabotaged on Third Reading and vote it up or down."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request a Roll Call vote on Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Mautino: "The request is acknowledged. Representative Feigenholtz to close."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to Leader Lyons, had this Bill... had this Bill originally gone through an appropriate committee and been addressed in a dignified manner, perhaps these Amendments wouldn't need to show up. I'd also like to remind the Body that just today a court struck down this Bill saying that it does not provide for equal access to other procedures in the State of Oklahoma. Please vote 'aye' on this Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #3. Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Your light was on and I answered."

Watson: "To the Bill. I would just like to say and I don't know what the implications are, sometimes people say things on this floor, but there is no more dignified person in this chamber than Joe Lyons. And for somebody to take this opportunity to try slight that is a little out of hand."

Speaker Mautino: "There has been a request for a Roll Call.

That's been acknowledged. So, all in favor will vote 'yes';
opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all
voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
wish? Chapa LaVia, Colvin, Leader Cross, Franks, Lyons and
Pihos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 36 voting 'yes', 66
voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', the Amendment is defeated.
Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Cassidy, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "On Floor Amendment #4, Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Once again, I do want to express all due respect to Leader Lyons and re... re... repress the point that had this Bill been heard in the appropriate subject matter committee we would not be having this conversation. For a women's health leq... piece of legislation addressing women's health be heard in the Agriculture Committee it's profoundly insulting. Amendment 4 would establish some parity, if the underlying Bill were to pass. The presumption in House Bill 4085 is that women do not have the capacity to make health decisions with their doctors. If we want to insert ourselves into that doctor-patient relationship, then we should do so equally. This Amendment will similarly require that before a doctor can prescribe medication for erectile dysfunction the patient must be offered the opportunity to see a video depicting the treatment for the most common side effect of these medications which is known as priapism. This is not a punch line of a joke; it is a very painful and serious condition requiring intense medical treatment. Men should fully understand the risk to this treatment and just as in the underlying Bill, physicians will need to report the names of the patients seeking this treatment and those who refuse it. It's simply about fairness. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I ask for your same consideration on this. I will say this that if Representative Cassidy would like to run a

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bill on erectile dysfunction in the future, go ahead and run it and we'll vote it up or down on its own merit. Just for... to set the record straight, Ladies and Gentlemen, in 2009 and 2010 Jil Tracy ran House Bill 3700, and 5343, through the Human Services Committee and got nowhere. A year ago, Representative Brandon Phelps took this same issue to the Agriculture Committee where it got out of the committee and then, of course, got bogged down with the notes. So, to say that this thing hasn't tried to go through Human Services, it's dead on arrival there. We all know what it's like to send something to a committee where it's dead on arrival. Well, so he took it to a committee where he'd get it passed. So, I take also issue with to say the people on the Agriculture opinion on this Bill is any less valuable in any other committee. So, I ask you to please again stand with me... stand with me on voting 'no' on this... on this Amendment, this hostile Amendment. If you want to vote against the issue on its own, God love you, but don't let this Bill be held hostage by a hostile Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Watson. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dave Harris."

Harris, D.: "A question of the Sponsor, please? The Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Who's on the Rules Committee?"

Cassidy: "It is a bipartisan committee."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Harris, D.: "Thank you ver... It is. All of our committees are bipartisan. Who controls the Rules Committee?"
- Cassidy: "Why is that relevant?"
- Harris, D.: "Well, it's relevant because as I understand it every piece of legislation and every Amendment that comes into this chamber has to go through the Rules Committee before it goes anywhere else. Is that correct?"
- Cassidy: "It is. And this Bill..."
- Harris, D.: "So... so, the Bill... the..."
- Cassidy: "...was assigned where the Sponsor requested it that it be assigned regardless of the appropriateness of the subject matter."
- Harris, D.: "The Sponsor can request just about anything, but the Rules Committee can act on its own, can it not?"
- Cassidy: "And that's why this Amendment is on the floor.

  Because this... I requested that this Amendment go to an appropriate subject matter committee."
- Harris, D.: "And... but the criticism... the... and... but the criticism... the criticism is that the Bill went to the Agriculture Committee..."
- Cassidy: "Absolutely."
- Harris, D.: "...which is controlled, if I'm not mistaken, last time I counted on a 3 to 2 vote, by people from your side of the aisle."
- Cassidy: "This is not a question of Republicans or Democrats.

  This is question of trusting women."
- Harris, D.: "I un... I un..."
- Cassidy: "I trust women."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Harris, D.: "I understand. It's a question of how the process works. The Bill itself was assigned to the Agriculture Committee by the Rules Committee. My... The last time I looked at the Rules Committee my guess is that two of the Majority Members of the Rules Committee are probably going to vote against this Bill. They may... The Bill in its final Third Reading form. They made the determination to send it to the Agriculture Committee, so my point is your criticism that it went to the Agriculture Committee should not be directed at this House, it should be directed at the Rules Committee more appropriately. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Those Members are here as well."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Watson."

Watson: "And I would just like to say to the Representatives on the other side of the aisle who have a problem with where these pieces of legislation ended up, now you know how it feels when some of our Bills get sent to certain areas. What I expect the next time a Bill gets sent to a committee that it has no business being, is I expect you two to stand up on the floor and voice your dissent. You allow the process to get slighted and cheated onetime, guess what happens, it comes back and bites you in the rear."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "Once again, this is about trusting women. This is about the appropriateness of a doctor-patient relationship. This is about women having the ability to make their own medical decisions. This is about fairness. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Floor Amendment #4. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapa LaVia, Colvin. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 32 voted 'yes', 68 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', the Amendment #4 to House Bill 4085 is defeated. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #5, offered by Representative Jakobsson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jakobsson on Floor Amendment #5."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jakobsson: House, I have House Amendment... I have Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 4085. If the purpose of this Bill as the Sponsor stated is to try to get a woman to change her decision about having an abortion, I want to make sure that care she receives is safe and will not harm her or will not harm her fe... her fetus should she choose to continue her pregnancy. In order to protect both the pregnant woman and her fetus, ultrasound should only be performed by qualified personnel under the order or referral of a medical professional. House Amendment #5 requires that only a qualified person may perform an ultrasound on a pregnant woman. Further, #5 requires an order or referral physician, an advanced practice nurse, a nurse midwife or physician assistant when a ultrasound is performed on a pregnant woman. This language is new to the Bill and is designed to protect a woman in her pregnancy. Both the Food

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

and Drug Administration and the American Institute of Ultrasound Medicine have warned that ultrasound on pregnant women should only be performed by qualified individuals for medical purposes. While ultrasound administered in low doses in a medical setting is considered safe, the FDA warns that the long-term effects of repeated ultrasound exposure on the fetus are not fully known. I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved adoption of Floor Amendment #5. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons."

"Well, I don't know how to say this, but Naomi if you would have read the Bill perhaps you would have said that the whole definition of physician and qualified person is already in the existing Bill. The existing Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll give you a little more background on the real issue is here. A woman is in a abortion clinic, should they be offered the opportunity to view their ultrasound. This does not demand an ultrasound. If an abortion clinic doesn't do ultrasounds, they can get off the hook by simply saying we do not provide ultrasound through our clinics in the neighborhood and the community to do that. There is nothing in this Amendment that adds anything to the Bill that wasn't in the original legislation. Stand with me once again. This is a frivolous Amendment. I'm not saying that the issue isn't concerned about having the right person to do these ultrasounds. It's already in the Bill under the definition. Vote 'no'."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."
- Sacia: "Representative Jakobsson, am I not correct in stating that no one is forcing a woman to have an ultrasound here? Isn't it simply, if it is offered, that the lady is then offered the opportunity to see it as opposed to the numerous calls to my office saying a woman is forced to have an invasive ultrasound and then forced to view it."
- Jakobsson: "This has been a discussion from the beginning of the Bill and that is what this Bill is asking people to do is look at an ultrasound. How can you look at it if you don't have it?"
- Sacia: "It's only asking to offer the lady the ultrasound if it has been... if that procedure has been performed. Is that correct?"
- Jakobsson: "She has to be offered the ultrasound, but then it has to be reported if she refuses it."
- Sacia: "My question, Representative, is if the abortion clinic is offering an ultrasound and the lady chooses to have it or if it's a procedure that's automatically given in that facility, am I not correct in stating that the woman is never, ever forced to view it, simply offered the opportunity to see it if, in fact, it was performed?"
- Jakobsson: "They're not always medically indicated."
- Sacia: "I'm just asking you to answer the question, Representative, because there's a lot of misinformation on

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Representative Lyons' Bill out there. And now, with everything happening today, I just simply want to clarify the purpose of your Amendment when no woman is ever being forced to have an ultrasound if the procedure is offered by that particular clinic at the time the lady comes in making her decision that then and only then it is offered to the lady to view. It is never, ever forced upon her. Is that correct?"

Jakobsson: "I think we should be talking about the Amendment that's before us and not the underlying Bill because it's the Amendment that we're going to vote on."

Sacia: "Would you, once again, restate the purpose of the Amendment?"

Jakobsson: "The purpose of the Amendment is to make sure that only a qualified person may perform the ultrasound and that there is a referral from a physician or an advanced practice nurse or a nurse midwife or a physician assistant when an ultrasound is performed on a pregnant woman."

Sacia: "And what part of Representative Lyons' Bill does not say that?"

