141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Good afternoon, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desk. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor David Fink who is with the Grace Baptist Church in Lockheart... Lockport. Pastor Fink is the guest of Representative McAsey. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off electronic equipment, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend David Fink."

Pastor Fink: "Let us pray. Father, we thank You that You show Your goodness in Your favor to the United States of America and those who govern it. This House is one of those states that make up this mighty nation. We ask You to bless this House and each Member who serves in it. Remind them of a truth except the Lord build the house, they that labor, labor in vain. Help these lawmakers to search their hearts that they may serve with dignity and honor and through them our state will achieve the destiny that You have set before us. Give them the wisdom as they make good decisions, courage that they will hold fast to Your truth, and compassion that all should prosper from the laws they approve. We receive Your presence here today and Father, we pray that these lawmakers will remain mindful of You that they will honor You in everything that they do here today. In Jesus' name, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "I would ask all our veteran Members to please lead us in the pledge."

Veterans-et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Majority Leader Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the absence of any excused absences among House Democrats today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost, GOP."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect all Republicans are present today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Now, 118 two days in a row. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 118 Members have responded to the Roll Call, a Quorum is present. We're prepared to do the work of the people of the State of Illinois. Committee Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel & Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 22, Short 2012: do pass Debate for Senate Bill 3629. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: recommends be adopted Senate Joint Resolution Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary I-Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: do pass as amended Short Bill for Senate 3522. Representative Debate Chairperson from the Committee on Environmental Health reports the following committee action taken on May 22, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Bill 3442. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Adoption Reform reports the Committee on committee action taken on May 22, 2012: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 4028. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken 23, 2012: on Mav recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4596 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2837. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2012: do pass Short Debate for Senate Bill 2979 and recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3982. Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary II-Criminal Law the reports following committee action taken on 23, 2012: May recommends be adopted House Resolution 1003, Resolution 1032, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3458. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2012: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2643. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 23, 2012: do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 179, Senate Bill 953, Senate Bill 402, Senate Bill 1338, Senate Bill 2315, Senate Bill 1567, Senate Bill 2332, Senate Bill 2348, Senate Bill 2390, Senate Bill 2394, Senate Bill

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- 2424, Senate Bill 2428, Senate Bill 2437, Senate Bill 2456, Senate Bill 2958, Senate Bill 3168, Senate Bill 3245, and Senate Bill 3802. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1072, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 1079, offered by Representative Dunkin. House Joint Resolution 89, offered by Representative Cross, and House Joint Resolution 90, offered by Representative Dunkin.
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chad Hays, I believe you have a couple of very special guests on the floor that you'd like to introduce to the Body. Can I have your attention?"
- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is truly one of the great honors of my life to welcome for the first time since I have been in this august Body my parents Jerry and Hilda Hays. Please give a warm welcome to my parents during their first visit to Springfield."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. and Mrs. Hays, you do nice work. Chad's a great Member. Welcome to your Capitol. We're going to run some Third Reading Senate Bills before we have our Veteran's Memorial Service. We're waiting 'til about 1:00 to do that so, we will be proceeding, again, from the Senate Calendar starting on page 5. Representative Jack Franks, I believe you have Senate Bill 408. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on Senate Bill 1673, on page 5 of the Calendar?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1673 is on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Currie."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please move the Bill back to Second for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Thank you, Leader. Page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Readings. Representative Sid Mathias, Sid, you have Senate Bill 3250... 20... 3252, 3252. Out of the record. Representative Scott Penny, you have Senate Bill 3258. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative, I've been advised by the Clerk that you have a Floor Amendment for this Bill. You want to take that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, put that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and what's the status on the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3258, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Penny, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Penny on Floor Amendment #3."
- Penny: "This Amendment is a change to the Bill which would allow a person... a young person who has had one conviction for reckless driving, if they reach the age of 25 years and have a clean driving history other than the one conviction for reckless driving, it would allow that conviction to be sealed. It's not a scofflaw Amendment where they can continually come back and reseal the same event. They can't even make the application 'til they've reached 25 years of age and it would be limited to one incident."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Floor Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Seeing none,

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

all those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading.

We'll hold it on the Order of Third Reading. Representative

Poe, for what purpose do you seek recognition,

Representative?"

Poe: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Ray."

Poe: "Yes, I'd like to introduce to the Body a class of...
teacher is Russell Benning. He brings a group over from
Trinity Lutheran every year here in Springfield. And I want
to give him a big welcome back over to the Capitol. So,
thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, we're glad to see you.

Enjoy your day. Representative Bob Rita. On page 6 of the Calendar, Bob, you have Senate Bill 3279. Do you wish to call the Bill, Representative? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Representative Rita, I've been advised by the Clerk that there's an Amendment due. We'll put that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and what's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3279, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment addresses some concerns that came up under the debate and what it basically does is removes the word 'photo' to government-issued IDs."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation to Floor Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption 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. We'll hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Anthony DeLuca, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3318. Representative DeLuca, Senate Bill 3318 on the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3318, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Anthony DeLuca."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the trailer Bill to the Illiana legislation that we passed a year and a half ago. At the time, when that Bill was passed, the quick-take language was omitted. This Bill reinserts the quick-take authority for IDOT to construct the Illiana Expressway. I'd be happy to take any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 3318. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Leader Mike Bost."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, you know, when we start talking about any quick-take language in the… not only in the State of Illinois but in the United States today all… automatic certain concerns come up. What authority… with this quick-take authority, what… what process must be used as we start to deal with these… these areas of interest where they might be going across? What exactly is the process that they go through?"

DeLuca: "What is the quick-take process?"

Bost: "What... in... in this particular case, is there any modifications in the quick-take process? I understand it..."

DeLuca: "Okay. No it..."

Bost: "...but I want to make sure all other Members do."

DeLuca: "...no, it would be no different than any other quick-take authority and any other project that IDOT would have."

Bost: "So, basically as this project goes on, as they move forward, they can basically come in and tell a person that's a landowner that we're going to give you the following amount of money for your land and that'll be it, correct? And we'll take it and do with... as we wish, correct?

DeLuca: "Well, it's not that simple but generally speaking, yes."

Bost: "Okay. Can... can you tell me what specifically... we know from our analysis the Farm Bureau is in opposition. Can you tell me why?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

DeLuca: "They're in opposition of quick-take authority as generally speaking: they will never support any quick-take authority. There was also an issue that I had brought up yesterday when we moved the Bill to Third Reading about the farmstead split, they had concerns about that. They believe that the Illiana Expressway, when it's constructed, if it split a parcel of their land, that that would be the one split that they were allowed to have. We followed through on that and found out Will County that that's not the case. They would be able to split it a second time, if they so desire."

Bost: "All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, I... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I... I believe that people should pay very close attention to this. There is concerns from the Farm Bureau about this process. I understand we have awarded quick-take before, but each Legislator here understands what we're doing. We're giving the government the ability to come in and take property and pay the price that they choose to pay. Now, there is a calculation that goes through and there is a process that they go through, but we're talking about people who have had property that maybe their families may have even homesteaded. So, be aware of the vote. I myself will not be supporting the Bill, but I'd be glad to listen to the rest of the debate."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay."

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

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

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Kay: "Thank you. Representative, there is a Fifth Amendment right that gives everyone due process with respect to their property. How does this interfere with that?"
- DeLuca: "It doesn't. It doesn't take away any of the due process rights."
- Kay: "So, the property owner will get what he determines to be
 fair-market value as if he were to sell it at a normal
 sale?"
- DeLuca: "Well, there would be an appraise... an appraisal that would take place."
- Kay: "Well, that's not an answer..."
- DeLuca: "It's not... it's not what the landowner believes, it's the appraisal."
- Kay: "So, if he doesn't consider that appraisal to be accurate
 and true and correct and fair, what happens then?"
- DeLuca: "The landowner would be allowed to get an appraisal themself."
- Kay: "Okay. And then what happens after that?"
- DeLuca: "Once the appraisal is determined?"
- Kay: "Well, I'm... I'm trying to bring this to a close. I want to understand the due process that we are representing here with respect to a quick-take."
- DeLuca: "Yes. The landowner would have the ability to enter into court and go through the proceedings if he believes that they are due more money than the appraisal... appraise the land at. So, they would still have the ability to do that; it doesn't take that away. All this does is allow the process to move along quicker so the project isn't delayed."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Kay: "Okay. Now, the... the legal process though, is that before
 or after the taking?"

DeLuca: "After."

Kay: "So, we kind of have the landowner here by the back of the
 neck. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. Well, I appreciate your honesty about that. I'm not going to support your Bill either. I think it's a Fifth Amendment violation. I know this happens every day but there's a lot of good people who are left on the short end of the stick with respect to quick takes. So, in all do respect, I'm not going to be voting for your Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Andre Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've spent quite a bit of time doing condemnation work and to address the issue with respect to Fifth Amendment problems, I'd like to ask some question with respect to legislative intent and how the process works. Representative, is it true that when you begin a taking action, the condemning body actually files a lawsuit?"

DeLuca: "Yes."

Thapedi: "Okay. And after they file the lawsuit, that lawsuit is based upon an appraisal that they have done, correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes, that's correct."

Thapedi: "And then after the lawsuit is filed and the condemning body has obtained an appraisal, the owner is then entitled to also obtain an appraisal. Isn't that correct?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "And then after the two appraisals are obtained, one from the condemning body and one from the owner have been obtained, then the owner has the opportunity to go before a jury and the jury would make the determination as to what the fair cash market value is of the property at its highest and best use, correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes, that's correct."

Thapedi: "So, then, therefore, there really is no Fifth Amendment problem or any other constitutional problem because a jury is actually going to be the one to decide what the fair cash market value of the subject property is at its highest and best use, correct?"

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "So, then, what potential constitutional ramifications could there be if the process is speeded up somewhat by a condemning authority depositing certain money at the beginning and then giving the owner the opportunity to be heard by a jury, with respect to what the fair cash market value of the subject property is?"

DeLuca: "Well, there really isn't any and that's part of the reason why this is nothing unusual. IDOT has quick-take authority in every road project that they construct. This is nothing unusual; this is essential for IDOT to have this ability to build any roadway in our state."

Thapedi: "So, in fact what actually happens is, is that the owner actually gets some of their money upfront and if they believe that they're entitled to additional money, the jury will still decide whether or not they're entitled to more

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

money on top of what they've already received as a result of the quick-take. Is that correct?"

DeLuca: "Yes. And the quick-take could even be viewed as benem viewed as beneficial for the landowner because they do get their money upfront as opposed to a condemnation process without quick-take where it could be tied up in the courts for years."

Thapedi: "Right. So... just so we're clear, the owner is not barred from getting additional money just because they got some money upfront, correct?"

DeLuca: "That's correct."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Senger."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Senger: "A quick question. Is there a chance that the quick-take appraisal and final dollar amount could be actually more... costing the state more than if we went in individually and did... worked with each property owner? In other words, could the judge come in and actually... judge place this appraisal as being higher than what we are... what we're looking at right now if we negotiated each one?"

DeLuca: "Yes, yes."

Senger: "Okay. Isn't that a bad thing for the state or for IDOT?"

DeLuca: "Could be."

Senger: "Okay. That's my... that's my only concern because is

I've seen some of these happen before where they... actually

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the judge comes in quite a bit higher than what would have been negotiated on a one to one."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Al Riley"

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. One of the last comments that was made was very astute, basically explaining what just compensation is which any individual involved with regard to this process will be afforded. This is one of many regional development projects in the south suburbs and I don't think we should, you know, really be confused. I had said a long time ago that no matter where you're from in this Body, no matter where you are geographically, that I would always support projects in your area for development. Well, this is one of ours and I would hope that you would support this great project and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "We have three speakers remaining:

Representative Brauer, Reboletti, and Dugan and then

Representative DeLuca to close. Representative Brauer."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I'm a little confused. I heard that this is actually a better process for farmers but Farm Bureau's against it. Why is that?"

DeLuca: "I said it could be. It could be because they're not delayed. The quick-take process allows them to get their money immediately and the court proceedings could still take place thereafter if they believe that they're due more money."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Brauer: "Well, I think this is really a great project and want to see it go on. I guess I... just a little concerned about the process that we're setting up here today for that. We had some questions in committee the other day, one of which you answered a question on how long the expressway will be, but you didn't have the answer on acreage. Do you have that today?"

DeLuca: "Answer on the what?"

Brauer: "Acreage, how many acres are we talking about?"

DeLuca: "Not acreage but I know that it would be a ultimately when the final route is determined, it would be a 400 foot route for the 46 or 49 miles, whatever the exact number is."

Brauer: "But isn't... isn't the original..."

DeLuca: "But in terms of acreage, I don't have an acreage number."

Brauer: "Isn't the original width a lot wider than that so they can make adjustments as... as they go through certain locations?"

DeLuca: "Yes. Landowners within a 2 thousand foot area have received letters stating that they are in the identified study area but that's going to be narrowed down to 400 feet."

Brauer: "Have you seen any numbers that will... I'm... some farmers will want to sell, I understand that, some will not. Do you have any speculation really how many farmers will be affected by this quick-take?"