Jakobsson: "Again, I'd like to refer to the Amendment that we're discussing."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. Once again, I urge an 'aye' vote on this because it requires that only a qualified person may perform the ultrasound, that they're often dangerous if repeated at high... the long-terms effects aren't known if there's repeated ultrasound exposure on... it's very

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

important to make sure that these are done by qualified people."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #5 to House Bill 4085. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will 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. 37 voting 'yes', 65 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', Floor Amendment #... excuse me... #5 is defeated. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang on Floor Amendment #6."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I suppose that many on the floor could argue that some of the other Amendments were hostile Amendments, Amendments designed to get in the... into the argument between prochoice and prolife and I see how you could make that conclusion, if that's where you wanted to go. But I submit that this Amendment is neither a hostile Amendment nor is it involved with that debate. So, I hope rather then continuing to have the same Roll Call, just as a kneejerk, you'll really take a look at this Amendment. What this Amendment says is if the ultrasound is offered, at the same time the ultrasound is offered the patient must be told if there's a cost to the patient or if there's a cost to someone. Not every one of these procedures is covered by insurance, not every one of these procedures is covered by anybody and sometimes the woman is going to have to pay for it. So, all the Amendment

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

says is if the ultrasound is offered, the woman needs to be told there's a cost or if there's a cost and who's going to pay for it and to confirm some kind of financial responsibility. I don't think that's too much to ask. People are told what the costs are of all medical procedures. People know there's a cost, so we don't want them to be offered this and have some thought that it's free. Every medical procedure has a cost. And I would ask you to be reasonable and just simply add to the Bill this provision providing for notification as to cost."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #6. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I don't take a lot of pride in having to go against one of my Leaders on the House Floor and in the Democratic Caucus, but I'll do it this time. Because in committee when he presented this Amendment, Lou, I asked you, oh, Lou, if I adopted your committee... Amendment to my Bill, would you be willing to vote for it and cosponsor it on the floor? He said no. So, let's not think about the folly of the appropriateness of this Amendment. First of all, 99 percent of abortion clinics do ultrasounds right now. It's all included to the paperwork that you sign when you go in there. Now, there's no additional cost. Well, Ma'am, would you like to have an ultrasound. We have to charge you more money. That's not how it's done. So, this may appear that they have some credibility to it. The fact of the matter is there's no additional cost for the ultrasound it's the doctor at the facility determines what kind of ultrasound

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

and if an ultrasound is needed. So, there is... this is a red herring. There's no substance to it. It's already covered in the process that they go through. I ask you once again for a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Bost: "Representative, first off, I have tremendous respect for you, but to the freshmen and to the newer Members of this caucus... or to this... of this General Assembly, when you say it's not a hostile Amendment, what would be your definition of a hostile Amendment?"

Lang: "A hostile Amendment is an Amendment designed perhaps to bring the Bill down. This is not designed to bring the Bill down. This is designed to enhance the Bill. And when my good friend, Leader Lyons indicated that he asked me that question in committee he did, he did and I gave that answer because I still don't like the Bill but we spend a lot of time around here trying to make bad Bills better. And my view is that if it is a bad Bill, but should it become law I would like it to be at least as good as it can be."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Amendment."

Bost: "My short tenure here has brought me to a recollection of the fact that a hostile Amendment would be one that would be offered on a Bill that is, 1) not agreed to by the Sponsor or, 2) is meant to remove votes and/or cause that Bill to fail. There are many who might be in support of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

this issue as it is, as the Bill is written, but when this Amendment is put on, they see a cost and a problem and a concern that maybe would cause them to pull away and not be able to support that Bill. Based on that, I do believe it's a hostile Amendment and I will be voting 'no' and I hope every one else will continue to."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lang to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this Amendment was not designed to bring down the Bill. This Amendment was designed to indicate that if a patient is going to have a medical procedure, the patient ought to be told if there is a cost. The Sponsor of the Bill has indicated that it's part of a package and there's probably no cost. Well, that's fine. Then the patient can be told that there's no cost. But every one of us goes and has medical procedures and every one of us would like to know what that medical procedure is, what the cost would be and who the heck's going to pay for it. That's all this does. This is not designed to bring down the Bill and I would submit that if this Amendment were adopted it won't change any votes on Third Reading. This could only make this Bill better regardless of what side of the ultimate issue you might be on on Third Reading. I would recommend 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment 6 to House Bill 4085. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 38 voting 'yes', 64

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and Amendment #6 is defeated. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Flowers, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook on Floor Amendment #7."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative, I think I'm going to withdraw my Amendment #7, but I would like to ask you a question. Is abortions in this state legal?"

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Lyons."

Lyons: "If you're withdrawing your Amendment, Representative Flowers, sobeit. If we're going to discuss further parts of the issue, we can do that on Third Reading, with all due respect."

Flowers: "Okay. Well, I'll just withhold my question until Third Reading. But please..."

Speaker Mautino: "Do you..."

Flowers: "...withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady requests that we withdraw Floor Amendment #7. Mr. Clerk..."

Clerk Hollman: "No..."

Speaker Mautino: "...further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4085, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Lyons."

Lyons: "Let me explain what the Bill does and I don't think there's anybody in the sound of my voice in this chamber

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

that doesn't know exactly what it does. It adds seven words the abortion process, would you like to see ultrasound. It puts no burden. It adds no undue burden on this issue at all. There are... There's the 1992 Planned Parenthood v. Casey which allows states to do things that do not create a undue burden. Asking that question, is not an undue burden. It'll... The physicians are the ones who make the determination on what kind of an abor... what kind of ultrasound is to be done. There's all the horror stories in this information of what... of how that would be ... would be some type of mandated situation, nothing could be further from the truth. It allows a.m. this question to be asked only after seven days of gestation, which means if there's a woman who's been a victim of rape or incest there'd be plenty time of a window for this issue to be addressed without having to kick in this ruling. Twenty-two states have this including Wisconsin, and Indiana, Nebraska, Michigan that have a form that allow ultrasounds. There was a case in Texas in January of 2012, this year, that upheld a Fifth Appellate Court ruling in Texas this year held these types of tests constitutional. This legislation does not mandate an ultrasound. It does require the physician or the person qualified at the abortion clinic to at least ask the question, would you like to see the ultrasound. Ladies and Gentlemen, I can't tell you how much I appreciate all 68 of you, 62 of you, whatever it was that voted for this. You did the right thing. And I also know how to count. And this is not easy for me to do on this day either after having you stand with me. I had about 61, 62 pretty solid

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

votes on this thing. I'm five or six short today with people who are missing that I know I could count on. So, I'm not going to call the Bill today. We'll leave it on Third Reading. I'll ask the Speaker for an extension on the deadline on this, but I'm not going to run this and ask people to vote for a Bill that I don't think I can pass on the House Floor. But to every one of you that supported me these things which are nothing short of Amendments, I appreciate it. For those who are on the other side of this issue, I wish you'd just look at what we're trying to do. This is as innocent a request as we could make, would you like to see the ultrasound. The fact of the matter is most women that see the ultrasound have a second thought to it and say maybe I should have this baby. Maybe you see that little heart beat and I hear that voice saying to me, mom, I'd like to live. We'll have that discussion another day hopefully, but to all of you that stood with me on these Amendments, I'll never forget it. Thank you very much. Hold the Bill on the Order of Third Reading."

- Speaker Mautino: "Take the Bill out of the record. On page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4028, Representative Feigenholtz. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4028, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Feigenholtz on Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4028."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4028 does three things. It is a DCFS initiative amending the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act by expanding the definition of a person responsible for a child's welfare. The second piece is combining two advisory boards and the third piece is... is an initiative, again, of DCFS to shorten the time that an adoption proceeding can take place."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Sommer."
- Sommer: "To the Amendment. I'd just like to say that I find the Amendment to be suitable and ask for support on it."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 4028 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4028, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I explained the Amendment which became the Bill. I'd be glad to answer any other questions."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 4028. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Biss, Cavaletto, Morthland, Pihos, Watson, do you wish to be recorded? Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 89 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House Bill 4028 is declared passed. Representative Gaffney, on page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4749. Read the Bill."

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4749, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gaffney, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gaffney on Floor Amendment #1."
- Gaffney: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask that this Floor Amendment be adopted and then discuss the Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4749, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gaffney."
- Gaffney: "Thank you. The original version of this legislation was House Bill 2558 and it passed the General Assembly unanimously. This legislation provides technical changes that were suggested by the Illinois State's Attorneys

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Association. And overall, this legislation is intended to install a preference for public agency attorneys to be used as special prosecutors in order to save the taxpayers money. Also, the legislation is intended to provide the county with more information concerning fees and work product when a private attorney is appointed as a special prosecutor. Be happy to answer any questions. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Gaffney moves passage of House Bill 4749. And the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; 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. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 4749 is declared passed. Representative McAsey, on page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4662. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4662, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #2."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 and then would address the Amendment as well as the underlying Bill on Third."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4662, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This legislation is... represents the efforts of the Illinois State Bar Association as well as the corporate fiduciaries. The Amendment that was just adopted addressed some concerns that were raised by the Attorney General's Trust Division. This is agreed legislation. It has to do with our trust law and bringing into the State of Illinois provisions allowing for decanting. It allows for trusts to evolve and meet the changing needs. Allows trustees discretion to distribute trust principal into other trust instruments, sets forth the rules, notice requirements. And I would be happy to take any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 4662. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr... Mr. Clerk, take the record. 106 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', House Bill 4662 is declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, Representative McAsey, there appears House Bill 4663. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4663, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #2."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move for adoption of Floor Amendment 2 and would discuss both the Amendment and the underlying Bill on Third."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. No one seeking recognition, all in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4663, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on House Bill 4663."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a second Bill that is part of the efforts of the State Bar Association and corporate fiduciaries to modernize trust law in the State of Illinois. Specifically, this is dealing with directed trust and situations where through a trust instrument, certain individuals are designated ability and authority to make certain decisions. This sets forth the liability for persons in those situations."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 4663. No one seeking recognition, all in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pritchard, do you wish to be

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 106 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 4663 is declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 5633, Representative Schmitz. Read the Bill. Out of the record. Page 12 of the Calendar there's House Bill 5434, Representative Williams. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5434, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Williams, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Williams on Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5434."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment simply makes a few changes to the Debtors' Rights Initiative of the Attorney General's Office making sure it applies only to debtors who are natural persons, not corporate debtors and another change regarding a court determination of willful refusal to comply with the payment order. And I'd be happy to discuss the Bill more thoroughly on Third."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. And on that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Franks: "Representative, can you tell us what the Amendment does, 'cause I know there were some questions to the underlying Bill and has the Amendment taken away the opposition that was previously had?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Williams: "Yes. This Bill is a compilation of extensive discussions between a creditor's bar, collection agencies, members of the judiciary, legal services programs and in corporate in put... input from all involved. So, there is no opposition remaining."
- Franks: "And how did it change from the underlying Bill? I remember when I spoke with the Attorney General's Office before there was some questions on how some of the jurisdictions were implementing the body attachment orders. I think there was a question of consistency and I wasn't sure if that was addressed in this Amendment."
- Williams: "Well, this Bill will provide consistency among all counties in terms of how body attachments work. And in terms of this Amendment specifically, first it clarifies the key provisions as I mentioned only apply to debtors who are natural persons not corporate debtors which was an issue that was brought up in the discussion. Secondly, originally, we had a provision that prohibited a jailed debtor's bond money for being turned over to the creditor. Under the new language, the court may order a jailed debtor's bond money to be turned over to the creditor if, after an inquiry, the court determines the debtor has willfully refused to comply. So, this incorporates best practices for debt collection without impairing the rights of someone who simply can't make a payment."
- Franks: "Is it... has there been any change in when a body attachment can be issued such as, presently, the system typically works is, a citation to discover assets is issued and if the debtor fails to show that individual was given

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

what's known as a rule to show cause why that individual should not be held in contempt. And if, again, that individual fails to appear in court, then the judge would be in her right to give her what's known as a body attachment to bring the body of the debtor to court to answer questions of the creditor. Has that changed at all?"

Williams: "What... the new procedure, if this legislation's passed, will be as follows: the debtor appears at a citation hearing, the debtor will be examined about his income... his or her income and assets, if no nonexempt income and assets are discovered, citation is dismissed. If nonexempt assets are available, it will not be. If there is no appearance, the court will issue an order to show cause but personal service is required. I think that's the main difference."

Franks: "I think that's a good change with the rule..."

Williams: "Right."

Franks: "...to show cause. The question is on the citation. Let's assume, for instance, that a debtor does appear at the citation hearing. But on the citation notice there is a list of documents that the debtor is required to bring such as copies of bank accounts, copies of their car titles, copies of their W-2s and copies of their tax returns are typical issues. And let's assume that the debtor appears at the citation, but doesn't bring any of those documents. Had... Would the debtor, it'd be my opinion, the debtor would not have essentially appeared because all they've done is shown up but not brought any documents. So, I want to make sure that if the debtor does appear that the debtor has to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

really be there and answer the questions and bring the documents that were requested."

Williams: "This is not addressed in this legislation. That would be a matter for judicial discretion and I would think a reasonable judge, with this legislation in place, would be able to address that issue, have a continuance, whatever would be appropriate in that situation."

Franks: "Well, I just want to make sure for legislative intent that if someone just shows up that they have not cured the issue of the citation and debtor... and that a rule could eventually be issued should the debtor not provide the documents required pursuant to the citation."

Williams: "There would be... there's nothing in this legislation that would preclude a judge from acting in the manner you discussed. Again, it's within their discretion. It is not precluded in this legislation."

Franks: "I appreciate your hard work on this."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill and in so doing, I'd like to thank her for her very hard work on this. This has been an issue that's come to the floor over the last year or so with some abuses across the state. And Representative Williams worked with the creditors' attorneys, with the debtors' attorneys. And let me also thank the Attorney General and her staff for being involved with this Bill. It's a very good Bill to clean up some real mess involving a post-judgment proceedings as it relates to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

collection from judgment debtors. So, I just rise to support the Bill and to thank Representative Williams for her hard work."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5434. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "No... no further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5434, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative Lang for your comments, but I have to say the credit goes to the Office of the Attorney General and all the parties that worked so hard with us to come to an agreed situation which, as I said, ensures that no Illinois resident will go to jail as a result of a debt they cannot afford to pay. And at the same time, remains consistent with current best practices and preserves creditors ability to obtain and fully enforce judgments against debtors who can afford to pay them. I think, as I said earlier, this was a result of extensive negotiations and discussions. I can go into more detail if you'd like, but the main points of the Bill prohibit payment orders that rely on exempt income and assets such as disability, et cetera; provide... prohibits bench warrants from missed hearings unless the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

debtor is personally served; provide plain language opportunities to assert exempt income and to clarify the courts must make a finding of an ability to pay before entering a payment order. These are commonsense solutions. We have a long tradition of not putting people in jail because of poverty and this ensures that will not happen in Illinois. I'm happy to answer any further questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 5434. On that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Williams: "Of course."

Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Franks: "Representative, I've had a chance to finally read the entire analysis and my question would go to House Amendment #2 dealing with the information requested from the judgment debtor on the form. And there are specific enumerated things that are able to be on the form. And my question is, would this preclude the judgment creditor from getting additional information. For instance, on here they have name, address, date of birth, marital status, dependents, employment status, source of income and real and personal property and other assets. Could we... could a creditor also say we need you to bring your W-2s, we need to see who you've applied for jobs in the last two months. Would we also be able to require them to bring the last two years of tax returns? I want to make sure that those things are not precluded on a citation to discover assets."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Williams: "And as we discussed when discussing the Amendment, that is not precluded in the Bill. Again, this has some broad protections as I enumerated in the beginning, but does not otherwise interfere with the normal process within the course for collecting judgments and is very consistent with current best practices."

Franks: "So, the form that will be issued will not be exhaustive. It would be including but not limited to language indicating that you can get the additional information."

Williams: "And that can all be addressed within a supplemental proceeding."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

Williams: "Sure, thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady's moved passage of House Bill 5434.

All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gaffney, Reis, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 5434 is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of House Bill 5025?"

Clerk Hollman: "The Bill's on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Mautino: "Please bring that Bill to Second Reading.

Representative Lyons on a Motion."

Lyons: "Yes, Speaker, I..."

Speaker Mautino: "Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lyons, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."
- Lyons: "So, Mr. Speaker, my intention here is to table

  Amendment #2 and adopt Amendment #1, the correct

  Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves that the House table Amendment #2 to House Bill 5025. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Verbal, verbal. It's just an Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "There's a Motion to Table Amendment #2. There is a Motion to Table Floor Amendment #2. This will require a Roll Call vote. All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos, Jackson, Howard. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and Amendment #2 is tabled. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lyons, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."
- Lyons: "Floor Amendment #1, Ladies and Gentlemen, does what I intended it to do yesterday. Basically gives a five-day window for the utilities to take the brick off of somebody's account. I ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5025, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I once again ask for your 'yes' vote. This time I'm looking for green buttons and thank you very much for the mistake I made yesterday on the Amendments. And I'd like to thank Mark O'Brien for bringing it to my attention and Chief Mapes, I'm sorry I created a little parliamentary problem here by screwing up on the Amendments. Thanks for your help. I ask for 'aye' votes."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5025. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan, Soto, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House Bill 5025 is declared passed. Representative Schmitz, on page 18 of the Calendar is House Bill 5257. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5257, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply adds two words to the Code right now. Currently, the cities and villages have the ability to... if they have to mow your yard or take off junk off the property, et cetera, they can lien your property or they

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

can put a special assessment on your tax bill to take care of those services if you leave your property go. This adds trees and bushes to it... to the Code."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5257. And on that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Franks: "Representative, by calling this a... is it a special assessment now, you're saying, that if the... if the municipality would cut trees or bushes on someone's yard, that they'd be able to do a special assessment. Is that what this Bill does?"

Schmitz: "Correct. Currently, cities, villages have the right to do the special assessment for a whole host of services that they do: removing junk cars, mowing the grass, those types of things. There's another section of the Code that dealt with nuisance greenery, but you did not have the ability to do a special assessment on the property. What we did is we just took trees and bushes out of nuisance greenery and put it into this provision."

Franks: "Well, let me..."

Schmitz: "So, now, it says weeds, trees, bushes, mowing, junk cars."

Franks: "Well, what's the practical effect though because it was in the nuisance section, for one of a better term. When it's in a nuisance section and it's taken care of, it does not become a special assessment, does it?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Schmitz: "In the nuisance section it does not. And what we found out going through this process is some villages passed ordinances dealing with nuisance, nuisance greenery, and found out the only rights that they had dealt with putting a lien on the property. The other towns and villages found out. They said, well, mowing is already in the other section where you can put a special assessment on here but trees and bushes aren't so."
- Franks: "So, what's the difference between a lien on the property and a special assessment? I'm trying to figure out what the practical effect would be for collection of these amounts owed because that's all the municipality cares about. They're going to do the prop... they're going to do whatever needs to be done either way whether it's in... whether it's in the nuisance section or the special assessment section, but what's the practical effect by moving this to the special assessment section?"
- Schmitz: "The timing of the receipt of the payment. They will speed up the receipt... the village or city would receive their payment much quicker when it's assessment on the property tax bill versus a lien on the property."
- Franks: "And how is an assessment collected versus a lien because I would presume if special a... let's assume it's a special assessment. And what happens if the property owner doesn't pay it?"
- Schmitz: "It's my understanding that they have... basically would be late on their property tax bill. The governmental body who's putting this special assessment on there has to follow a process on when to file notices, all those types

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

of things, and then the county in order to put it on the bill has to make sure that all the process will be followed, then they put that line on their bill. Now, if the homeowner decides to pay eight of the nine lines on their bill, they still missed a line on their bill."