DeLuca: "Not until the final route is determined."

Brauer: "No sort of educated guess?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

DeLuca: "I don't have one."

Brauer: "Well, I... again, I think this is a really well deserved project to get funded. I'm a little concerned about the process and because of that I won't be able to support it."

DeLuca: "Our final speaker will be Representative Dugan."

Representative Lisa Dugan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dugan: "Yes, Representative, and we of course, had some conversations on this and of course, I'm certainly a strong supporter of the Illiana as it is over in the area of my district. I heard a comment made that... did I understand you correctly that you said IDOT already has the quick-take powers for roadways?"

DeLuca: "They have it on every project that they... every roadway that they construct they have IDOT authority. I'm sorry. They have quick-take authority."

Dugan: "And... and so, I'm assuming that we're saying we need to put quick-take powers in this legislation because it's not actually a road of IDOT's? I guess I'm... if they have quick-take powers I'm not sure why we're putting legislation to put in quick-take powers."

DeLuca: "Because the legislation that we ran previously, which was the public... public-private partnership, the quick-take authority language was omitted from that Bill. And that's what we're doing here today is placing it back in it."

Dugan: "And was there a reason why it was not put in the original legislation?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

DeLuca: "I have no been able to get an answer to that very question."

Dugan: "And so, again, Representative, you know that I support this project very much and was with all the colleagues that were on the original legislation: however, the eminent domain powers that we have in this state that IDOT has I believe is a fair way for landowners to make sure that they have a voice. I understand that... that we would take the land and then certainly the property owner has a right to go to court and say if they didn't get a... what they believe was a fair price for their land. Would... would the homeowner have to pay the court cost in order to fight whatever it is that IDOT believed was a fair cost for their land?"

DeLuca: "Yes. They would be responsible for their court costs."

Dugan: "So, an eminent..."

DeLuca: "And other fees."

Dugan: "...domain, where they have a chance... where the parties go to court, the state takes the property owner to court and they then make a decision what a fair price is and it's decided by the court, in this case, we would just tell them what they would get and then if they wanted to fight us, they would have to pay for the court costs in order to fight us, and that's a concern to me. I understand what you're trying to do. I also want the property... the project to move as quickly as possible, but as I spoke to you, Representative, I believe the eminent domain powers that the state has is sufficient to... to deal fairly with the people and I believe it can move just as quickly if the

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

state is being fair with their values that they're planning on giving the property owner. So, for that reason, I will be voting 'no' on this... on this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Beiser and then DeLuca to close."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill was before my committee and when the previous speaker asked the reason that that language is omitted, there was testimony to that effect that it was too heavy of a lift for that Bill to pass with that language in it. I just want to make sure everybody hears that because it is a matter of record what was testified in it and to say otherwise I think would be not proper."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The concerns that have been expressed, I understand; I have concerns as well. I did have concerns about the whole concept of quick-take that is why I have been working very closely with IDOT. I have been working very closely with the Farm Bureau. As many of you know, it's difficult to find a stronger supporter than I on the Farm Bureau issues; and that's part of the reason why I wanted this issue and continue to move forward with it is because I want to make sure that we hold IDOT accountable to the commitments that they have made to those residents, that they have made to the Farm Bureau about treating them fairly, having the least amount of impact on residents as possible as the final route is determined. A quick-take is one of those necessary evils. It's difficult to say that, you know a

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

quick-take is a great thing and we like government or IDOT having the authority and the ability to do that, but a vote of 'no' on this is essentially a 'no' vote on the Illiana Expressway and could potentially kill the project. So, as difficult as it is and then the concerns that you may have, join me... join me in working with IDOT and the Farm Bureau to make sure that this process goes as smoothly as it possibly can. And I ask for your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative DeLuca moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3318. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sullivan, Yarbrough. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 61 Members voting 'yes', 57... 57 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is now time to present the Fallen Service Members Ceremony. So, I'll ask all Members to please be at their desks, staff please retire to the rear of the chamber or leave the floor temporarily. All Members please be at their Assistant Doorkeeper Padget, are we ready to proceed? Okay. This is my eight and final chance to preside at this wonderful ceremony where we respect our fallen members of the Armed Forces. And I know all of us in our heart of hearts hope there is a day coming down the road when we have no names to read but until then I would ask the Members and guests in the gallery to please stand for the Presentation of Colors by the 114th Illinois Volunteer

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Infantry, Reactivated. Mr. Clerk, read Resolution... House Resolution 1071."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1071.

WHEREAS, In accordance with the established tradition of the Illinois House of Representatives, it is fitting that, in observance of Memorial Day, we honor our brothers and sisters who have given their lives in service to our country as the guardians of our long-held freedoms; and

WHEREAS, No better words have been written to honor those brave souls who were sacrificed long ago or pay tribute to the those brave men and women of today who have continued that fight for freedom than the Gettysburg Address; let us recite those words so humbly said by our President, Abraham Lincoln: "Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who have gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But, in the larger sense, we cannot dedicate - we cannot consecrate - we cannot hallow - this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us - that from those honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion - that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain - that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom - and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."; and

WHEREAS, Those words from long ago still speak to those brave men and women of today who we now honor; it is all together fitting and appropriate that we, with heavy hearts, again accept the honor of reading the Roll Call of those American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from the State of Illinois who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the preceding year since the previous tribute; therefore, be it RESOLVED, OF REPRESENTATIVES BYTHE HOUSE OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that a copy of this resolution and a copy of the ceremonial honor roll and program of the May 23, 2012 reading of names be presented to the families of these fallen heroes."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the adoption of House Resolution 1071. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 1071 is unanimously adopted. Major General Dennis Celletti. All Members and guests are asked to please

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

remain standing for the reading of the names of our fallen heroes. Leader Renee Kosel."

Kosel: "Private First Class Michael C. Olivieri, United States Army, Chicago, killed in action June 6, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Tim Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Private First Class Timothy 'T.J.' Hansley, United States Army, Elgin, died June 21, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley."

Bradley: "Sergeant Benjamin 'Ben' Thomas, United States Army,
Marion, died June 23, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Norine Hammond."

Hammond: "Staff Sergeant Tyler M. Martin, United States Army, Colchester, died July 12, 2011."

Speaker Lyon: "General Wayne Rosenthal."

Rosenthal: "Sergeant Christopher R. West, United States Army, Virden, died July 17, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Watson."

Watson: "Sergeant Andrew R. Tobin, United States Army, Jacksonville, killed in action August 24, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Reis."

Reis: "Sergeant Timothy Sayne, United States Army, Effingham, killed in action September 18, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Don Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Major Jeffrey Bland, United States Marines, Galesburg, died September 19, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Frank Mautino."

Mautino: "Captain Thomas Heitmann, United States Marines, Mendota, Illinois, died September 19, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rich Morthland."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Morthland: "Private First Class Chad P. Dellit, United States Army, Fulton, died September 21, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "Specialist Michael Vukovich, United States Army, Crystal Lake, Illinois, died September 30, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Unes."

Unes: "Lance Corporal Jordan S. Bastean, United States Marines, Pekin, killed in action October 23, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader JoAnn Osmond."

Osmond: "Sergeant First Class David G. Robinson, United States Army, Winthrop Harbor, died October 25, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Lance Corporal Nickolas A. Daniels, United States Marines, Elmwood Park, Illinois, killed in action November 5, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rich Morthland."

Morthland: "Private First Class Adam E. Dobereiner, United States Army, Moline, killed in action November 18, 2011."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay Hatcher."

Hatcher: "Specialist Christopher A. Patterson, United States Army, North Aurora, killed in action January 6, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "Captain Nathan R. McHone, United States Marines, Crystal Lake, Illinois, died January 19, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brandon Phelps."

Phelps: "Captain Joshua C. Pairsh, United States Marines, Equality, Illinois, died January 22, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cunningham."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Cunningham: "Corporal Conner T. Lowry, United States Marines, Chicago, killed in action March 1, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Farnham."

Farnham: "Corporal Alex Martinez, United States Marines, Elgin, killed in action April 5, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Sergeant Dean R. Shaffer, United States Army, Pekin, died April 19, 2012."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Been a trying Session, but these are the times I think when you're proud to be a Member of this Body when we take the time to do this. And Joe, I appreciate just... just the way that you handle it in the sincerity. And I also... it's a tradition that started with our former colleague Representative Ron Stephens who's up in the gallery and I just want to say I appreciate what you've started. Thank you, Members."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the words of Representative Watson and you, as well, Mr. Speaker. Just carrying it a step further, if I may. Retired Representative Stephens himself, badly wounded in Vietnam, continues his mission now that he's retired from the House being extremely involved in the Wounded Warrior's Project in raising money for those who we don't have on our wall but who come home with very, very severe wounds and injuries. And he is to be commended for that; he would not want me saying that, but, his efforts are ongoing in

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

raising any and all moneys he can for those so severely wounded. It's extremely meritorious that not only was he responsible for getting this amazing ceremony started and keeping it moving but the work he's doing today for the Wounded Warriors Project. So, thank you, Ron Stephens."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, that concludes our ceremony. We'll take a moment and think of the families of all those beautiful faces that we saw here: somebody's son, somebody's dad, somebody's relative. So, let's take a final moment. May they rest in peace. May God hold them all in the palm of His hand. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Chair would like to take this opportunity to give a welcome to one of our former Members who we never had a chance to formally say hello or goodbye to, Ron Stephens in the gallery. Ron, welcome home. Representative Dan Brady on a Resolution on a... on a death memorial."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd ask if the Clerk could read the Death Resolution and ask for the Body to stand and afford the same attention that they did for the great tribute of the memorial service to our fallen soldiers."

Speaker Lyons: "House Resolution 983, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 983, offered by Representative Brady.

WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are saddened to learn of the death of former Illinois State University President Lloyd Watkins, who passed away on March 1, 2012; he served as the University's 13th president from 1977 to 1988; and

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- WHEREAS, Lloyd Watkins was not only a leader at Illinois State University; he looked beyond the campus and was a leader who made a difference in his community; during his presidency, the University became the State headquarters of the Illinois Special Olympics, attracting thousands of visitors to campus each summer; and
- WHEREAS, He served on numerous community and university boards, including Normal's 2015 Committee, and helped small businesses as a member of the Service Corps of Retired Executives; and
- WHEREAS, He focused on expanding international education programs by creating exchanges with student centers in Austria, France, England, Japan, China, Scotland, Germany, Italy, and Spain; and
- WHEREAS, He tirelessly advocated for Illinois State University, worked to overcome a budget crisis in the early 1980s by launching a long-range planning effort, and put great emphasis on obtaining grants and donations from the private sector, a move his successors have continued to build upon; and
- WHEREAS, During his tenure, he presided over numerous capital improvement projects on campus including the multimillion-dollar Redbird Arena; he launched 5 new academic programs, including international business, public relations, writing, applied computer sciences, and school psychology, and also expanded the Honors program; and
- WHEREAS, After serving 11 years as President of Illinois State University, he retired in 1988; he continued to benefit the University community by sharing his passion for

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

learning by teaching in the Communications Department until 1991; and

WHEREAS, He was preceded in death by his parents, Herman and Lydia; and his first wife, Mary Ellen (Caudle) Watkins; and WHEREAS, Lloyd Watkins is survived by his wife, Kay; his sons, John L. Watkins (Margaret), Joseph W. Watkins (Michelle), and Robert L. Watkins (Charmelle); grandchildren, Ryan, Reid, and Mariana Watkins and Lucas, and Emma Watkins; his step-children, Eric D. Bloomquist, Darin L. Bloomquist, and Ellen K. Elliot; and his step-granddaughter, Faith A. Elliot; therefore, be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn, along with his family, friends, and former students, the passing of Lloyd Watkins; and be it further RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented

to the family of Lloyd Watkins as a symbol of our sincere sympathy."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you as well for your attention. Our community lost a true leader, not only in the twin cities but across the state as been attested to by the Resolution. President Watkins clearly made the university and the community better from his service and by his presence. We're also joined here today in the Speaker's Gallery, his wife Kay and son, Bob that were able to be here for the Resolution. And I would simply ask the Body if they would join me in bestowing upon Mrs. Watkins and her son, Bob, a

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

nice round of applause for the dedicated service of his father and her husband. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'd simply ask the Clerk if all Members could be added to the Death Resolution."