Franks: "That's... let's assume they don't pay that 'cause then it... then it... does it become a lien. I'm just wondering... my concern is this. Let's assume we add to the special assessment so that way it increases their tax bill which is different than a lien on the property, correct, 'cause this would go right to the bottom line on someone... on someone's taxes. So, let's assume they don't pay. This would give rise to the municipality then to actually lev... do a levy on a tax sale on someone's property for not cutting their... their trees."

Schmitz: "I was trying to follow you there for a second, Representative."

Franks: "Okay. Want me to do it again? Okay."

Schmitz: "I need a chart."

Franks: "Oh, you need a chart. Here's the flowchart. The homeowner fails to cut his trees and bushes. As a result, a special assessment is put on, not a lien. The special assessment is placed, then, on the tax bill as opposed to a lien. Because the lien can sit out there and when the property is sold then the lien would be satisfied, but there would be interest accrued. But here the difference is if the homeowner doesn't pay the tax, then the municipality can sell the home for a tax sale because the guy didn't cut his bushes. Am I right?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Schmitz: "I... Representative, I believe you are. As I'm scanning through here, that happens today. That can happen today."

Franks: "I... I know."

Schmitz: "That's under the current statute."

Franks: "I know. And I'm always worried about that. I like the idea of the liens better than the special assessment for this reason because at that time, if there's a lien when the home is sold, the municipality would act as other creditors and they would get their money. I understand. You're trying to make sure that the municipality gets their money quicker and easier."

Schmitz: "Well, I'm adding two services to an existing statute that already allows local government to do that today."

Franks: "Well, they could do it right now under the nuisance statute."

Schmitz: "No."

Franks: "The reason you want to move it here is so they can get their money faster."

Schmitz: "No, they cannot do that under the nuisance stat... The nuisance statute does not include a special assessment."

Franks: "Oh, I get that. But the special assessment did not include the cutting of trees and bushes."

Schmitz: "That's correct."

Franks: "You're putting that into the special assessment."

Schmitz: "That's correct."

Franks: "Okay."

Schmitz: "I'm adding two specific services to inoperable vehicles, rodent and vermin abatement, weeds, grass, removal of debris, et cetera."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Franks: "I get... I get that, but the... I just want to caution you that by doing that, though it may speed up the ability for the municipality to recover the money they've expended which certainly makes sense, but the municipality also has other options. Besides a lien, they could also file a suit against the homeowner to collect and not have to do a special assessment. My concern though, at a time when we have ever increasing property taxes and people... and record unemployment, though it's coming down a little bit, I'm always worried about giving government the ability to sell somebody's home on a tax sale for people who can't afford it. And we've seen a big spike of that in our area. And now, you've got, I think, six whole precincts in McHenry County. You'll be hearing about that soon... soon too. So, my concern is the ... is that we may be being too onerous on this and perhaps the municipality, though they're owed the money, they should be treated like every other creditor because the way this is drafted they become... they have a super priority over every other creditor and that's my concern here. And I don't know if you have a response to that."

Schmitz: "No, I mean, yeah, I understand what you're saying, but I'm not creating a special assessment statute that..."

Franks: "No, I get that..."

Schmitz: "So, I..."

Franks: "...but you're adding to it and you're giving more..."

Schmitz: "I'm adding two more services to it. That's correct."

Franks: "Right. But you're giving them, the municipalities, more power for that special assessment."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Schmitz: "'Cause currently, right now, I was dealing with a municipality that their owed, just under the mowing alone, a quarter of a million dollars in property upkeep which, if you want to spread it around, the local taxpayers in that town have already paid for that service. You know, they had to spread that cost around."

Franks: "Well, they could actually go to small claims court and collect on it."

Schmitz: "Which is a cost."

Franks: "Right. But that's what other creditors have cost as well because those people who aren't paying the municipality probably aren't paying their creditors as well. And what the difference is is this gives a super priority to one type of creditor simply because they're a governmental entity instead of a someone else. Perhaps the same homeowner bounced a check, you know, to a... to a convenience store owner. That convenience store owner's going to have to wait to get his money until after the municipality gets theirs."

Schmitz: "But I don't want this to… 'cause this is already, as I said earlier, this is already existing statute, so I don't want this to be misconstrued that… that this is the first recourse of a village. You know, I represent many communities and this is not the first recourse of action. This is already in existing statute. In my office, I receive zero phone calls on any local government exercising this right. This is an option for them to use. The majority of the communities that I've dealt with in the past either collected the money or went to the lien process. This is a...

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

this is a very, going to the special assessment process in existing law is probably in my mind the last resort for a community to do that."

Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Franks. Please turn on his mic. Could you bring your remarks to a close?"

Franks: "I will. I appreciate that, Mr. Schmitz. I just... I'm always wary when we put government before every other creditor. We certainly know that the problems that government have because of the reduced funding that we've provided and... but it's also because of reduced tax receipts and that's because people have less. And I'm just concerned that if we put Governor... government at the front of the line that others may suffer. But I appreciate what you're trying to do."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Davis, W.: "Representative, in our analysis there's not a lot of detail and I didn't have a chance to read through the entire Bill, but when you talk about adding trees and bushes, who's making the decision that it's a nuisance?"

Schmitz: "The village or the local government already has, in most cases, existing ordinances on what they determine... A lot of communities say you've got to have the lawn no higher than such and such height or the... if the tree is laying on the house, those types of things. They've got ordinances on property upkeep."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

- Davis, W.: "So... so, there's something that speaks to the condition of that tree or bush that then ultimately determines that it should be trimmed or removed from a house. And I guess my con... what I'm asking in some respects is, I mean, I'm no expert in whatever that is called, but let's say you've got a tree that has a lot of limbs and they lay over... like a Weeping Willow tree. If it's laying over, because that's what Weeping Willow trees are and what they do, would someone arbitrarily say that's a nuisance and then I want to trim back the limbs of a Weeping Willow?"
- Schmitz: "No. Representative, I don't... that would be existing ordinance now. In a community they may have something like that, but the only time that it will really come through..."
- Davis, W.: "But if it's an existing ordinance, but you're adding trees and bushes. I'm talking about a tree. So, if it's existing, then what are you adding?"

Schmitz: "Well, you and I are doing apples and oranges here."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Schmitz: "Local ordinances versus state statute. This statute does not define a tree trimming operation. It doesn't say a Weeping Willow's got to be such and such height. Local ordinances take care of that. What this takes care of if a local governmental body, a city, has to go out there and physically remove a tree off a home because the homeowner says, you know what, I'm not doing it. And it's a public safety issue; it's... it could be falling on the neighbor's house and the homeowner says, I'm not doing it. The city has to do that based on their local ordinance, not based on

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

this statute, based on their local ordinance. This statute gives them multiple abilities on how to collect those dollars, recover those dollars for that service they just provided."

Davis, W.: "Understood, Representative. Thank you."

Schmitz: "Okay."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Penny."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Penny: "As a person involved in small town administration, I would like to remind everyone that we expend great amounts of money throughout the year which the regular taxpaying people are paying. If a person fell delinquent on paying his tax bill as a result of this procedure, the delinquent debt would be picked up in most cases by a taxbuyer after a period of notification. And he would have approximately three years to redeem that unpaid year of taxes. So, there are many safeguards built into this. It is very beneficial to the communities to be able to recoup their money quickly through the regular tax billing process and this would be a good Bill to keep taxes down for the regular taxpaying public. I would ask that you support the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLuca."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that he will."

DeLuca: "Representative Schmitz, if this becomes law, would a municipality that currently has liens on a property that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

they have maintained previously and they're being ignored, would they be able to shift that burden to the special assessment?"

Schmitz: "One second, Representative. You know, Representative, with the Speaker's indulgence, I'll pull this from the record. We'll get that answer. I don't have that answer and neither of us have that at the moment."

DeLuca: "I'm not asking you to pull it from the record."

Schmitz: "Okay. I just... I want to give you an answer and I don't have one."

DeLuca: "Okay."

Schmitz: "I... I... Your question is, could an existing lien, an old bill... all of a sudden this passes, the effective date, can local government take an existing old bills and now turn them into... turn them into a special assessment. Is that..."

DeLuca: "Well, it's up to you. If you think you can get an answer quickly and bring it right back up, that's your decision."

Schmitz: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, we'll be happy to pull this from the record for you."

Speaker Mautino: "Please take this from the record. On page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4314, Leader Colvin. Is this your last Bill, first Bill, last Bill? Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4314, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Colvin, has been approved for consideration."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Colvin on Floor Amendment #1."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. I wouldn't say all that as this being my last Bill, you never know. I would like for the House to consider House Floor Amendment #1 for adoption. Mr. Speaker, if you'd like to adopt the Amendment, I can explain it on Third, either way you want to do it is fine."