Speaker Lyons: "So ordered and we'll take one moment of silence. Representative Brady now moves for the adoption of House Resolution 983. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 983 is unanimously adopted. Lloyd Watkins, rest in peace. Back to the Order of Third Readings, on page 6 of the Calendar, Leader Dan Burke, you have Senate Bill 2526, Dan, 2526. I'll be running down page 6 of the Calendar on Senate Bills-Third Readings, Members, so if you do have something there, we'll try to get to you. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2526, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan... Dan Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2526 would simply require regulated gas and electric utilities with at least 10 thousand... 100 thousand customers to submit to the Illinois Commerce Commission an annual report on the utilities procurement goals and actual spending for minority-owned, women-owned, veteran-owned, and small business enterprises. Both the procurement goals and the actual spending will be reported as a percentage of the total work performed by the utility. These reports would be posted on the ICC's website and each

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

annual report will be maintained for at least five years. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 2526. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 2526 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Smith, Turner, Dave Winters, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Elaine Nekritz, on page 6 of the Calendar, Elaine, you have Senate Bill 3287. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3287, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Elaine Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3287 creates the Illinois Service Member's Civil Relief Act which is rather timely on the heels of the memorial service we just had. The Federal Law protects service members called up by the president from having their utilities shut off. It offers an ability for them to end their cell phone service if they so like, and it also prevents foreclosure actions and having a rental... a home rental terminated and a myriad of other protections while they're on active duty, but there's some gaps in that. While Illinois Law has a number of these

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

provis... protections scattered throughout the code for active duty members called up by the Governor, we wanted to put those all in one place and add a few more protections. These are very important protections for the men and women of the State of Illinois who are serving overseas or called up in the event of a disaster. There have been a report of cases, one in early 2011 under the Federal Service Member Civil Relief Act where over 4 thousand refunds were issued to service members who were overcharged for mortgages or against whom foreclosure proceedings were commenced improperly. We need to make sure this kind of thing doesn't happen to our Illinois' service members. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Leader Mike Bost."

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

Bost: "Representative, and I... I'm in support of the Bill; I'm just wanting to clarify a few... a few things. Did... when the Amendment, the last Amendment was put on, was that... did that become the Bill or what was the changes that were brought forth by the last Amendment?"

Nekritz: "The... the very last Amendment just simply added some requirements for those that are serviced by a... an electric co-op to make sure that they had provided the same documentation to the co-op as was required to be given to another utility before... in order to demonstrate that they were actually called up."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Bost: "So... so, it is a change to the... that we're doing here in the House and it has to go back over to them?"

Nekritz: "Oh... the... Amendment #1 was... Committee Amendment #1 was a complete gut and replace...

Bost: "Okay. Okay."

Nekritz: "...and then Amendment #2 was a Floor Amendment. So, yes, it will need to go back to the Senate."

Bost: "Okay. And... and exactly, and I know, you know, we deal with cell phones in here, we deal with utilities, how long after they return does this hold on... do these... can they be basically free from... from being turned off and or foreclosed on or..."

Nekritz: "It varies throughout the Bill. I would say for the most part it's 30 days but there some that are 90 days but it really..."

Bost: "Okay. It's not..."

Nekritz: "...it's very specific to every kind of protection that's in the Bill."

Bost: "It's not like... it's not like... you know, years or anything like that?"

Nekritz: "No, no, no. It's a matter of... it's a... it's only a matter of a few months."

Bost: "It gives them plenty of time to get their affairs in order once they get home."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Bost: "Okay."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Bost: "Thank you."

Nekritz: "Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Nekritz moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3287. 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 Smith, Sullivan, Tryon. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Zalewski on Senate Bill 3314. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3314, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mike Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3314, we did this Bill last year and couldn't quite close the deal in the Senate, so we brought it back this year. What it simply does is ensure that on ballot language dealing with the referendum that the multiplier's included on the ballot language to ensure that the voter knows exactly what they're voting on when it comes to a property tax levy increase. Again, this is a transparency measure designed to educate the voters more clearly than what's been done in the past. We had an issue in the Riverside Brookfield School Board referendum last year. This Bill clarifies that and makes it abundantly clear what the legislative intent is here. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

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

I thought we had already passed a Bill like this a few years ago, Representative Tryon and I."

Zalewski: "We... we tried, Rep... I... I don't know about Representative Tryon, Representative. I tried to do a Bill like this last year and it didn't get... make it out of the Senate but again, whatever the current language states there's a belief, and it's incorrect, but there's a belief that... that the local doesn't... isn't compelled to put on equalization factor on the ballot language. There's been litigation and we just want to be perfectly clear of what we're trying to do."

Franks: "I believe that Representative Tryon and myself had passed a Bill a few years ago when there was... whenever there'd be a referendum that you would have to say how much it would cost a homeowner in \$100 thousand increments. And I'm not sure how this is different than that."

Zalewski: "This... this includes the... the multiplier, the three point... the assessed values, it has a multiplier in it. So, again, there was an issue where that multiplier wasn't included in the language and voters were under a mistaken impression about what they were voting for and what the referendum result would do to their property tax bill. This makes it abundantly clear what would happen if they were to approve the levy."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Franks: "Okay."

Zalewski: "I agree, Representative, I acknowledge that we, you know... we thought we covered this a couple years ago but again, in Riv... in my district we have an issue where the ballot language was not clear and there was confusion and rightfully so. So, we're trying to address that."

Franks: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, it never goes down even though property values the last couple years have gone down and sales of homes were difficult so how does this impact that presumption that it's probably going to go down and what I assume looking at this, and you... and I maybe wrong so you should correct me if I am, that this means that the first bill you get will be increased instead of being based upon the previous year..."

Zalewski: "Well, what this does..."

Mulligan: "...and the anticipation that it's going to go up?"

Zalewski: "Well, what this does is include the equalization factor, Representative. So, most times that's one, but it... it can vary in Cook. So, what we're doing is we're making it abundantly clear that when that varies, that equalizer, we have to include that on the ballot so people understand that it's not \$100 thousand... say, on a value of \$100 thousand home, it's not just multiplied by one. It could... that... that equalization factor could vary, fluctuate."

Mulligan: "Is this only apply to homes and not business?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Zalewski: "Well, it applies to… we're amending PTELL,

Representative, so my guess… my belief is yes."

Mulligan: "Because..."

Zalewski: "But I... I'm not entirely sure about that. I'll... I can..."

Mulligan: "Well, property tax... the work in property tax is a very lucrative business for lawyers particularly in Cook County regarding business and they make quite a bit of money on it. Also, there are lawyers that try to come into the area and talk to or particularly in seniors in our area tell them that they can save them a lot of money on their property tax when this comes out. So, I'm just trying to figure out what your Bill is going to show. Is it going to show a decrease if there's a decrease in value or is it just going to automatically show what was from the year before as the first installment?"

Zalewski: "Rep... Rep... let's be clear, Representative. This... this Bill will only come into effect, if under PTELL you go to a referendum that you want to go above CPI or whatever the 5 percent is late... later or the two... the least of the two. So, we're not talking about a yearly instance here, you know, we shouldn't be at least. We're talking about instances when the board goes to the voters and says, we need... we need more than what the... what PTELL allows. And in that instance, you go... you to the voters with a ballot, we as the previous speaker from McHenry stated that we've done... we thought we completed the Bill where... which listed all the information but it was... there was some lack of clarity."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Mulligan: "So, will this allow you to go to referendum? Do you have to have the whole county or do... can you do a township?

How would you..."

Zalewski: "Under PTELL? You're asking me if under PTELL when you go to a referendum."

Mulligan: "Right. You're saying that this Bill would allow you to go to referendum..."

Zalewski: "No, no, no."

Mulligan: "That's what you told me."

Zalewski: "This Bill... this Bill does not allow you to go to referendum. This Bill clarifies the language that's placed on the ballot should a local taxing body choose to go to referendum."

Mulligan: "Do you... are you a lawyer?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

Mulligan: "Do you work for a firm that does this kind of work?"

Zalewski: "No, Ma'am."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ed Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is simply a transparency Bill only. It does not affect taxes, it does not affect what you pay or do not pay, whether taxes go up or down. What it tells you is straightforward; we want you to know, with your assessed value and now with this Bill including the equalization factor, what you would pay if you had to vote on a referendum. What has been happening is, they've been saying what the assessed value calculated by the new tax rate, what you would pay, but they've been leaving off the

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

equalization factor. By doing that, it under reports how much you would pay if you voted for this referendum. So, this Bill simply gives you the most up-to-date, current, however you want to say it, value on what you would pay if you choose to vote for this referendum. That's all this does. It's a transparency Bill; it's a very, very good Bill. Please vote for it."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Tryon."

Tryon: "So, I rise to ask the Sponsor a question, if he would yield."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman awaits your question."

Tryon: "Representative Zalewski, actually, what... what we're doing here is... it's the way that the proposition reads now when voters go into the ballot box. Essentially, it just says what you're going to pay per \$100 thousand of assessed valuation."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Tryon: "So, what you're saying is because the equalization changed, you can't really get a true picture and it has no impact on... on commercial because commercial and businesses aren't voters and this is to be able to explain the proposition to voters and how it impacts their personal property or their home."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Tryon: "Is that correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Tryon: "So, I believe the intent of this Bill is to clarify what we wanted to do all along so somebody could easily go

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

into the ballot box and say this is going to cost me \$1000, \$300, \$100, \$50..."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Tryon: "...and know what the impact of what they're voting on was going to do to them and their families. Is that not correct?"

Zalewski: "Correct, Representative."

Tryon: "I think you have a great Bill and I would urge everybody to support this. Thank you."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lyons: "He awaits your questions."

Harris, D.: "I'll... Representative, I'll be brief because the previous speakers really did do a good job of explaining it, but just real quickly... and we had a full discussion in committee. What was the equalization factor in Cook County last year? Do you remember?"

Zalewski: "I... I don't know, Representative."

Harris, D.: "I think it was around 3 or 3.1 if I'm not mistaken."

Zalewski: "Okay. I'll take your word for it, Representative."

Harris, D.: "Meaning... meaning that the assessed valuation, get the assessed valuation, but then guess what, the state comes in and says here's your equalization factor so it jacks it up..."

Zalewski: "Goes up."

Harris, D.: "...by three, right?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Zalewski: "Right."

Harris, D.: "But, the taxing body when they say, well, it's only going to cost you, if we go to referendum, it's only going to cost you \$30 per hundred or per thousand, or \$20 per thousand. They may not include that equalization factor, right?"

Zalewski: "Correct. They didn't in this specific instance."

Harris, D.: "Right. So, they... that... so, what it cost you per thousand could be, in Cook County, two or three times higher than what the taxing bottom... body might say, right?"

Zalewski: "Correct, correct, Representative."

Harris, D.: "So, what you're doing is saying, lets be honest with the taxpayers and tell them what it's really going to cost if we go to referendum."

Zalewski: "Correct. We're making it abundantly clear what we're doing here."

Harris, D.: "What a great idea."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Harris, D.: "Let's send it out of here with 100 votes."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "Couldn't have said it better myself, Representative.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3314. 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 Turner, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Deb Mell, on the bottom of page 6, Deb, you have Senate Bill 3337. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3337, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Deb Bel...
 Mell."
- Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3337 repeals a provision requiring the Department of Children and Family Services to monitor and evaluate a two-year family support center demonstration project and to submit a status report to the General Assembly. This is... this is basically just a cleanup Bill as a result of an audit. Thank you very much for your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 3337. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its passage signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Monique Davis, Rosemary Mulligan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chris Nybo, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3336. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3336, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

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

Nybo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that deals with the rapid growth of inline skating. It's a Bill that actually promotes safety for those who inline skate in two regards. First of all, inline skaters are not prohibited from skating on roadways when there is no available, but they're required to skate against traffic. This Bill will allow them to skate with traffic on streets outside of the City of Chicago for skaters that are above the age of 18 and on roads where speed limits are 45 miles or less. That's consistent with the recommendation of the International Inline Skating Association which strongly opposes requirements that force inline skaters to skate against traffic. The second change to this law, Mr. Speaker, I think you have to keep in mind inline skaters can go up at speeds of up to 20 miles per hour. When there is a sidewalk available, they're required to skate on the sidewalk. This Bill will now give them the option to skate on the street when there is a sidewalk available. So, they'll no longer be required to be on the sidewalk and again, that's consistent with what the International Inline Skating Association advocates. You could imagine, there could be very... a big safety risks when you have people at those very high speeds being forced to be on sidewalks. I would ask for support... a supporting vote on this one and I'm open for any questions that the Members may have."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the passage of Senate Bill 3336 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? Jack Franks, Rosemary Mulligan, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 101 Members voting 'yes', 16 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to be doing some Second Readings now on page 10 of the Calendar. If you have a Bill on page 10 or 11, we'll be starting. We certainly will be skipping around a little bit for reasons that most of you know, but we will start with Senate Bill 281. Representative Michelle Mussman, is she on the floor? Representative Mike Unes. Representative Mike Unes, you have Senate 548. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 548, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. 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. Representative Carol Sente, you have Senate Bill 555. Representative Carol Sente, you have Senate Bill 555. Would you like to move that Bill? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 555, 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."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Dan Burke, on the Order of Second Readings, Dan, on page 10 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 968. Want to move that Bill to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 968, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Greg Harris, on page 10 of the Calendar, on the bottom, you have Senate Bill 1351. Out of the record. Continuing Members on page 11 of the Calendar, Representative Sullivan, you have Senate Bill 1900. Representative Sullivan, Senate Bill 1900 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1900, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Sullivan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sullivan on Floor Amendment #2."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor Amendment #2 mirrors language on House Bill 408 whereby assessors in Lake County would have to turn their books in at a specified date of July 15, which is a change from October 15. Most of the state currently turns in their work... assessors turn in their work by June 15; we're just trying to be more in line with the rest of the state. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Golar, Esther, you have on the Order of Second Readings, Senate Bill 1531. Out of the record. Representative Jackson, Ed you have Senate Bill 2761 on the Order of Second Reading. You want to move that Bill to Third? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Jackson, the Clerk has informed me there are still notes pending on that Bill, there are notes pending on that Bill. So, we'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Dave Winters, Senate Bill 2867 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2867, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Winters, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters on Floor Amendment #2."

Winters: "Thank you. Floor Amendment #2 basically allows the USEPA... they are scheduled to issue a general NPDES Permit by this January 1 for surface discharging private sewage disposal systems. In case they do not get that done, Amendment 2 would allow up to six months after the date of that issuance. I would urge its adoption."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing with Hou... Senate Bills-Second Readings, on page 13 of the Calendar, on the top of that list, Representative Linda Chapa LaVia, you have Senate Bill 3259. Representative Chapa LaVia, Senate Bills-Second Reading, 3259. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3259, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Kelly Cassidy, you have Senate Bill 3261, Kelly. Out of the record. Representative Thaddeus Jones, on the Order of Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 3277. What's the… Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3277, 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 Lyons: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- taken on May 23, 2012: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 4204, Floor Amendment #4 for House Bill 4239, Floor Amendment #2 for House Bill 4277, and Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 180."
- Speaker Lyons: "Continuing with Second Readings of Senate Bills, Representative Jackson, you have Senate Bill 3373, Ed. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3373, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Jackson, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jackson, is it our understanding that you wish to withdraw Floor Amendment #2?"
- Jackson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Floor Amendment #2. Is there anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Ken Dunkin, Representative Dunkin, on the Order of Second Readings, you have Senate Bill 3397. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3397, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Cassidy, do you wish to move Senate Bill 3433? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3433, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Continuing with Senate Bills-Second Readings, on page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Mike Tryon, you have Senate Bill 3442. Mike, do you want to... out of the record. Mr. Clerk, what's the status on Senate Bill 3442? Put it back on the record."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3442, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Tryon, has been approved for consideration."

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

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 was our commitment to work with opposition to the Bill that would establish a statewide plastic bag and film recycling act. We added in this Amendment the ability for communities to have programs that were working with the manufacturers to reduce the amount of bags and film products that end up in our landfills. We took away some of the fining mechanisms and put in warning systems before fines were to happen and tried to address the concerns that the environmental community had about the percentage of... of recycled bags that would be taken out of the landfill stream. And we think we did as good as we could possibly do. I think this Amendment recog... represents

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

a good faith and a very reasonable approach to amending this Bill to overcome some of the objections."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Floor Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Al Riley."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Tryon, first of all, thank you for Amendment #1 because I do think it, you know, clarified a few things that maybe got people in agreement on some issues, but can you tell me some... I mean, there's still a lot of opposition. So, who has basically joined the brotherhood of proponents for this Bill?"

Tryon: "Mu..."

Riley: "Since before..."

Tryon: "...much of this, Representative Riley, could... we could discuss on Third Reading. I'm not really going to call the Bill today for a vote, but actually I have been surprised since I've received the sponsorship of this Bill that we had this kind of opposition, especially from the environmental community because this establishes a statewide recycling program that will provide Illinoisans all over the state, the ability to take back film products, not just store t-shirt bags that we all get when we go to the store but dry cleaning bags, shrink wrap for toilet paper and pop, and a variety of different types of plastics that are going into our landfill that no state has solutions for. And what the opposition is opposed to isn't on environmental issues, it's on governance issues because,

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

in order for this program to work, we have to have a program that preempts Home Rule. So, the opposition is mostly coming from environmental groups that are opposed to the restrictions placed on some of the communities. We have six communities that would like to have programs that either tax or potentially ban. And the show stopper for the industry is you can't ban and they need the waste product to enter into the recycling stream to make a statewide recycling program work. Plastic bags are only 15 percent of the film product, so this is going to get to the other 85. So, we've done, I think, a great job at making this work for all of Illinois."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "I would like to remind this is just adopting the Amendment, we're adopting Amendment #1. We will put it on full debate when it's on Third Reading. Leader Lang, you have a question on the Amendment? The Gentleman does not seek recognition. So, we will bring this back on Third Reading and have full discussion. So, 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. Representative Zalewski on Senate Bill 3514, Mike. Out of the record. Representative Connie Howard, on page 15 of the Calendar, Connie, you've got Senate Bill 3823 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3823, a Bill for an Act concerning child visitation, which may be referred to as the Stephen Watkins Memorial Act. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments have been adopted. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Elaine Nekritz, going back on Senate Bills-Second Readings, Elaine, you have Senate Bill 3216. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3216, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on page 11 of the Calendar on Senate Bills-Second Readings, Barb, you have Senate Bill 2194. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2194, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, we'll leave that Bill on the Order of Second Reading on the request of the Sponsor. Members, we're going to start doing additional Third Reading-Senate Bills. So, we'll be starting on page 7 of the Calendar. So, if you have your Calendar ready please follow, we'll being doing most of the Bills on this... on this page. On the top of page 7, Representative du Buclet, Senate Bill 3349. Out of the record. Representative Sandy Pihos on Senate Bill 3367. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3367, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Sandy Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3367 focuses on improving transparency and accountability related to driver's education and safety. The Secretary of State in conjunction with the Illinois State Board of Education will develop course content topics for driver's education instruction. It provides for car inspections for cars that are five years old or have more than 75 thousand miles on them, and has provisions for requirements for public schools that wish to contract out with private driving schools to teach driver's ed. It also addresses posting requirements for schools that want to charge above the \$250 permitted for driver's education and I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Monique Davis. Whenever you're ready Monique the floor is yours. Monique."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was talking to the little Bradley children here. Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the Sponsor of the Bill. Is this a mandate?"
- Pihos: "The parts that would be ab... it applies for a waiver if you want to charge above \$250 which is the amount we've authorized by law for a school district to charge, so that part of it is a mandate. The car inspections would be a change strongly supported by CPS who have the oldest cars.

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

That part of it would be a mandate, yes. And the posting requirement would be new to post on your website 14 days before."

Davis, M.: "So, that would be a mandate that they post..."

Pihos: "Only if you want a waiver. Only if you want a waiver for driver's education to charge more than \$250."

Davis, M: "Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos... Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. It's been worked on very, very hard by Representative Pihos and in the Senate. It's one that's going to assist school districts, if they have problems in special... in driver's education. They will be able to farm this out, do it privately. Some of the privates did not understand the Bill, but it is in their own best interest. And I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos to close."

Pihos: "Yes. This Bill is the result of a very long process involving many conversations with representatives from all the stakeholder groups examining how to deliver the best quality driver's education to our teens. So, I would ask for your support on good public policy on behalf of the safety of teen drivers."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pihos moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3367. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, May, Tryon, like to be

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 76 Members voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jerry Mitchell, you have Senate Bill 3374 on page 7 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3374, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an excellent Bill. This is a commission to redo the physical education guidelines according to the new state goals. If something is needed for phys ed, hopefully, when this is all done, we will make a whole lot more sense out of physical education and have it in all of our schools. I recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Leader Mike Bost."

Bost: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Just... just one question. Is this your last Bill?"

Mitchell, J.: "It very well could be."

Bost: "I... I really hate to hear that."

Speaker Lyons: "Jerry to close."

Mitchell, J.: "Just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman asks for the passage of Senate Bill 3374. 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, Will Davis, David Leitch. David, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sid Mathias, you have, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Readings, Senate Bill 3386. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3386, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sid Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3386 is an initiative of the Cook County Board of Review. It makes some technical changes to the statute. They want to be able to do more things online and so what the Bill basically does it allows the Cook County Board of Review the option of providing electronic notices rather than mailed notices and it also helps the taxpayers by allowing them to file assessment complaints electronically, which certainly is a plus for the taxpayer. And also, if a taxpayer is represented by an attorney, the notices can be e-mailed as well as mailed to the attorney. So, I think it's a good Bill brings them closer to doing things without as much paper. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is the Cook County Board of Review ready to implement this program, if we were to pass this? Is this... is there an implementation date in place?"

Mathias: "I... I think they indicated and I... I did receive a letter from one of their commissioners basically saying they already... they're... they already introduced a online filing system for appeals and it's been very successful. And so, they already are doing things and they want to basically try... their goal is to completely convert the office to a paperless system. So, it sounds to me like they've made progress in that and that they will be able to do this."

Reboletti: "Have... have they indicated to you what the amount of savings it is they may see based on the fact that they could reduce their postage and paper costs?"

Mathias: "They did not give me an amount, but I can imagine, you know, it's not just in paper but it's also in time and..."

Reboletti: "Personnel."

Mathias: "...yeah... and personnel to be able to go through a computer and do this rather than having lots of paperwork on their desk."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Durkin: "Representative, will the taxpayer be given the option of choosing between whether going paperless through electronic means or they can continue to take a notice by mail?"

Mathias: "I know there... it indicated that it was... they have the option. I'm not so sure..."

Durkin: "They meaning the Board of Review?"

Mathias: "No, the Board of Review has to be ready so I imagine it's at they're option to allow... in other words, I don't think at this point their requiring everyone to do it but it... it just allows the taxpayers to do it."

Durkin: "But they..."

Mathias: "So, they will have the option for being allowed..."

Durkin: "It would be an opt in for the taxpayer, correct? If they..."

Mathias: "Once they get the system..."

Durkin: "All right."

Mathias: "...going."

Durkin: "No, I just want to make sure that we're not going to everything now is going to be online. I mean, as much as people who like to be electronically in touch with the times, they quite aren't. So, I just want to make sure that that's clear that taxpayers still has the option of not having the electronic notifications. They can still have the mail, correct?"

Mathias: "I do not see anything in here that would prohibit that, but I would need to look at that. I don't... I don't see anything that prohibits it."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Durkin: "Well, I think if somebody could just bring up at the Board of Review. I'm going to support your Bill, but I think we just need... I think it should be... the option. Should be left to the taxpayer to choose which method of notification they wish to receive the information."

Mathias: "Thank you."

Durkin: "Okay."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jack Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Franks: "Has House Committee Amendment #1 been adopted?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Two Amendments have been adopted to Senate Bill 3386. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee and Floor Amendment #2 has been adopted."

Franks: "Thank you. Then I'd like to ask the Sponsor some questions."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor awaits your questions."

Franks: "Representative, on House Amendment #1, according to our analysis, it deleted the provision that would allow the Cook County Board of Review to dispose of complaints four years after the filing date opposed to the current five years, correct?"

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

Franks: "So, what does that mean? I'm not sure I understand what the difference is in the date."

Mathias: "I... I... it's just... the difference is a year."

Franks: "Yes, but I don't know which way and I don't know if it's... and I don't know if it's a shorter statute of

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

limitations or what that actually means. I'm not trying to trip you up, but I'm..."

Mathias: "No, no, I understand."

Franks: "Perhaps we could take it out of the record and come back to it in a minute, but I just... I'm not sure what it means, Representative."

Mathias: "Just one… yes… Yes, I believe… thank you. I believe current law is five years and so we're… I believe we're allow… originally, they wanted to reduce it I believe to four years, but the Amendment actually I believe puts it back to… to five years which is the current law."

Franks: "I'm not sure the Amendment does that because the Amendment it looks like... oh I'm sorry. The original Bill was four years and this puts it back to five. Okay. So, this is an extra year for..."

Mathias: "Well, it's not extra; it's the same as current law."

Franks: "It's the same. Is this something that the Board of Review wanted? Is this something to deal with their cycle?"

Mathias: "Well, if... yes, I think some of the commissioners wanted it because of their three-year cycling, or four... I think it's three or four-year, four-year now cycle. They... that's why they wanted it; it would just continue to add more paperwork. But hopefully if now they can do it online there'll be less paperwork."

Franks: "Yes. Well, I... I just want to make sure that we're not extending the time because some of the complaints we hear down here it just takes so long. I mean, obviously, we cut their budget 50 percent and it's a big problem that we had foisted on them, but by the same token, we've had other

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

issues as a result because of the delay in getting the answer from the Board of Review that if there has to be a refund or something then it makes it very difficult. So, I just want to make sure that the taxpayers are not being adversely affected by maintaining a five-year cycle."

Mathias: "No. Right now that is the current law."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias to close."

Mathias: "I think it's a good Bill. It... it'll certainly help with paperwork, help with storage for them because of the... more things will be online and I think it has... it helps the taxpayer who will be able to file online and be able to probably check more things online once the system is up and running. So, I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3386. 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 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lou Lang, you have Senate Bill 3399. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3399, a Bill for an Act concerning beer wholesalers. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is an initiative of the beer distributors who seek to

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

deal with some unfair cancellations of contracts. And all the Bill does is lower the threshold of... that would require arbitration without cause from 15 percent of the distributor's volume to 10 percent of the distributor's gross receipts. And I know of no opposition to the Bill as drafted."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3399 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chapin Rose, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Readings, Chapin, you have Senate Bill 3406. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3406, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Chapin Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is now agreed to by all parties or those parties are neutral. We have made Amendments requested by the City of Chicago that addresses their concerns. Basically, the Bill would require that when a Code violation is reported that the notice of violation provide the specific Code statute... Code and/or statute number and citation. So, they can't just say here's your building Code violation and then your fine is \$50 or

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

whatever it is without telling you exactly what the specific Code violation number was so you can go back and figure out what you need to do to correct the violation."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what used to happen to those citations then if the person who was being served with the summons of the violation had no idea what they were being charged with or what the allegation was?"