Speaker Mautino: "Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4314. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4314, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Colvin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I have for the House to consider 40... House Bill 4314, as amended, deals with a qualified business enterprise located in an enterprise zone in my community. Finkl Steel is a steel manufacturing fabrication company that is in the process of relocating their business from the north side of Chicago to a larger facility on the south side of the City of Chicago specifically in the 33rd Representative District which I currently represent. A couple of years ago they applied for... almost three years ago, they applied for, with the DCEO, after meeting the qualifications, a utility tax exemption to help facilitate their move with respect to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

their use of electricity. Finkl Steel is one of the top of electricity in northeast Illinois. facilitate that move, they had to do a couple things. They had to ensure that they would be either creating or retaining 300 jobs in the Chicagoland area in a high unemployment area. They met that requirement and they are currently in process of fulfilling that goal. This Bill gave them a 36-month window to complete that transition. I can tell you the cost of electricity usage they are currently still building out the electrical needs for the plant. They are currently in the process of hiring all those folks. They have not completed that task. simply a 12-month... asking for a 12-month extension of that commitment. Finkl Steel has every intention of meeting that goal. We've been working with them for the last 3 months and I can tell you they have been a tremendous corporate citizen. And I should also point out that Finkl Steel had a couple choices where they were moved. Their first choice was the south side of Chicago. We will work with them to help facilitate that move. The second choice was Ontario, Canada, back where their parent company is located. I'll be happy to answer any questions with respect to the Amendment."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 4314. No one seeking recognition, all in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Soto, Tryon, du Buclet. Representative Tryon, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the

120th Legislative Day

- record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 4314 is declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4665, Representative McAsey. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4665, a Bill for an Act concerning residential construction. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative McAsey, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey on Floor Amendment #2."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Floor

  Amendment #2 is a gut and replace. I would move for the

  adoption of the Amendment and then discuss on Third."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All in favor will say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4665, a Bill for an Act concerning residential construction. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 4665 creates the Radon Resistant Construction Act. This Bill is the… the result of the work of the homebuilders, realtors, the Illinois Emergency Management Association. All of them are supportive of the language before us today. Radon is a radioactive colorless,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

odorless, tasteless element that comes from uranium in the soil. It's the leading cause of lung cancer behind... or among nonsmokers rather. And this legislation actually came to me from members of the Will County Real Estate Bar who have seen radon mitigation become a problem as people are working to sell their homes. So, basically, what the Act sets forth is that all residential construction in the State of Illinois moving forward will be built as radon resistant construction. And I would ask for support."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 4665. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates that she will."

Davis, W.: "Thank you. Representative, in their... in efforts in the State of Illinois to build what would be concerned low... low-income housing or moderately priced housing or affordable housing, maybe that's a better term, how does this impact the cost?"

McAsey: "I think that's a great question, Representative Davis. This legislation is actually really about consumer protection and having a lower bottom line at the end of the day. What's happening across our state right now is that when residential properties are being resold, they're testing positive for radon and at that point, it's a very costly process to put in radon mitigation systems. It is a fraction, about a third of the cost on the high-end, to just lay, essentially, what's a piece of PVC pipe in the foundation and through the structural wall at the time of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

construction. So, this is really about making housing more affordable at the beginning and making housing more affordable when people are recognizing that right now this is driving up the cost of residential transactions."

- Davis, W.: "All right. I get the affordability on the back end, if the house is sold, I get that, but on the front end does it impact the cost and if so, how much are we talking?"
- McAsey: "I would say that it is not a large cost. I do have cost estimates that would suggest that this would be... it would be very minimal because essentially what the cost is is the cost of buying a length of PVC pipe. So, there are cost estimates that say that it might be a couple hundred dollars, but I would suggest that those cost estimates saying that it might be three or four hundred dollars are actually on the high end, but certainly compared to right now, recognizing 1200-1500 dollars for mitigation it is certainly a lesser cost. And really, I would argue that PVC pipe cost significantly less than hundreds of dollars."
- Davis, W.: "Oh, no, again, I'm not disagreeing with you, but again, if we're just talking about, affordable housing. I'm just curious to know how much it could impact the bottom line of what may be considered affordable and does it push the cost up significantly in a sense that it's not affordable anymore since you're requiring this be a part..."

McAsey: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...of the construction process."

McAsey: "Right. And so, Representative Davis, the high end estimate is that this would cost \$400 and again, that's at the high end, a total of \$400 for labor and for laying the

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

PVC pipe. So, given the total cost of building new residential construction, I don't think that this would drive up the overall cost."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 4665.

All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Sosnowski.

Mr. Clerk, take the record. 96 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and House Bill 4665 is declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar is House Bill 5341, Representative Beiser. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5341, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Beiser, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Beiser on Floor Amendment #2."
Beiser: "Yes. Floor Amendment 2 does... is a gut and replacement.

It does three things to the Pawnbroker Act. It allows a prosecutor to retain custody of the property after issuing a hold order until the disposition of the criminal proceeding. The courts find that the property... number 2) if the courts find that the property was, in fact, stolen, the prosecutor must return it to its lawful owner under a court order; however, if not determined to be stolen, must be returned to the pawnbroker. And number 3) if it stipulates that it be returned to the rightful owner, the defendant... the property stolen has to be returned to the property

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

owner or the defendant must pay restitution to the pawnbroker in the amount originally sold plus any attorney and court fee costs."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5341. All in favor will say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5341, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill that I brought from a constituent who had a unfortunate circumstance regarding this type of activity. I worked with the Pawnbroker's Association. This is their language. It's an agreed to Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5341. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Acevedo, Kay, Mulligan. Representative Mulligan, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5341 is declared passed. On page 13 of the Calendar is House

120th Legislative Day

- Bill 5586, Representative du Buclet. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5586, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative du Buclet, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative du Buclet on Floor Amendment #2."
- du Buclet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to adopt the Amendment #2 to House Bill 5586."
- Speaker Mautino: "And the Lady moves adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 5586. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5586, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative du Buclet on House Bill 5586."
- du Buclet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Today I'm presenting House Bill 5586 which focuses on the care of residents affected by the proposed closing of Tinley Park Mental Health Center. The Governor has proposed moving these individuals to community care settings or private hospitals and he's laid out a basic budget amount for their care. This Bill would allow... this Bill as amended

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

says that when the state contracts with outside groups to care for these individuals the contracts must preserve the same basic legal rights."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 5586. No one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Golar, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House Bill 5586 is declared passed. Representative Arroyo, on the Calendar, page 13, appears House Bill 5531. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5531, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Floor Amendment #1, Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Yes. I move to adopt Amendment 1 and move it to Third so I can call it on Third."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of Floor Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

  Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5531, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Arroyo on House Bill 5531."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5131(sic-5531) is a tuition waiver. This Bill will no longer provide tuition waivers to students of state university employees who make over 50 thousand annual salary. The Illinois Board of Higher Education receive over \$2 billion annually for the... for the annual budget and they give away tuition waivers at four... at \$414 million. Tuition waiver rates are... in our universities keep going up because we are paying 2.5 million... 2.5 percent for education of out of state children. Illinois cannot afford this any more."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5531. The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost is seeking recognition."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Bost: "Representative, on the Bill, with the Amendment, you say that you put an exemption in there for anyone who has... now, and I hope the Members of the Body understand this, any... any person that has this benefit, because it's a benefit of employment, if they make... have a household income... have a household income of less than \$50 thousand they still qualify, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Bost: "Okay. So, that means that if they're actually making about \$30 thousand and they have a spouse that... well, for the most part, probably works at... that just about anywhere making 18, 20 thousand. All of a sudden they go over that

120th Legislative Day

- 50 thousand mark, their children are not eligible for this. Is that correct?"
- Arroyo: "We have to draw the line somewhere. We could draw an Amendment..."
- Bost: "Well, actually, that line, you know, you know, what's really wild is is that..."
- Arroyo: "We... we could... we could draw an Amendment to raise the cap if that's what you would like, Sir."
- Bost: "The... the... Well, we're kind of in the last days here and... and as far as moving Bills over to the Senate, but Representative, what is your thought process... and, I understand those that are... that might be the administrators that they have a very high salary. I understand that argument, okay. But what... what do you say to the fact that this is an opportunity as a... that the universities can offer this and I understand... Let me ask you this, is it... is it a full tuition waiver that the universities offer?"
- Arroyo: "The universities could still offer; it just won't be mandatory."
- Bost: "The universities can still offer; they just won't be mandatory. Okay. But the problem is, what about the students that are two years into their education and they still get... you know, they kind of thought that this is going to be covering their tuition."
- Arroyo: "Due to this budget times that we live in right now, I think that we have to draw the line somewhere. I amended the Bill to say that if you're... if you're at the start of the year, you can finish the year off, so it finish off in September."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bost: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

Bost: "Ladies and Gentlemen, these waivers that are offered by our universities, many of our employees at our universities have made their decision on taking that employment based on the fact that these are a benefit that they feel was offered to them and we aren't talking about those that have a large income, we're talking about regular employees. Ladies and Gentlemen, there's also problems that exist in the fact that, as I said, people are already into their education and all of a sudden we're going to pull these tuitions out from underneath them. The universities themselves have said that their cost are minimal and here's why, here's why. They have only 50 percent waivers. That means the other 50 percent of their tuition they're paying, they're paying student fees, they're paying housing, they're paying book fees. Because of that they're still doing well about keeping students enrolled. Many of these students might not have the opportunity to go to our universities if we pull this away. I understand, believe me, if there's anyone understands, I understand that we make... need to make sensible reductions throughout the state, but this doesn't actually save us money, I would argue that in the long run, it costs us money in the fact that we would have less students and all of those tuition waivers that... or tuitions that we were receiving and the student fees and everything like that would be lost. I encourage a 'no' vote."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "With 10 Members seeking recognition, we'll be... we'll go to the timer. And next to speak will be the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lyons for three minutes."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Lyons: "I'll be brief, Mr. Speaker. Representative Arroyo, we had this Bill in committee this morning, in Executive, and we had some good conversation on this. But one question I failed to ask in committee and would like to ask you, have any of the universities either collectively or one of them offered you an alternative. You had any conversations with any of them?"

Arroyo: "Negative, Joe."

Lyons: "Okay. So, not one of them, knowing this Bill has been out here, have approached you to say, well, could we back this off or could we make it less of a contribution? Ladies and Gentlemen, I said this in committee and I mean it now, if the State of Illinois is on the verge of bankruptcy, which we all know, we just passed Resolutions today to make sure that we stay within some spending limits, I'm very proud of every one of our universities here in the State of Illinois like everybody, all 118 of us, but if we're going to have to make some sacrifices, to quote the Governor, we all need haircuts, none of us will get scalped, this... this has to stay on the table. I support the Gentleman's initiative here. If for nothing else, keep the conversation going, send it over to the Senate, what if... if it becomes part of the final package or if this... a stand-alone Bill,

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

let's not turn our back on something that does have some merit. So, I stand with you on your Amendment, Representative Arroyo and if it can be improved upon in the Senate, keep an open mind."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, quick question for you that I failed to ask in committee this morning as well. That is that your proposed savings to the university... to the state, will... will that money that's proposed is savings, will that be put into the universities' budgets of higher education in this budget cycle?"