Rose: "Quite frankly, that's the genesis of the Bill, Representative. It can be... sometimes can be very confusing to landlords. They get a ticket notice in the mail that, you know, says here... here's your fine and they don't what they did wrong and so that's why we're doing this. Now, I suspect that nine times out of ten... that nine times out of ten most of our municipalities are very compliant and they're... want the Code to be corrected, but there have been a number of instances, particularly in our more urban areas, where, Representative Reboletti, my former seatmate, Reboletti, that people are kind of baffled because they get a violation notice and no one will tell them what it's for."

Reboletti: "Well, I would suspect and I would hope that a hearing officer would... would have dismissed that, but I have to take a phone call from you now, Representative

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Rose. And one last question. Does this Bill have anything to do with PCBs or an aquifer?"

Rose: "This has nothing to do with PCBs nor does it have anything to do with an aquifer..."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Rose: "...Representative Reboletti. Thank you."

"Representative Chapin Rose moves for the Speaker Lyons: passage of Senate Bill 3406. 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? Leader Acevedo, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lisa Dugan, on page 7 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 3441. Representative Dugan, 3441. Out of the record. Representative Ed Sullivan, you have Senate Bill 3450 on the Order of Third Readings. Representative Sullivan. Out of the record. Representative Dan Biss, on page 7 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3499. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3499, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Biss."

Biss: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the chamber. This Bill simply makes a fairly technical change to some of the assessments and fees we have in the Nursing Home Act. There's an opportunity in that Act for nursing homes to

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

when assessed a fee, immediately pay down a portion of it to end the inquiry and that clause of the law has two different formulas they can use. One of them is extremely confusing. And it appears, at least, to create a sort of unreasonable loophole that they could go through and it's created a lot of confusion. And so, this Amendment simply does away with that opportunity and makes the fee the preexisting flat fee that it was before. Happy to take any questions and I'd appreciate your support."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3499 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, Will Davis, David Leitch, Jack Franks. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 72 Members voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pat Verschoore, on the bottom of page 7 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3507. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3507, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pat Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A constituent brought this to me. In Iowa now they tax your unemployment benefits and also Illinois taxes your unemployment benefits. What this Bill would do would

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

be able... give the person that has to pay their taxes in Iowa a credit in Illinois so there wouldn't be a double taxation. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3507 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, David Leitch, Deb Mell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 65 Members voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, is House Bill 4278. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 4278?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4278, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Gordon, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jehan Gordon on Floor Amendment #1."
- Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 provides that the penalty fees paid to the State Board of Education for reinstatement of a lapsed certificate shall be paid to the Teacher Certification Revolving Fund administered by ISBE. There's no opposition to this piece of legislation and I'm open for any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

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. Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar is House Bill 4320. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4320, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Don't get too excited folks this isn't the Gaming Bill. This is just a small Bill that... that has been dubbed the Chuck E. Cheese Bill and all this Amendment says is that games that are at... amusement games like at a Chuck E. Cheese like skeeball or other games that have been turned into video type games are not video games under the Video Gaming Act. I would ask your support of the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Leader Bost on the Amendment."

Bost: "Just... just an inquiry or... would the Sponsor yield for just a second?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "How much... how much time do you spend at Chuck E. Cheese?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "As little as possible, Sir."

Bost: "I... I understand that."

Lang: "Yes."

Bost: "I understand that. I was just wondering."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang 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 Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 15 of the Calendar under Considered... Postponed Consideration, Leader Lou Lang has Senate Bill 1849. What's the status... Leader Lou Lang on Senate Bill 1849. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a rather serious issue. I'd ask everybody to please take their seats, bring the noise level down. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. All right, Leader Lang, you're off. You're ready. Go get them, Lou."

Lang: "That may be the funniest thing Mr. Dunkin ever said; I just thought I'd mention that. And yes, I used your name in debate, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1849 has been dubbed the gaming Bill. This is an important Bill for the State of Illinois because... well, for a number of reasons. First, as I think we all know, we have some problems in our state today with economic development. We have some problems in our state today creating jobs and keeping jobs. We have some problems in the agribusiness industry where we are leaking jobs on a daily basis from people in the 30 to 40 thousand jobs that

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

are in the horseracing industry. This Bill will do much about several of those items. We've had a long history of gaming in the State of Illinois, a long history of gaming Bills in the State of Illinois. As you recall, sometime ago we passed a Bill called Senate Bill 744 out of this chamber. We also passed it in the Senate, but that Bill was never sent to the Governor. And the reason it was never sent to the Governor is, after it passed, the Sponsors felt they could do better. We felt that 744, while it passed both chambers, was not our best product. And so we worked to do it better. And while we were working to do it better, the Governor held a press conference on gaming and when he held that press conference on gaming he outlined about 12 things that he thought were a good framework for a gaming Bill. Subsequent to that we drafted Senate Bill 1849 which encompasses something like 8 of those 12 changes, 8 of the 12 changes. And I would say to you first that remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, no one ever gets everything they want around here. We all negotiate Bills; we don't always get everything we want in those negotiations. So, the Governor got 8 of the 12 changes that he wanted. And then we voted on 1849 some months ago and it only failed because a few Members who were planning to vote 'yes' were missing that day or it would have passed that day. But today is a new day. What does this Bill do? Let me just give you the bare bones, although I'm sure you've heard enough about gaming and most of you know what's in this Bill. It would create five new casinos: one for Chicago, one for Park City which is in Lake County, one for Danville, one for Rockford, and

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

one in the south suburbs, yet to be named, to be chosen by the Gaming Board. The reason we left that alone is because there are many cities in the south suburbs that would like to be in on this, and they will compete and the Gaming Board will pick the best one. And that particular casino is important because every day, Ladies and Gentlemen, hundreds of people drive right through the south suburbs of the City of Chicago to spend money they earned in Illinois in the State of Indiana. The people that are most concerned about this legislation are the elected officials in the State of Indiana because we know that it's going to bring Illinois citizens back, it's going to improve tourism all over the state particularly in the City of Chicago, bring back conventions and tradeshows, which is why the Chamber of Commerce, the Restaurant Association and all those types of folks are for this Bill. The Bill will also provide limited numbers of slot machines at our racetracks. They're already gambling at racetracks; I should remind all of you. And so, it's not a huge stretch to let people do what they're already doing at racetracks, which is to gamble. But those slot machines at those racetracks will save the horse racing industry and save the thousands and thousands of agribusiness jobs we are losing now. The Bill will provide that all of the upfront licensing fees, all of the upfront licensing fees, \$1.2 million dol... billion, \$1.2 billion will go to the unpaid bills of the State of Illinois. Of course, if we use that as matchable dollars, the number is much, much higher. It provides many different distributions for funds, many of them for agribusiness, soil and water

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

conservation districts, et cetera. It provides money which could be as much as 30 million or more dollars a year for a Distressed Communities Fund, which would help create jobs in the inner cities across the State of Illinois through grant and loan programs where we could convince people and urge people and support people who want to start new businesses and hire their out-of-work neighbors. In the process of drafting this Bill, some of the changes we made at the request of the Governor included much more ethics and oversight, including a new Inspector General gaming. It provides for less gaming than the original Bill we passed out of this chamber, 25 percent less gaming in this Bill than in the Bill we recently passed, Senate Bill 744. It takes out gambling at the airports, it takes out gambling at the Springfield fairgrounds, and it provides substantial new funding for the Illinois Gaming Board to do the work it must do to license, and to vet, and to fingerprint, and to make sure that gaming is as open and honest and transparent as it has always been. And despite my well publicized disagreements with the Illinois Gaming Board on a number of issues, I applaud the Illinois Gaming Board for its success over a very long period of time in keeping corruption out of Illinois gaming. And additional dollars this Bill will provide for them will make it even easier and better for them to do the job they do. This Bill will create substantial numbers of jobs; bring back people that have fled to other states, to open businesses here. This is a good deal for the taxpayers and is the only Bill of this magnitude that will bring new

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

dollars into our state and to create this many jobs. It's the only Bill on our Calendar or the Senate Calendar that can do this. For these reasons, I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Well, Representative, you've gone way beyond Chuck E. Cheese. First off, there are some questions and I think I asked many of these questions the first time this Bill came up. There is a provision in here that the funds that are... will be generated from the slots at tracks will go to the purse for the horseracing. Is that correct?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Bost: "Okay."

Lang: "Some of the money, of course, comes back to the State of Illinois."

Bost: "Right, right. I understand that, but... but as a horseracing industry their support for this is because specifically they could feel they could increase the purses and draw more business to the horse track which are slipping away to other states. Is that correct?"

Lang: "As you I'm sure know, Representative, when other states put slot machines in at their racetracks, they stole a lot of business from the State of Illinois. And why did they do that? They did that because horses that were racing for \$2 or 3 thousand dollars a race in purses in Illinois could go to Delaware or Louisiana and race for five to ten times that amount of money. So, if you were a trainer, you were a

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

horse owner, you are an agribusiness person that just simply grew feed or... or were a farmhand, you would want to go where the money is and that's what they've done. And this Bill will make us the number one horseracing state in America again."

Bost: "Also in... also in the Bill, what is the estimate of how much of a... what this will generate to the state coffers? Do we have an estimate on that?"

Lang: "Depending on who you talk to you get a lot of different numbers."

Bost: "I'm sure."

Lang: "I've seen numbers as low as \$300 million a year. I've seen numbers higher than a billion dollars a year. I think the economy has a lot to do with this. I think if we ever do anything with the smoking ban it may affect this. And by the way, there's nothing about the smoking ban in this Bill at all. And I think how well the racetracks, and new casinos, and current casinos who will get more positioned under this Bill market themselves, I think will have a tremendous impact on the results."

Bost: "You believe from what you've said that... that actually more people will participate in gaming if... if this passes."

Lang: "I... I... I'm not sure if more people will participate in gaming, but I know less people will go to Indiana and Wisconsin and Iowa and Missouri. This is a business as you know, Representative, like any other. If we were talking about the widget industry, we wouldn't... this Bill would've passed 118 to nothing years ago. The word gambling is problematic for some people but this..."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Gentlemen, I've implemented the timer but I'll certainly give you an extension, Mike, so please continue."

Bost: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you. This is, as you know, a legal business in the State of Illinois right now like thousands of other businesses and all this Bill purports to do is to let a business that helps the State of Illinois grow and prosper and create jobs."

Bost: "All right. Mr. Speaker, just to the Bill. I... I think that we need to look at this very closely. I understand the horseracing side of this; I understand that. I don't... and... and the Leader did explain that he doesn't know whether it will expand or if people will actually gamble more, it does give the opportunity to gamble more, but I kind of have to believe that the people in the State of Illinois that want to gam... play right now or game are able to do that with existing facilities. I'll... I'll watch the debate very closely. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dave Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. And it's not often that the Sponsor and I are on the same side of controversial Bills, but in this case I would laud the Sponsor in responding to the Governor's request for some changes in the original legislation. As the Sponsor mentioned, you don't always get everything you want in... in a compromise, but I think the Governor ought to be satisfied that most of the major changes he wanted are in this legislation. I would like to emphasize the competitive nature that this Bill allows Illinois to start to recapture

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

some of the people in our state that choose to go outside. Rockford is probably the epitome of the example of a town that should've qualified under the original casino Bills 20 years ago because those were targeted for high unemployment cities and Rockford has suffered from the industrial loss of jobs. We certainly need the help and there is a major expansion under way in Wisconsin that we hope to shirt ... short circuit. If we don't do it this year with this Bill, Wisconsin will probably build an Indian Casino right on the Illinois and then border within... you can see opportunity to capture Illinoisans on their way out of state will be gone forever. This Bill will help, not only Rockford, but other communities in need like in Lake County and southern Cook and in Danville. It will also help racetracks by allowing them to compete with racetracks across the country to make them a viable place for gaming. And gaming is going to happen. We're not virgins in this state, there is gaming believe it or not, but this would allow the racetracks to be more competitive. And it will also allow the existing casinos, by allowing them to expand their operations, to also gain from this Bill. I think that the compromise that Representative Lang has put together is... is an excellent example of the best of legislation where you hear the opposition, listen to their concerns, answer those you can and then present a Bill that, while it won't please everyone, should please most of us. And I would urge 'yes' support for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chad Hays."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the previous speaker Hays: mentioned, 20 years ago, when gaming came to this state, the original Bill was designed to bring relief and to assist communities that were in significant economic distress, communities like Rockford, communities Danville, communities in the south suburban area, Chicago with its significant tourism and convention business makes a lot of sense. Tremendous revenue can be generated from a facility in the city. My own community in Danville, it's on the state line, we have studies that indicate that up to 65 percent, 65 percent of the revenue could come home back across the border from Lafayette, Indiana, from as far away as Indianapolis and Terre Haute, back across the border to our state where it belongs. Hundreds of millions of dollars upfront in construction with no incentives, regulated, no risk for the local taxpayer. There are huge winners, our cities, our counties, every local public school district in my area will share in their revenue. The local community college will share in their revenue. The county of Vermillion will all win. Three hundred and fifty of our own laborers will go to work, not as they are today when they traveled this morning to Evansville, Indiana and to Terre Haute, but at home where they belong, going home at night to their loved ones in Illinois, in east central Illinois. Seven hundred and fifty to eight hundred jobs, good jobs, jobs that pay on a median basis higher than the median income of the individuals who live in the county of Vermillion with benefits. We have wonderful state and county parks, festivals, the National Junior College

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Basketball Tournament for the last 18 years has called Danville home. Our tourism industry, stronger than you might think in east central Illinois, will get a huge shot in the arm with this appropriate partnership. We are all in, in the Danville area. The mayor of Danville is in, the Vermillion County Board chair is in, the Danville City Council has passed a Resolution in the past unanimously saying we are in, the president of our community college is in, our local school superintendent is in, labor across the board is in. I am asking you for your help today, on this day, after 20 long years, put a fai..."

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

Hays: "I'm asking you to put a face card on our ace in Danville, Illinois today. We need your help. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Davis, W.: "Representative, in your opening statements you talked about the possibility of capturing new license fees, I think the dollar amount you used was \$1.2 billion, is that something that we may be able to see as early as this fall or would it be next year?"

Lang: "It is conceivable that if the Gaming Board moves quickly enough to get some folks license fees in during this fiscal year that we could probably have maybe 400 or 500 million dollars in licensing fees in during this fiscal year; and if we do get them in, we can decide how to handle those funds later."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Davis, W.: "So, it is possible that those dollars could be positively impactful to our budgetary process that we're going through right now, correct?"
- Lang: "Well, the answer to that is yes but with a caveat, just to be honest. I don't think we should count these revenues in in the current budget process we're undertaking because we do not know if we will have these revenues in before the end of the fiscal year or whether it will be the following fiscal year. But I would submit to you that if we work quickly enough and the Gaming Board works quickly enough, we could get some sizeable checks in and maybe in May of next year we'll be talking about supplementals or paying old bills with these dollars because the Bill requires that all licensing fees go to old bills."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, maybe not in this current fiscal year so we're going to obviously pass some appropriations Bills, but we could come back in the fall having realized possibly some extra dollars, provide supplemental appropriations where we might be able to, assuming it's the will of the Body, to put these dollars back into the significant cuts that we made in education. Particularly in general state aid. Is that a possibility?"
- Lang: "If... if things move quickly enough, the answer to that would be yes."
- Davis, W.: "Great. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I decided to take the conversation in a completely new direction for that purpose. Many of us have been languishing, anguishing, and really toiling over exactly our appropriations process this year. Obviously, based on House Resolution 706, we had

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

to endure significant cuts that are impacting us all across the state, in K through 12 education, as my committee Members would attest to, we've had to make significant cuts to general state aid, we've had to make cuts to early childhood, we've had to make cuts to even transportation reimbursement. Things that all of us hold near and dear. But certainly if education is indeed a priority, at least it is for me as well as a few others, and even if you look at the other appropriation committees where everyone has their own priorities or things that they would like to see hold or... or left in, facilities, whatever the case may be, the I... the simple idea is that we need new revenue, Ladies and Gentlemen. Unfortunately, we..."

Speaker Lyons: "Will, we'll give you another minute. Please proceed"

Davis, W.: "Thank you. Unfortunately, we couldn't have that conversation before we voted on House Resolution 706, but nevertheless, here is an opportunity for us to have the conversation now about bringing new revenue and making restorations to some of the drastic and terrible cuts that we've had to make across the State of Illinois regardless of which appropriations committee that you're on. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, here is an opportunity for us to do the right thing: bring new revenue into the state, help education, help human services, help public safety, general services, whatever the case may be, higher education. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge you to support the Gaming Bill. Let's work very hard for its passage and to make sure that these new licenses are up and running as quickly as

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

possible so that we can bring new revenue into our conversation whether it's to pay old bills, that's fine because that relieves pressure off the general revenue fund and gives us an opportunity to do a little bit more than what we've been forced to in our appropriations process currently. So, again, I urge you to support this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jim Sacia."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Leader Lang, in the 10 years I've been here I... I have admired your tenacity at this Bill. And I think what I admire most and... and the Gentleman who just spoke, being an African American and you being probably a little more liberal than me, and fair to say that arguably this... that was not funny... fair to say that... that this is one of those Bills that affects the entire state, downstate, certainly the Chicago area, it affects African Americans, it affects Caucasians, it affects each and every one of us. Just a couple of questions. Why didn't we leave the airport in? We had that opportunity for all of that additional revenue and a lot of that revenue wouldn't even have been any encumbrance on any employee... or any resident of the State of Illinois."

Lang: "Mr. Sacia, there's a couple of reasons. First, at the beginning of this process I would've preferred to leave that in but going through the effort to try to negotiate with the Governor, to try to pay heed to some of his comments, it was his desire that we not have slot machines

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

at the airports. Additionally, I have learned that there's some Federal Law, don't ask me to quote it..."

Sacia: "Okay."

Lang: "...that would say that if you have gaming at an airport, the money must stay at the airport for airport use, perhaps for capital development at the airport. And I do not believe the City of Chicago wished to make that decision."

Sacia: "Sure."

Lang: "Additionally, it would de... those were not additional machines, those were not additional positions and they would've had to have been subtracted from the allotment for the City of Chicago. They would've preferred them in one location of their choice."

Sacia: "Thank you, Leader Lang. A comment or question, if I would, Sir; hereafter, when I go to Arlington and there's a half hour between races, will I have an opportunity to pull handles?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Sacia: "Wonderful. So, all in all, this is a positive piece of business legislation. I... I noticed that the Illinois Chamber, at least on... on our analysis they are not listed. Did they take a position or didn't we hear from them?"

Lang: "I... I believe the Illinois Chamber is for this Bill but I cannot swear to that."

Sacia: "Sure."

Lang: "But I can tell you the Chicagoland Chamber is for this Bill..."

Sacia: "I see that."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "...the Restaurant Association, the Hotel Association, all the hospitality and tourism groups because they know how much it's going to improve tourism, convention shows, trade shows in our state."

Sacia: "Sure. Leader Lang, I truly applaud you for all the work you've done on this and I hope we can all join you and put 118 'yes' votes on; maybe that's a stretch, but we should."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ed Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, for legislative intent, could you describe what we mean by electronic gaming, please?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir, as soon as I find my script for that."

Sullivan: "Would you like mine?"

Lang: "Give me one moment. Thank you, my trusty staff person, Mr. Hays, has brought the document over to me. For purposes of legislative intent I would like to make clear the definition of electronic gaming in the Illinois Gambling Act. The definition indicates that electronic gaming includes, 'slot machine gambling, video game of chance gambling, or gambling with electronic gambling games as defined in the Illinois Gambling Act or defined by the board that is conducted at a racetrack pursuant to an electronic gaming license'. It is the intent of this legislation that electronic gambling games means those gambling games as defined as gambling games in the Act and are played using electronic devices. It is not the intent of this legislation for the meaning of electronic gambling

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

games to include any type of game with a live gaming apparatus conducted by persons employed by an electronic gaming facility. Is that the answer you're looking for, Sir?"

Sullivan: "Yes, it is. Thank you much. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this Bill. In the next week, we're going to make some very, very, very difficult choices. This is the last place that we can go at this point to try and address some of the needs of our communities. So, when you're thinking about these Appropriation Committees and what we're going to cut, remember that today in the next hour or so, you're going to have a choice. Do you want to raise money to help fill some of the problems and relieve some of the cuts? So, now is the moment of time where you can make that decision. Please yote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dennis Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will Leader Lang yield?"

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

Reboletti: "Leader, I know that you talked about this a little bit before, but we reduced the amount of gaming positions from 2 thousand all the way down to... is it down to 1200. Is that... am I reading that correctly in the analysis... in our analysis?"

Lang: "The... that is not correct. And so, the... in Senate Bill 744 that we passed out of this chamber it allowed gam... casino licensees to have 2 thousand positions: this Bill reduces that to 1600."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Reboletti: "And what... was that at the request of the Governor's Office by the Governor?"

Lang: "It was the ... it ... while it would be my preference to have no limit at all because we don't tell Starbucks how many to build, we don't tell Burger King and McDonalds how many to build, I think... I think the free market ought to decide. There's a school of thought out there that says we have to have some control over this and so those negotiating the Bill felt strongly that we should at least give some credence to that and so we reduced the number not down to 1200 but to 1600. I would add though that some of the current licensees won't increase even to 16 hundred. They wouldn't go to 1600 or 2000. The Bill however, has a provision that we call use them or lose them. So, if... if under... if this Bill were to pass, if one of licensees did not want 1600, one of the other licensees could snap them up and use them and so we'll at least make sure that all of the positions are in use."

Reboletti: "With... with respect to the issuance of the licenses, does that go through an auction process to the highest bidder or are those licenses set at a regular price and then people come to pay for those?"

Lang: "There is a per position fee whether you're a riverboat, a casino, or a racetrack, there is a per position fee for everyone position you add. Now, if an enterprising like entrepreneur wanted to go to the Gaming Board and offer more, I'm sure the Gaming Board would take that into account when they determine who should get the new licenses."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Reboletti: "Is that where you're getting the 1.2 billion then, from the cost per gaming device or gaming position?"
- Lang: "The 1.2 billion comes partly from that and partly from what we call a reconciliation fee. And so over the next period of years, they're going to each casino and each racetrack is going to have to pay 75 percent to the state of their highest year of the first four. And so, there'll be a lot of money coming in, the estimate is 1.2 billion over that period of time."
- Reboletti: "And I'm also looking at the reduced gaming tax rates, delays in implementation until 2014. Could you explain that a little bit, Leader?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, your time expired, but I'll certainly give you another minute or so."
- Lang: "So, Mr. Reboletti, if you go on to your next question we'll get you an answer to that question."
- Reboletti: "The Bill also provides additional funding for the Gaming Board. Was there a certain amount on that?"
- Lang: "Fifty million dollars."
- Reboletti: "And what will that be able to accomplish for them?

 Is that so many more agents or how is that broken down?"
- Lang: "As you know, through this entire time we've been talking about a gaming Bill, the Illinois Gaming Board has been saying they don't have enough resources to do the work they're doing now. They've said this is too big; we can't handle this, et cetera. And so, we picked a very large number and said you can have up to 50 million additional dollars to hire investigators and finger printers and

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

police and whatever you need to do your job to get this act implemented."

Reboletti: "And assuming that this passes and the Governor signs it, when do you perceive any construction would start on these facilities? What would be the earliest date?"

Lang: "Well, some of the construction will take place very rapidly because the first thing that will happen is that the current licensees, both racetracks and casinos, will move for their new positions. So, if you're a casino, maybe you have room for these 400 extra machines or table games or whatever you're putting in and maybe you don't have to do a build out and you can put them right in. If you're a racetrack, you may have to build a new area. Some may build building which is accessible to the current racetrack; some want to attach it's some do not, but they have to be accessible. And so, and then you've got the new licensees, the five new, they will be allowed to put positions once the Gaming Board determines who will get that license, they will be allowed to put new positions in temporary facilities pending the construction and approval of the new facilities. So, conceivably within this first fiscal year we could have some gaming revenues, but I think more like 18 months to 2 years before most of it begins to come in."

Reboletti: "The track..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, I have six more speakers. So, if you could bring it to a close."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Reboletti: "Okay. I'm... I'll come back to do this. Leader Lang was trying to answer one of my questions if he can come back to me later on that. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Sir. David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and a question to the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman awaits your questions."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you. Representative, what is the Governor's position on the Bill? Do you know?"
- Lang: "The Governor has indicated more than once that he supports the casinos in the Bill and he and I have had a dispute over whether there should be slot machines at racetracks."
- Harris, D.: "So..."
- Lang: "There are maybe other things, but the Governor, I think, would acknowledge that of the 12 points he brought up at his press conference in the spring, he received 8 of them in this Bill; I think a pretty good batting average."
- Harris, D.: "Right. Although he has been pretty clear on where he stands on slot machines at the racetracks: he said he would veto that. I think that is the reason why we did not send him the previous Bill. So, we have to assume... assume that he would probably veto this one although he could certainly change his mind. Concerning the... the revenues that you predict coming in, what has happened... do you know what has happened with the casino revenues with our casinos that are in place now with the tenth license having come online?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Lang: "Yes, Sir. Some of our casinos have their numbers reduced, but the adding of the tenth license in Des Plaines has more than made up for that and our casino revenues are up year over year and month over month and our responsibility, of course, is to improve the bottom line for the taxpayers, not for any individual stockholders of any individual riverboat."
- Harris, D.: "Right. Our revenues are indeed up month over month, year over year but only by about 3 percent, if I recall the last numbers. Let me ask you, why does the City of Chicago get its own Gaming Board and Danville doesn't or Rockville... Rockford doesn't. Why do they get their own gaming..."
- Lang: "The City of Chicago does not have its own Gaming Board.