Arroyo: "I didn't hear what you said, Sir."

Brady: "The money that you proposed that will be saved by eliminating the tuition waiver, will that money go into universities' budgets in this upcoming budget cycle? Will they receive more money in their budget because of this tuition waiver if it is eliminated?"

Arroyo: "Every dollar they don't spend means they can spend that dollar elsewhere."

Brady: "But we... we..."

Arroyo: "Then there's... do you know how many scholarships they give away at the university..."

Brady: "Yes."

Arroyo: "...Representative? You know. What is the number you have?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Brady: "Well, I have just specific to a university that I happen to represent."

Arroyo: "Okay."

Brady: "And so, I don't have the number for all of our state universities, but my... my question..."

Arroyo: "Can I... can I..."

Brady: "...Representative, my question to you was, if the tuition waiver is eliminated, is there going to be increased funding into our state universities' budget because of this?"

Arroyo: "This is not appropriated, Representative."

Brady: "So, the universities then presently absorb this cost in their budgets with the money that they are given through the appropriation process. Is that not correct?"

Arroyo: "This is like the Representative scholarship. We don't give no money to... to the..."

Brady: "So, the universities then absorb this in their budget, whatever it costs, differential loss that there may be, they absorb that in their budget. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, simply in this time of our financial challenges and we certainly all agree on that, but the university community that we owe millions, and millions, and millions of dollars to are asking us one thing. Don't eliminate this waiver now on us as we use it for a variety of things: number 1) to recruit and retain good faculty and staff. And so, I can appreciate your intent here, Representative and I think maybe there... with some more work there might be some other areas to look at, but at this point in time, we have the universities we owe millions of dol..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "Please turn on Representative Brady's mic.

I'd ask you..."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "...will you bring your remarks to a close."

Brady: "Thank you. I will, Mr. Speaker. And we have a situation to whereby eliminating these waivers we're not putting any more money back into any university's budget. So, those who we owe money to and continue to provide services in higher education, I, myself, will listen to for this time around and I'll be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Pritchard: "Representative, what committee was this Bill heard in?"

Arroyo: "It was heard in Executive Committee."

Pritchard: "And it deals with what?"

Arroyo: "With scholarship tuition waivers."

Pritchard: "That sounds like an educational issue. Why wasn't it heard in Education Committee?"

Arroyo: "Well, I'm not sure of that. I can't answer that."

Pritchard: "So, in other words, we have another situation where the committee that is responsible for this area does not have an opportunity to debate it. What is the purpose..."

Arroyo: "You have the..."

Pritchard: "...of your Bill?"

Arroyo: "...you have the opportunity to debate it on the floor, if you like, Representative Pritchard."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Pritchard: "Excuse me?"

Arroyo: "You have the opportunity to debate it now."

Pritchard: "That's fine. So, what is the purpose of your Bill?"

Arroyo: "The purpose of the Bill is that higher education and the universities get \$2 billion of funding and they give away 414 million of all this tuition waivers. We're not trying to eliminate all of them, but the majority of them. There is a big savings here that we could talk about and the tuition waivers are given out, you know, the General Assembly gives out 1500 tuition waivers."

Pritchard: "So, this Bill is tied to the... as kind of a retribution for the General Assembly program?"

Arroyo: "No, no... here. Do you know how many scholarships are given out to the univ... all the universities. They have 50... 45 thousand scholarships that are given out."

Pritchard: "But we're talking about..."

Arroyo: "I don't know if you guys know that."

Pritchard: "...the tuition waivers for employees' children.

That's not 400 thousand."

Arroyo: "But it's not only employees' children. You got... you got tuition waivers from faculty, administration..."

Pritchard: "So, what's the purpose of the waivers that are issued by the universities?"

Arroyo: "I didn't hear that. What was that?"

Pritchard: "What is the purpose of the waivers that universities issue that we're talking about in this Bill?"

Arroyo: "This is intentioned to have the universities look more carefully at how they distribute the tuition waivers."

Pritchard: "So... Mr. Speaker, to this Bill."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, these waivers are issued by universities as part of a compensation package. It's issued to people that are generally not high paid. Sixty percent, for example, at Northern Illinois University make less than \$50 thousand. So, it's an important benefit for those employees. It also is something, and in this Bill, deals with veterans, we are already giving veteran exemptions. This Bill adds nothing more to these important individuals that have served their country. What this Bill boils down to is an opportunity for universities to put together a compensation package, as they see fit and to award it to individuals that might not otherwise attend university. In fact, a number of the recipients, some 2 thousand, may go to other states. So, this is a way to keep some of our best and brightest here in the State of Illinois. I would encourage you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker. You know, this is a... quite an interesting debate. As the chairman of Appropriations for Higher Education who have... actually have the... I have more colleges and universities in my district than any Legislator here combined, downtown Chicago, the near south side, more than any one here in this room. Now, I get a scent... excuse me... a whiff of hypocrisy here. And that whiff of hypocrisy speaks very similarly to the legislative scholarships. How interesting. Here you have about half of us utilizing our legislative scholarship and most of us have committees that

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

make 90 to 100 percent of the decisions just like my legislative committee, which is diverse from socially economically from one extreme to the other making reasonable evaluative assessments of people, young and old, undergrad and grad school, making decisions. And so, now, here we... we're looking at \$413 million in legislative waivers compared to roughly... what's half of 13 is what 65... million 500 waivers. Now, this privilege and it's interesting to listen to my colleague who have major universities in their district, now all of a sudden legislative waivers, which is what this Bill addresses, now it's an issue. Now, it's a handicap when it comes to giving and allowing president and university administrators and deans of colleges to do a waiver on some with or without committees, some at the discretion of whoever's leading that particular department or that university or that college that we pay for. That's an interesting disposition for us to be in. And so, the truth is you don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. So, all the Legislators, somehow we get a press pop on how bad and antiquated legislative waivers are even though somewhat... most of us have a sophisticated process of evaluation, but this is different. That's quite interesting. I think it's high time for us to air this out and discuss all the merits of all of the \$413 million of leg... of waivers. You can call it legislative waiver. Here, legislative... I'11 be specific. You can call it administrative waiver, employee exchange foreign waiver, student athletic scholarship waiver, academic waiver..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Dunkin, can you bring your remarks to a close."

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir. So, I ask the Sponsor of the legislative scholarships that passed overwhelmingly here in this Body how much did the legislative scholarships cost and who it was costing? There... the fact of the matter is there is no cost; it's a waiver. It's merely a warm body in a seat in a room where there's going to be bodies anyway. So, if we're going to be consistent and we're going to be consistent, that means every single waiver, being a legislative waiver or a academic waiver and all the other waivers that equal in value \$413 million, should go down as well. I'm going to be watching very interestingly all of us here and what are vote is and see if we can be consistent 'cause most of us do not know or can attest if those particular committees or those universities have a process as most of us did and most of us do. So, again, this whiff of hypocrisy I hope that's not... that's not... I hope we're consistent here. Let me put it like that on a positive note. So, as a chair of Appropriations..."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Will,
Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Does this apply to the City of Chicago community colleges and other community colleges throughout the state?"

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "This is for the nine public universities."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Kosel: "I was told that it might have implications for the community colleges also."

Arroyo: "Well, there's a lot of miscommunication..."

Kosel: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...in this chamber. That's the problem. People are using different numbers and saying a bunch of things, but a lot of what they're saying is not true because it's benefiting to the people that are telling you."

Kosel: "Okay. So, this would not affect any community college or the City of Chicago community college system only Chicago State University?"

Arroyo: "Yes, Ma'am."

Kosel: "Would it be possible... one of the arguments that has been put forward has been that, you know, we have to go out and recruit these really select professors and this is the tool that we use to recruit. Is there anything in this Bill that would preclude within an employment contract to have a waiver for a student in a specific employment contract?"

Arroyo: "Could you restate that question, please?"

Kosel: "So, if I... if a university is going out and recruiting a professor that is very difficult to get and we've heard the argument that this is something that they consider in the employment and therefore, it's a recruiting tool to get these professors that are very difficult to obtain. Is there anything in this Bill that would preclude the university from signing an employment contract with a professor and including a specific waiver as terms of his employment?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Arroyo: "My Bill doesn't do nothing with hiring a professor or anything. Just talks about the tuition waiver itself."

Kosel: "So, it would not be your intention that the university could not use this as a recruiting tool for a specific..."

Arroyo: "Absolutely not."

Kosel: "Thank you."

"Mr. Speaker, I would like to address something about Arrovo: and let the Body know where the money and who is getting the most tuition waivers. The most tuition waivers 2... 2.4 percent go to foreign exchange students with our dollars, 2.5 percent go to out-of-state students with our tax dollars, 2.6 percent goes to foreign students from out of state. We're paying other peoples' education with your tax dollars. We're here to save the State of Illinois tax dollars, so let's show... let's show that today and get rid of these tuition waivers for the people of out of... our state. The General Assembly has waivers to our Members and they can live outside the district. If you live a block outside the district, you're in... you're in penalty. You get penalized, but we're paying like 7 or 8 percent to our students from out of state. I don't know where we're... what we're talking about here. I don't know. I'm confused. But anyway, I'm always confused anyway, but you guys are going to set me straight and tell me what I'm doing wrong."

Speaker Mautino: "Ten Members seeking recognition.

Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Yes, he will."

Kay: "Sponsor yield, I'm sorry."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Arroyo: "Can I continue with... My mic is on. Can I con..."

Speaker Mautino: "Actually, it's Representative Kay and I will restart your three minutes."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "Proceed."

Arroyo: "I thought we were on Short Debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Mautino: "He has asked you questions and you can reserve your comments for close, but it is his three minutes as this point."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to request unlimited debate, if
you would, please?"

Speaker Mautino: "While I check the rules on here, why don't you go ahead with your three minutes and I haven't seen you joined by the appropriate numbers for unlimited debate. So, proceed with your questions."

Kay: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah. Would you please reset the clock? Okay. Representative, I have a couple questions. My analysis shows that we are spending a lot less money than you indicated. I think you cited 414 million. Where does that number come from?"

Arroyo: "The Board of Higher Education."

Kay: "And that... that's total..."

Arroyo: "And the analysis... the analysis I got was from the..."

Kay: "Okay. That's total..."

Arroyo: "...University Office of Planning and Budgeting."

Kay: "Okay. That's total for all the waivers and that would include those people that you said were from other countries and for other states and people that didn't..."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Arroyo: "Right."

Kay: "...reside in Illinois. Let me suggest... Wouldn't it be useful or would had... would it had not been useful to amend what we're doing sometime ago..."

Arroyo: "Kay."

Kay: "...and just cut those people out..."

Arroyo: "Representative, I can't hear you."

Kay: "Well, I can't talk any louder, Luis, I'm sorry. I guess my question was this. Wouldn't it have been useful to simply amend what we were doing sometime ago and remove all those people from foreign countries and out of state so that they weren't in this mix? I mean, that certainly makes sense."

Arroyo: "No matter where you start, we have to start somewhere, it...it's..."

Kay: "I under... I understand. Let me... let me continue here because..."

Arroyo: "I'm willing to... I'm willing to..."

Kay: "Yeah. Let me..."

Arroyo: "...amend the Bill when it gets to the Senate and we can talk about..."

Kay: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...capping and put a higher cost on."

Kay: "Yeah."

Arroyo: "I mean, there's a lot of ways of doing this."

Kay: "Look, I'm not adverse. I just want to move along here and use my two minutes, if I could. I'm curious. What you're suggesting is that we ought to allow the free market to

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

work in the State of Illinois when it comes to hiring people for state universities?"

Arroyo: "I don't have... This has nothing to do with hiring anybody in the State of Illi..."

Kay: "Well, I think... I think I've heard other speakers say it does because it's somewhat of an incentive to those people who come to these universities to teach. So, are we..."

Arroyo: "This is..."

Kay: "...disincentivizing those people? Just yes or no."

Arroyo: "This is only tuition waivers. It has nothing to do with hiring anybody for any university."

Kay: "Well, let me ask a different question. If we take this incentive away, are we looking at additional costs to the professors that we hire at these universities to cover what is a known incentive and thereby increasing the pension contribution that we have to make?"

Arroyo: "These are high... you're talking about the high paying professors. There's some... there's a guy named Mike Hogan..."

Kay: "Luis, please. Just... could you just... I don't have much
time. Could you just answer my question, please?"

Arroyo: "I'll get back to you on that. I can't... I don't have the answer for that."

Kay: "Well, let me ask you a last question. We're... we're not getting too far here, Representative. My last question is this. I think we have trustees at these universities that we actually put in place... they're elected, if I understand it correctly... don't you think those people are responsible for what happens at those universities?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Arroyo: "Kay, if those professors would have came and talked to me, I could amend the Bill and we could have talked about it. None of those professors came and talked to me about my Bill."

Kay: "Well, okay. I... I... my time is about up here..."

Speaker Mautino: "Grant the Gentleman another minute."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I was asking some legitimate questions, I think, because I'm uncertain as to how I'm going to vote, but I didn't get any answers to my questions. I understand that you're starting at ground level here, but let me ask one final question and then I'll just simply say, I'm going to have to hold my vote and see how others debate this, with you. But, it seems to me that if you're asking us, at ground level here, to make these cuts, are you suggesting to me that we're going to proceed on on an equal basis with every line item to make cuts just like this?"

Arroyo: "This has nothing to do with that, Kay. And I'm still willing to sit down and try to work with this to try to put an Amendment on the Senate side to satisfy the people that have a problem with this."

Kay: "Yeah."

Arroyo: "This is just step one to this tuition waiver Bill."

Kay: "Well, I'd rather send a good Bill to the Senate and rely on our work as opposed to theirs, but I appreciate your comments. I think we need to visit because I didn't get a lot of answers to my questions. I think..."

Arroyo: "Well, I tried."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? There has been a request for unlimited debate. I will set those at five minutes. We have 10 people seeking recognition. Next... next speaker will be Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Mautino: "Indicates that she will."

Jakobsson: "Representative... Representative, have any of the universities asked you to introduce this Bill?"

Arroyo: "Absolutely not."

Jakobsson: "No?"

Arroyo: "No."

Jakobsson: "Do you have any support from any of the universities?"

Arroyo: "I... I talked to Mr. Kay and I told him that none of the universities came to talk to me about this Bill. So, I've had no conversation with any of the universities."

Jakobsson: "All right. But none of them asked you to support this Bill."

Arroyo: "No."

Jakobsson: "How much... I just want an answer to this part of the question. How much do the faculty and staff waivers cost the universities?"

Arroyo: "Could you repeat the..."

Jakobsson: "Not... not all of the waivers that are given. I just want to know these particular waivers that you're trying to eliminate. What do they cost?"

Arroyo: "Eight point one million in 2011."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Jakobsson: "And you've broken that out from that larger amount that you were giving us earlier when you were talking about the cost of waivers?"

Arroyo: "That's what the value is."

Jakobsson: "You also said something about waivers being used for out-of-state tuition."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "Can you tell me how these waivers, these faculty staff waivers that are part of their compensation package, how do they go out of state? I don't understand that..."

Arroyo: "This is for out-of-state students..."

Jakobsson: "...so, I need you to help me understand."

Arroyo: "...students that come from another state come to our schools on a tuition waiver. They could also afford to pay for it."

Jakobsson: "They come to a tuition waiver because their parents work at the universities and yet, their kids live out of state?"

Arroyo: "No. The professors waive their tuition waiver so they can come to our schools. They don't work in our schools."

Jakobsson: "But, we're talking about the tuition waivers that the faculty and staff get for their children. So, are you saying that their children... they send them out of state to live somewhere else but then they bring them back into state when they're ready to go to school, go to college?"

Arroyo: "This is the same thing as an athletic waiver or any other kind of waiver. They just come from other states to receive the waivers."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Jakobsson: "The children of the faculty and staff come from other states. Is that what you're telling me?"

Arroyo: "No, no."

Jakobsson: "Well, that's what I'm asking 'cause you..."

Arroyo: "We give them tuition waivers because they come from another state."

Jakobsson: "But we're not talking about other tuition waivers."

I thought your Bill had to do with the faculty and staff waivers."

Arroyo: "They're part of the total number we gave you."

Jakobsson: "Well, I think you're avoiding answering my question. To the Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "To the Bill."

Jakobsson: "Representative, do you un... Well, everybody, this... these waivers and it's been said earlier, but these waivers are part of a compensation package. They're not part of your compensation package or Representative, over here to my left, it's not part of his compensation package, but they're part of the compensation package of the people who work at the University of Illinois. And the universities budget for these waivers. They know when they offer the positions to the faculty and the staff that if they stay at their universities long enough they will have the opportunity to avail themselves of this waiver for their children. So, I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Zalewski.

Out of the record. Representative Watson."

Watson: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

120th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved previous question.

  All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the

  Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the question is put.

  Representative Arroyo to close."
- Arroyo: "I think that this is an important Bill to save some money, but I have a question for one of my colleagues that asked me some questions about..."
- Speaker Mautino: "You have the opportunity to explain your position in your close."
- Arroyo: "I want to talk about a question I got from one of my colleagues about that if I was asked certain questions. So, I want to ask my colleague, has she come to talk to me about the scholarship waivers? I want to ask Naomi Jakobsson... I want to ask Naomi Jakobsson... I 'll... I'll urge you an 'aye' vote, please."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves passage of House Bill 5531. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Feigenholtz, Nekritz, Poe, Yarbrough. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 26 voting 'yes', 75 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and House Bill 5531 is defeated. Representative, on the Order of Post... Excuse me. Representative Rita, House Bill 4313 appears on page 7 of the Calendar. Representative Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "On the last Bill, my button was pressed 'present', but I'd like to be... let the record reflect that I wanted a 'yes'."

120th Legislative Day

- Speaker Mautino: "The Journal will reflect your intentions.

  Representative Rita on House Bill 4313. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4313, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Out of the record. Representative Thapedi,
  House Bill 5823 appears on Third Reading, page 19 of the
  Calendar. Read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5823, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have the status of this Bill 'cause there's some housekeeping that needs to be done with respect to this Bill?"
- Speaker Mautino: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of the Bill?" Clerk Hollman: "The Bill is on Third Reading."
- Thapedi: "Okay. Preliminary I'd like to move it back to Second and add an Amendment."
- Speaker Mautino: "Please place this Bill on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are any Amendments pending?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Thapedi."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Thapedi on Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5823."