 The City of Chicago has... has a casino authority to make recommendations to the City Council about who might be the casino operator, who might get this contract or that contract but..."

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

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

Harris, D.: "But the other… the other municipalities don't have that."

Lang: "Well, but the other… first of all, they didn't ask for it and second of all, the City of Chicago needs it because for transparency purposes I don't think anyone on this floor wants a Chicago City Council to be making those decisions without some sort of advice from some other body. Now, let… I just want to add this, Representative. In the original version that we passed, Senate Bill 744, it was

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

very clear to me that the Illinois Gaming Board was still supreme over all and that the Chicago casino authority could not make any decisions on its own, but the Governor and some other people felt that needed to be clearer. So, Senate Bill 1849 makes it crystal clear that the Illinois Gaming Board is the supreme regulatory body for gaming in the State of Illinois."

- Harris, D.: "All right. Well, thank you very much. And Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill, if I may."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris, your three minutes are up. I'll certainly give you another minute to finish your remarks."
- Harris, D.: "I'll try to wrap it up in a minute. As you know, I represent Arlington Heights, but I do not represent the racetrack. Again, due to creative cartography, that's in another district. I've looked at this Bill very closely and I voted for the last Bill, but let me tell you what I looked at by way of revenues. Rivers came online, they're generating 34, 37 annual... excuse me, adjusted gross income... adjusted gross revenue every month. But, look at the other casinos and they have indeed decreased, in other words they have been cannibalized by... by the Rivers Casino. And if we're talking about getting money to cut... to prevent the cuts that we have to make this year, it's not going to happen. COGFA put out a study November 9 of 2011, just 5 months ago, that said the total revenues that are going to come in from this Bill would be \$1.4 billion, a one-time revenue. Most of that comes from the reconciliation fees... over \$1 billion come from reconciliation fees which the

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Sponsor admitted don't kick in for another 4 years. So, yes, we're going to get some money, but it is not a windfall so don't go spending the money because it's not coming in. Clearly, there will be dollars coming into the state, but it's not anywhere near what we think it's going to be. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Representative Mautino in the Chair. Further discussion? Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Kay: "Thank you. Leader Lang, you and I had a robust debate about this last fall and I don't want to retrace that ground, but I do have some... some questions today that I think I need to ask and I think you can probably answer. Of the moneys that you project from gaming, can you tell me how much we can reasonably expect to use to reduce our debt?"

Lang: "As the Bill is written, Representative, all, all of the upfront fees and reconciliation fees go to old bills. If you use it for matchable bills, it could be over \$2 billion. If you don't use it for matchable bills, maybe \$1.2 billion."

Kay: "Okay. How much then would we have in addition to that, if that's fair to say, to keep facilities open like Murray, and Tamms, and Dwight?"

Lang: "Well, Representative, the decisions on keeping those facilities open are today's decisions, current decisions.

I... I would not be the person who would stand on the floor and promise you that if this Bill passes it will have any

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

impact on our decisions that we have to make in the next 8 days relative to those facilities."

Kay: "Did you happen to see the SJR's morning report today, the
Journal dated May 23, 2012?"

Lang: "No, Sir."

Kay: "Let me begin reading a portion of it, if I may. It says the Illinois budget would probably be balanced today except for the 37.5 billion given away to Illinois gambling interest over the last two decades. Faced in 1990 with a economy... a slow economy, a new casino and in slot machine economy, Governor Thompson, their administration ducked other tougher choices and elected to pursue gambling. During the same period of time, Virginia and other states elected to use their surplus and not pursue gambling. So, I guess it looks to me like, according to... if this Act... if this report is accurate, what the SJR is saying is, but for gambling, we could be well on our way to financial security. Do you agree with that?"

Lang: "I... I don't agree with that, Sir. The facts are very clear that when the Rivers Casino opened the numbers in Indiana went down. Those are Illinois citizens that have come back to spend their money in Illinois and it doesn't matter whether it's a casino or a shopping mall. If you go to an Indiana casino, or I dare say a Missouri casino not to far from where you live, Sir, you see a whole heck of a lot of Illinois license plates."

Kay: "Yes. Let me... let me just go on here and mention a couple of other things that this article cited. It talked about the original 10 licenses which were... had a net worth market

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

value in today's dollars of 9.5 billion. And they were granted for \$25 thousand to imp..."

Speaker Mautino: "Grant the Gentleman another minute."

Kay: "...to political insiders. What guarantee is there that this
 will not happen again?"

Lang: "I think the Bill is pretty transparent on the issues of ethics. I think the Bill is pretty transparent on where the money goes and there's no money here going to political insiders, Sir."

Kay: "Okay."

Lang: "If you own a racetrack, I suppose you could be considered a political insider, but I don't think that's my definition. And so, people who own racetracks, people who own casinos are legitimate business people and just because they're involved in the gaming industry does not confer any... should not confer any special negativity to them as business owners in the State of Illinois."

Kay: "Well, let me... Leader..."

Lang: "And they're entitled to the... the full protection of the State of Illinois. As long as they're paying their taxes they should be allowed to advance their businesses and hire Illinois citizens."

Kay: "Well, Leader, on... in March of 2011 there happened to be a 60 Minutes expose, I don't whether you saw it or not called The Big Gamble where it talked about schemes and scandals and the way machines were rigged. And it was kind of interesting to note that there was a call for each Legislature to have hearings with respect to what is called

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

EGMs because things were being fixed. This was on TV. I don't think anyone ever rebutted what's..."

Speaker Mautino: "If the Gentleman would answer, your time has expired. Lou, you may answer the question."

Lang: "Mr... Mr. Kay, I saw some of that program but not all of it but let me just simply say this, there are something like 40 states in this country that have some form of gaming and the Illinois Gaming Board over the last 20-plus years has been the best regulatory body in America at keeping corruption out of Illinois gaming. If they thought these games were rigged, you'd have heard about it, they'd have done something about it. In fact, some have said that this Illinois Gaming Board is actually anti-gaming. And if that is true, they certainly would have stopped any corruption in its tracks. And because there... there has been no corruption, it's because the Illinois Gaming Board has made sure of that and there's no evidence that what you have proffered here today is a problem here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The... Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Moffitt: "And by the way, Mr. Speaker, you look real nice up there. I think you're about to be deposed though, maybe the way..."

Speaker Mautino: "And probably rightly so, continue."

Moffitt: "Representative, I would like to ask you some questions about what my understanding is sometime been

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

referred to as an ag package in terms of some revenue for some... I'd like to ask some specifics about that. And certainly, agriculture is our number one industry and need to do some things to try to keep it that way. Can you tell us what amount is in this for 4H, for extension, for horse racing, for county fairs, for soil and water, and the rest of the ag package?"

- Lang: "I'd be happy to. This Bill provides for \$31 million annually to support agriculture and natural resource programs: 12.5 million to soil and water conservation districts, \$6 million grants to county fairs and the two state fairs, 5 million to cooperative extensions, 3 million for state historic sights, 3 million for state parks, 1.5 million for CREP forestry assistance program, \$250 thousand for quarter horse programs, and \$150 thousand for botanical garden maintenance."
- Moffitt: "I appreciate that and you said that's a specific amount that's an annual... will be an annual commitment, an annual appropriation?"
- Lang: "According to the Bill, Sir, that's 31.4 million, an annual appropriation off the top."
- Moffitt: "Okay. Now, was there... we used to have... we've had a line item for ag-education, I believe it was 1.8 million where high school ag departments could get grants. Is there anything in here for high school ag departments? It may be listed as Illinois FFA."
- Lang: "There's no specific line item for that, Sir. However, as you know, when we fund this \$31.4 million it should free up other money to accomplish that goal."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Moffitt: "One of the… some of the information I saw about it, it made a commitment for, I believe, Illinois FFA. Now, is that from some other source to replace the ag-ed line item of 1.8 million?"

Lang: "Mr. Moffitt, when I negotiated this portion of the Bill and this was negotiated with Mr. Rose on your side of the aisle, along with Leader Mautino, there... this was not on their list. So, I am happy to work with you if this is an important issue to you, happy to work with you on a trailer Bill to talk about supplementing those dollars. If those dollars are going to be cut or have otherwise disappeared in the state budget, I'm happy to work with you. I'm a very big supporter of the program."

Speaker Mautino: "Represent..."

Moffitt: "I... I appreciate that, Representative and I would feel better if... and if it's somewhere else in the budget and someone knows that, I wish they would let us know. But I would... I would really like to see that commitment to high school ag somewhere in the budget. You said you'd work with us. Do you want to put odds on that on our chances of getting that? Would that be appropriate?"

Lang: "Well, Sir, I'll certainly... I give you 100 percent odds that I'll be happy to work with you on this. I should add however, that even though that is not here and again never asked for before this minute, this is \$31 million for agriculture interest that there's no other way to get to these programs. This is the only, excuse the expression game, in town to get this \$31 million to these programs."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Mautino: "Rep..."

Moffitt: "Thank you. And if we don't find that somewhere else I really... it is important that we continue to work for that high school ag, if it's not somewhere else in the budget. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

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 Lang, we started with just nine casinos. Is that correct?"

Lang: "We had 10 casinos in the law, for a very long time we only had nine."

Pritchard: "And in that period of time, what would you say has been the participation in the gaming at those… at those facilities?"

Lang: "I'm not sure I understand your question, Sir."

Pritchard: "How many people gamble there?"

Lang: "I... I don't have those numbers. I'm certain the Illinois

Gaming Board would. I suppose we could get them for you,
but it's... it's a significant number of people, sure... Sir."

Pritchard: "So, would you say that with these additional four facilities that we're going to have more people gambling in the state?"

Lang: "Well, I don't know that. My goal here is not to create gamblers. My goal here is to promote economic development and the creation of jobs and to stop the leakage of jobs, some of which are coming right out of your district, as

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

horse farms close, as owners and trainers move out of the State of Illinois. I know this, I know that the State of Indiana, and the State of Missouri, and the State of Wisconsin, and the State of Iowa are watching us very carefully today because they're very concerned that Illinois citizens who are going off to their states to spend their money may stay here and spend their money."

- Pritchard: "There's protection in this gaming Bill, not this particular one but in our law that deals with addiction for people that have too much fun at these facilities. Can you talk a little bit about the success of that program?"
- Lang: "Well, I think that program has had some success and we have self-exclusion programs which could be strengthened and should be strengthened but I'd like to add that for the first time in history there's a line item in this Bill that will take \$10 million off the top of all gaming revenue and provide it for those kind of gaming addiction programs, 10 million annually."
- Pritchard: "But is there anyone that oversees that to make sure that people are getting the treatment that they need to break their addiction?"
- Lang: "Well, these dollars take the form of grants to organizations all over the state, perhaps they're gamblers anonymous or other such organizations and they do pretty good work."
- Pritchard: "This also has been sold as economic development for the communities that it goes into. Can you tell me the success of the program in the nine communities that have had gaming facilities?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "Without going into specifics, I can tell you that none of the 10 communities that now... actually there's nine because Joliet has two riverboats, so the nine communities today that have gaming, none of them would give it back, none of them would want to do away with it, none of them would want to say..."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has expired. Please grant him one more minute to bring your remarks to a close."

Lang: "...none of them would say take this burden away from us. People have built hotels, they've built restaurants, they've built shopping malls, they've improved their water systems, their police force, their fire departments. And one other thing, Sir, if you'll take a look at Mr. Hays' community in Danville, Mr. Winters' community in Rockford, they are on the borders of Illinois where people leave their communities every day to spend money in other states, not necessarily to gamble. People leave Rockford every day to go to shopping malls in Wisconsin. And if this was not about gaming, people would say we've got to stop people leaving Rockford where they have an 18 percent unemployment rate and we've got to keep people in Rockford. And today there's an Indian tribe prepared to build a mega million, maybe a hundred million dollar complex in Beloit, just north of the City of Rockford where they're going to have hotels and restaurants, et cetera and it's going to suck people right out of the northern tier of Illinois, costing us jobs, costing us the ability to..."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Speaker Mautino: "You may finish your answer. We have seven Members seeking..."

Lang: "...to..."

Speaker Mautino: "...recognition."

Lang: "...sorry... to improve our economics in the State of Illinois. I think there's a lot to say about economic development and the proof is in the nine cities that already have this."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Nekritz: "Thank you. Leader Lang, I just have one question for you. Can you tell me why there is no ban on contributions from the gaming industry in this Bill?"

Lang: "Are you referring to the fact that there are some people that have asked for that?"

Nekritz: "I believe there were..."

Lang: "Right."

Nekritz: "...but is there... there was I guess..."

Lang: "So..."