120th Legislative Day

- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 5823 and more specifically Floor Amendment #1 addresses the wrongs in the adjudication of health care liens in Illinois. The legal community and the health care community are committed to resolving this issue and have joined together in this Bill to cure any defects with respect to the adjudication process. I have met with the Illinois State Medical Society. I've met with the Trial Lawyers, the hospitals, the Illinois State Bar Association and also the nursing homes who will not be a part of the final Bill, the Chicago Bar Association and the medical transport community. Amendment #1 is the agreed upon language that will go forward to the Senate additional work will be done. And I'd like to adopt the Amendment now, if I may."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman moves adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 5823. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'yeses' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Thapedi, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Thapedi on Floor Amendment #2."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, Amendment #1 is the intention to be the Bill; therefore, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

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

Speaker Mautino: "Third Reading. And read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5823, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said a little earlier, there is no opposition at this point. I've had detailed discussions with the Illinois Medical Society. It's my understanding they have advised everyone in the chamber that there is no objection at this point from the Illinois State Medical Society. It's our intention to pass the Bill now, continue with the negotiations in the Senate. And I'm asking for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5823. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan is seeking recognition."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. With Amendment #1 and the removal of Amendment #2 the Illinois Medical Society has indicated that they are neutral or in slight favor of the Bill. I just wanted to point that out to the Body. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative, I was talking to somebody else and I may not have heard this. Did you mention the impact on nursing homes on this Bill?"

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Thapedi: "I did mention the impact and I indicated that the nursing homes would not be a topic of discussion in this Bill. They will not be involved in the Bill whatsoever."

Lang: "And will they be specifically exempted in the final version of the Bill?"

Thapedi: "They will indeed."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the… will the Sponsor yield? I think he does,

Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Sponsor…"

Speaker Mautino: "Yes."

Moffitt: "Representative, there were a number... you mentioned specifically the Med Society..."

Thapedi: "I..."

Moffitt: "...is no longer opposed."

Thapedi: "Yes."

Moffitt: "There were several opponents. You did not mention them. Do these Amendments remove all opposition or only the Med Society?"

Thapedi: "Who are you referring to?"

Moffitt: "Hospital Association, Optometric Association. There was, I believe, several."

Thapedi: "The Hospital Association has no objection. Again, as I indicated earlier, perhaps that I didn't and I should probably do so now, I want to thank the Illinois State Medical Society for taking the lead on behalf of the health care industry. I'd also like to thank the Illinois Trial Lawyers for taking the lead on behalf of the legal community and with those two groups discussing and speaking

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

for the various interested parties, this is the agreement at this point that's prepared and right to go to the Senate."

Moffitt: "Okay. So, there are no opponents. There were several others. They are no longer opponents."

Thapedi: "There are no opponents as we sit here today now."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 5823. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Barickman, Brauer, Lang, Unes. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 83 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. House Bill 5823 is declared passed. House Bill 5452, on the Order of Postponed Consideration, Representative Gabel. Read the Bill. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Representative Bill Mitchell could be excused for the rest of the evening, please."

Speaker Mautino: "The record will reflect. Can you bring down the noise level in the chamber, please? We've had a request from Members to bring the chamber noise levels down. House Bill 5452, Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill addresses audit findings and makes a few technical changes that make some provisions discretionary rather than mandatory. Last time there were some issues raised about the activity of the fund and those issues have been clarified and resolved. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady has moved passage of House Bill 5452. And on that question, Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Mautino: "She indicates she will."

"I had great concerns last time because, although I with the part of the Bill that removes the responsibility of the list to the Illinois Authority, there were two funds referenced on page 5 in line 18 and line 22, one of those funds is a venture capital fund that has \$1.9 million worth of investments in it and we were moving that from a 'shall' to a 'may' and the other fund was an investment bond fund that has \$11.6 million worth of cash in it. But I've done my due diligence since then and talked with the Illinois Finance Authority and I think I have an understanding of how they intend to move forward with those funds. I think that was really the major impetus of the Bill and somehow I didn't want the General Assembly to vote for that and gloss over the fact that they had those funds. They were originally seeded with General Assembly money, but they are totally self-supported at this point in time. So, I will be voting on behalf of the Representative's Bill."

Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 5452.

All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Saviano, Winters, do you wish to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 5452 is declared passed. Representative Harris, on

120th Legislative Day

- Postponed Consideration appears House Bill 4324. Read the Bill. It's on... Mr. Clerk. Representative Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives. Thank you for allowing me to explain to some of you, you know, where some confusion might have been in this Bill. This is correcting one word in a piece of legislation that was passed last year, signed into law by the Governor. It affects only my district and no other. I would appreciate very much an 'aye' vote to help out the businesses in my community. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has moved passage of House Bill 4324. All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Gaffney, Lilly, Saviano. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 66 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House Bill 4324 is declared passed. On the Order of Postponed Consideration is House Bill 5182, Representative Monique Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5182, we had difficulty because there was an error in the analysis on our computers. There is no opposition to this Bill. We talked to the Chief of Police. There is no opposition to this Bill. Representative Reboletti agrees with this legislation. And we just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "Lady moves passage of House Bill 5182. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Durkin."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Durkin: "To the Bill. You know, I've had a chance to read this a little bit more. And now, what it states is that certain non... certain offenses which are not, I guess, one moment, forcible felonies, nonviolent crimes. There would be a presumption that they will be granted bail unless there's a specific finding that a cash bond needs to be posted. Now, just remember what you're voting for. So, every time you... we've spent the last four years passing laws which are going to make crimes for identity theft, nonviolent, nonforcible felony, no matter how much the dollar amount of the theft is, we passed laws regarding the financial exploitation of seniors. Those individuals would also be given automatically or at least a presumption that they should be no bond. Drug offenses are not determined to be violent crimes or forcible felonies and I'm not talking about possession. I'm talking about the drug kingpins who are coming in and out of the State of Illinois every year trafficking kilos of coke, cannabis, methamphetamines. Those are the individuals under this Bill would... there would be a presumption that they should be re... be given some type of personal recognizance bond. I'm sorry, but I think you need to think about what exactly you're voting for. There's a lot of bad eggs, a lot of bad people out there who should not get the benefit of what this Representative's trying to do. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I would be the last person here to suggest that somebody's who's hauling 2 thousand kilos of

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

cocaine should get a recognizance bond having prosecuted those cases, just like the former speaker did, but the intent is to bring this Bill back with a Senate Amendment that says it's only limited to Class IV Felonies if they're nonviolent offenses and that if the person is given a recognizance bond because they have a job, at the next point in time they have to bring back a letter verifying their employment if the court gives them that latitude to give a signature bond. That's all the Bill does. It has nothing to do with Class X Felonies, anything else. It's simply nonviolent Class IV Felonies. I'd urge your support. Thank you."

- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis to close."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely nothing in this Bill that would prevent a judge from sentencing or holding a person who has some kind of horrible crime. The Bill clearly states that if it's a nonviolent first offender who has employment that they would be remanded to come back to court but not held and lose their employment. This Bill in no way talks about people that has a lot of drugs. A judges say that he even thinks that person may not return has a right to put bail on them and hold them until the hearing. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Mautino: "The Lady moves passage of House Bill 5182.

  All in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. 62 voting 'yes',

120th Legislative Day

- 45 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and House Bill 5182 is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 900, offered by Representative D'Amico. House Resolution 901, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 902, offered by Representative Riley. House Resolution 903, offered by Representative Cole. House Resolution 904, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 905, offered by Representative Verschoore. And House Resolution 907, offered by Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Mautino: "Representative Currie now moves adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "Meeting immediately after Session are two committees: the Human Services Committee will meet in Room 115 and the State Government Administration Committee will meet in Room 114."
- Speaker Mautino: "And now... Representative Mulligan is seeking recognition."
- Mulligan: "Thank you so much. I would like to be recognized as I did not vote my switch the way I intended to on House Bill 5531. I would like to change my vote (sic-no)."
- Speaker Mautino: "The record will so reflect. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves the House stand adjourned to Friday, March 30 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. All in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'yes' have it. The House stands adjourned."

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on March 29, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6145, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 6146, offered Representative Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 6147, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. First Reading of these House Bills. First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 174, offered by Representative Gabel, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 179, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 408, offered Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 409, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 410, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act Bill 538, concerning revenue. Senate offered Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. employee Senate Bill 549, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 681, offered by Representative

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 758, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Senate Bill 2526, offered by Representative Dan Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2530, offered by Representative Connelly, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2580, offered by Representative Greq Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2643, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 2861, offered Representative Dan Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 2958, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2959, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2961, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3047, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3101, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3202, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3204, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3212, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act Bill 3216, concerning revenue. Senate offered Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3243, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning microlending. Senate Bill 3244, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3249, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3258, offered by Representative Penny, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3261, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Senate Bill 3283, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3284, offered by Representative Watson, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3296, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Bill Senate 3297, offered Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3314, finance. Senate offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3339, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 3359, offered Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3367, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3368, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3374, offered by Representative Jerry Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3384, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3385, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3396, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3399, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning beer wholesalers. Senate

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bill 3402, offered by Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3403, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3415, offered by Representative Senate William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 3430, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3442, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3450, offered Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 3497, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Senate Bill 3498, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3499, offered by Representative Biss, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3505, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3518, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 3522, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an concerning business. Senate Bill 3523, offered Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning tax refunds. Senate Bill 3538, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3549, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning child support. Senate Bill 3555, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3573, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bill 3583, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill correction... Senate Bill 3601, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 3602, offered by Representative Colvin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3618, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3621, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3659, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3663, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3665, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3669, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 3672, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 3676, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 3677, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Senate Bill 3680, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3693, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning crime compensation. Senate Bill 3694, offered Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3697, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3701, offered by Representative Reboletti, a

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3703, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an concerning aging. Senate Bill 3704, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3718, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 3724, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3726, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 3727, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning health regulation. Senate Bill 3744, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Senate Bill 3766, offered Representative Kelly Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Senate Bill 3778, offered Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 3789, offered by Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 3794, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 3798, offered by Representative Mathias, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Senate Bill 3802, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Senate Bill 3811, offered by Representative May, a Bill for an Act Bill 3813, offered concerning regulation. Senate Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning business. First Reading of these Senate Bills. There being

120th Legislative Day

3/29/2012

no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."