Nekritz: "...I should ask was there a conscious decision about that?"

Lang: "Well, first of all, this Bill was drafted before anybody made that request."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Lang: "So, this Bill, as you know, has been on Postponed Consideration for some time."

Nekritz: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "This is a topic, the one you raised, that is a fairly recently promoted topic."

Nekritz: "Okay."

Lang: "And it was the considered opinion, first, that bringing it back to Second Reading at a time that we're doing Medicaid and pensions and budget might make it problematic, but more than that, while it might be a good idea for us to banning campaign contributions about regulated industry, it's my considered opinion and you're an attorney, that to ban contributions from one and only one industry may not be appropriate constitutionally. I told people who advanced this issue that if they wanted to advance a Bill that provided for a banning of political contributions from all regulated industry: doctors, lawyers, insurance brokers, real estate brokers, and gaming interests, that I would consider that. But that's not what was proposed. And so, when you propose it just as a ban of contributions from the gaming industry, what you're really saying publically is, well, we don't care much about those other regulated industries but somehow people in the gaming industry are automatically crooked, or they're bad people, or their money is tainted and I don't believe any of that. These are honest businessmen and the Illinois Gaming Board has kept them to be honest good businessmen."

Nekritz: "Thank you. I appreciate that explanation."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion, Representative Poe."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Poe: "Representative, can you explain, originally, and I know on one of the five things or so was taken out of the Bill and one of them was that originally we had slots and more racing at the Illinois State Fairgrounds. Could you explain how that worked out just for intent of the law? Let me... let me go ahead and then you can confirm it or not. I think what happened is that was another area where the Governor chose not to want to support and to make this more... this Bill more palatable for the State of Illinois. And I think what we agreed that there will be \$10 million spent on the infrastructure to fix up the State fairgrounds. If anybody has been there in the last few years, it's running down. There was another five million put in there for promotion of events and I think probably if you remember in the last year we had a national rodeo out there, we didn't have enough money in the State of Illinois to promote that. And that's what this kind of money is trying to draw national shows in the State of Illinois. I think there was another five million that added on to the 4-H, FFA, solar conservation, and those kinds of programs. Am I close to being right on what was done?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir. When we were negotiating the original gaming Bill, you came to me to discuss the issue of improving the Springfield... the track at the Springfield Fairgrounds or the entire Fairgrounds by putting slot machines at the Springfield racetrack at the Fairgrounds during those couple of weeks a year where we have the fair open and so we could use those dollars to fix up, on a regular basis, the capital needs of the Fairgrounds. And I agreed to put

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

that in the Bill. Unfortunately, the Governor does not believe that's a good thing to do and so we took that out of the Bill, but in exchange for that, we gave you \$10 million to fix up the fair, grounds; it's the right thing to do. The Governor and other… and certainly others in the state have talked about how important the State Fair is as they've talked about how important the county fairs are; and there's a lot of important needs at the Springfield Fairgrounds where we hold our very important State Fair and I'm proud to join you in providing the dollars to help fix that up."

Poe: "Well, just... and a point is agriculture is the main...
number one industry in Illinois and this is a place where
we showcase it. And can you confirm the \$5 million for
promotions so that we can utilize that Fairgrounds year
round?"

Lang: "That's in the Bill, Sir."

Poe: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Dunkin: "Representative, can you elaborate a little bit on the Chicago casino and sort of the dynamics around that boat or excuse me, casino?"

Lang: "So, the City of Chicago would own the casino. They would be treated like another owner. The state would get its share. They would create a Chicago casino authority whose job would be to vet vendors, to vet people who would want

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the contract to run the casino 'cause we're not going to let the City of Chicago run the casino. The Bill says they have to go hire a casino operator to run the casino. And they will do that. But they make no final decisions. Under this Bill, the Illinois Gaming Board must approve all decisions that go on at the city just like they would have to approve Danville, Rockford, and all the other old and new licensees."

Dunkin: "Okay. Do we have any indication that they'll be a theater or restaurants in the casino at all?"

Lang: "Well, I haven't seen any plans because I don't even think the city knows where... what site they would select; that's one of the things the authority will do and they'll make a recommendation to the City Council. But surely you can imagine that they won't just build a building and have gambling in it; they'll have restaurants, they'll have hotels, they'll have shopping; they'll improve the infrastructure of everything around that site wherever it is because they'll want to attract people to it."

Dunkin: "Sure, understood. I'm just curious to see how this would impact tourism given that we have a very vibrant theater district, entertainment, great restaurants already in the City of Chicago and... and what the potential impact was going to be."

Lang: "Sir, all of those things are true but the fact is that while we have one of the great cities in the world..."

Dunkin: "Yes."

Lang: "...in the State of Illinois... that attracts quite a few people, the truth is that over the last series of years,

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

other cities have started to creep up on us and they've stolen some of our tourists. They've stolen some of our trade shows and conventions. Some that used to come to Chicago every year now come every other year. They still love Chicago, but they're going other places."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Lang: "And if Disney wanted to put Epcot Center downtown no one would say no; we'd find a place for them to squeeze that in. This is no different. It certainly isn't like Epcot Center, but it's a business, it's an attraction, it's an opportunity, and a new way to bring people back to the City of Chicago."

Dunkin: "Sure. And some... and I... first of all, I sincerely appreciate your hard work. I mean, you've worked on this for... since I've been here. I've been here 10 years and I would say that you were working on it even further... even before then. I'm... did you get a sense of... from the tourism industry... that people actually come to the City of Chicago because we don't have casinos to distract the conferences?"

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman's time has expired. Would you grant him another minute to make closing comments?"

Lang: "There's no evidence anywhere that people don't come to Chicago because there isn't gambling; there's no real evidence that... other than where major cities have put in major attractions... there's a bump in tourism, there's a bump in action, there's a bump in interests and it's not just for casinos. It'll fill up restaurants, it'll fill up hotels, it'll have more velocity of revenue around the

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

city, the County of Cook, and accordingly, the State of Illinois."

Dunkin: "Thank you for your clarification."

Speaker Mautino: "Further discussion, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Request a verification."

Speaker Mautino: "The Gentleman has requested a verification.

That has been acknowledged. There's a request, everyone. At the time of voting, vote your own switches. Further discussion? Representative Mulligan the Lady from Cook."

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

Speaker Mautino: "He indicates that he will."

Mulligan: "Representative, there's nothing in your Bill that would allow you to reverse something and put a casino at the airport? Am I correct?"

Lang: "The Bill does not allow for a casino at the airport.

Actually, the original Bill didn't allow for a casino at the airport. The Bill allowed for some slot machines to be at the airport, but not this Bill."

Mulligan: "All right. Because Des Plaines, which I represent, the new casino is right down the block from the airport pretty much. Is your Bill severable?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Mulligan: "So, if some of the portions of your Bill were struck down, others could still be considered to go into law?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Mulligan: "How many funds does the money go into? You've named a number of funds. It seems to me there's quite a few funds that you're dividing this money into. And when does it

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

actually go into the funds? Is it after the casino earns so much money?"

Lang: "So, Representative, there are a number of funds created but that's to make sure the money goes where it's supposed to go. So, when... the money that comes out of the horseracing industry, a lot of that will stay in the horse racing industry. So, there's one fund. We have all those agriculture interests that I mentioned. We have distressed communities fund: we have the fund compulsive gaming which I know you agree that we should do something about. And of course, most of the money ends up in education bills or capital. That's where most of the money goes."

Mulligan: "Would it remove Des Plaines' responsibility to share revenue from the tenth casino with other poor communities around the state?

Lang: "I don't believe that was a correct statement,

Representative."

Mulligan: "It does not."

Lang: "I do... I do not believe it does."

Mulligan: "Okay. Is there a provision for... a bypass an opt in for people with video gaming as there was in other Bills that we've passed?"

Lang: "The answer is no."

Mulligan: "Would it change the pov... position in other Bills for opt in or would that provision still be effective in law in Illinois?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- Lang: "The provision in the Video Gaming Act that requires communities to opt out if they want to not have video gaming will still be the law when this Bill passes."
- Mulligan: "Wasn't there several reports, and I think one of them was from COGFA, that there's only a certain amount of money period that goes into gaming it just is reallocated amongst the new casino for a while and taken away from other current casinos in Illinois?"
- Lang: "I don't believe that was their report. I believe COGFA thinks this Bill might bring in less money than some do, but there's no evidence that it's... it's moving the same money around. The evidence is quite to the cont..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lyons back in the Chair.

 Rosemary, one more minute, please."
- Lang: "There was a recent study done by a group headed by Bill Black, who you may remember, that was very clear that this will be a huge dollar amount for the state and create many jobs."
- Mulligan: "Who will appoint the administrative law judges that would make the decisions about abuses that would happen at this casino?"
- Lang: "Can you clarify your question? I don't know what you mean, Representative."
- Mulligan: "Okay. Your Bill allows all Gaming Board decisions, even those that are non legal and highly technical, to be appealed to an administrative law judge. The expansion creates the danger of abuse of the administrative appeal process by dissatisfied individuals who attempt to delay the implementation... implementation through frivolous

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

- appeals. So, I'm curious as to which administrative law judges would they appeal to."
- Lang: "Representative, this is the current process. If... if somebody is turned down by a state agency, any state agency, they can appeal to a court."
- Mulligan: "So, if a position becomes open, the current Governor appoints that administrative law judge?"
- Lang: "No. These judges are not appointed by the Governor."
- Mulligan: "Where are... where do they come from?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Time has expired. Chair recognizes Representative Tom Morrison."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Kay."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay. Representative Kay three minutes."
- Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do I need the Sponsor to yield
 again?"
- Speaker Lyons: "No, I think he's ready for you, Dwight."
- Kay: "Good, okay. Thank you. Leader, I'm sorry we couldn't continue our debate before. I had a couple of things I... I just wanted to revisit. If, in fact, you took the potential projected income, the revenues, and taxed that at 100 percent, what would that net you? What would that net the state?"
- Lang: "Well, Sir, as I said earlier, we expect the gaming revenue from this to be somewhere between 300 million and over a billion dollars a year. But that does not take into account sales taxes, and all the other things that people buy, and all the other things that people do when they're..."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Kay: "Well..."

Lang: "...when they're here doing whatever..."

Kay: "Right, right."

Lang: "...they do relative to this activity."

Kay: "It was just a thought. I think... I think you would actually in your first year depending on the first year you would actually make \$10 billion. I think that would be your revenue take and that's the way they do it in Canada. That might be something to think about if this progresses down the line. But let me just... let me just ask you one question. In 2005, as I understand it, and of course, I wasn't here I think you might have been, Speaker Madigan had a Bill to basically scale back 10 casinos. Do you remember that?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Kay: "And what was the purpose of that Bill? I think the Bill was 1920."

Lang: "Yes. Mr. Bradley had a Bill to end casino gambling in the State of Illinois. Is that the Bill you're referring to?"

Kay: "Well, I'm not sure whether it was Representative Bradley's or Speaker Madigan's, but I believe if I understand the history it was supported by the Speaker and it really passed out of this House. Do you remember the pur... the purpose of that particular Bill?"

Lang: "Sir, I assume if a person wanted to end gambling his purpose was to end gambling."

Kay: "Well, it was to eliminate 10 casinos with the purpose of really creating jobs which is just exactly what Nebraska

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

has done most recently. Most of the casinos were handled by icon, Warren Buffet. He owned or had some interest in most of them and he's bulldozed them over and he's created tech centers. Why wouldn't we do that here?"

Lang: "Well, Sir, you know, we have a..."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh..."

Lang: "...fundamental disagreement. I believe that this Bill will create jobs. I don't believe that doing away with the casino industry in the State of Illinois will increase jobs. I believe quite the opposite."

Kay: "Well, and I... you're right, Leader, we do have a fundamental disagreement. But let me... let me just say this in closing and then to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I want to emphasize today that Nebraska, Virginia, South Carolina, and at least three other states have eliminated and criminalized gambling because it has failed. It has failed in a number of ways and not the least of which is economic. But let me just say this in closing, Mr. Speaker. It is a shame that this is the only consumer-friendly eco... I think, economy that we can develop in the State of Illinois. That's what I've heard today. We have not been able to do it the legitimate way so we're going to go a different way and we're going to put slots and gaming in every casin... every racetrack, every..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, I'll give you a half a minute to finish. Please, con... Dwight."

Kay: "So, the bottom... the bottom line is just this, I think we send the wrong message. This is not a job creator and frankly, what we're doing is we're saying to the people of

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the State of Illinois we're going to take money from those people who are least able to pay the price for the... for the privilege of casinos generating revenue. I think it's a bad plan and I think we 'ought to reject it out... just out of hand."

Speaker Lyons: "There's four speakers left and that'll be the end. Riley, Cole, Ramey, and Jefferson, and then Lang to close. Representative Riley, three minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I congratulate Representative... Leader Lang for sticking with this for so long. But you know, out in the south suburbs, you know we've been at this a long time too. Matter of fact, there's about four communities that are looking forward to this Bill who actually applied for the tenth license. And there's nothing but agreement amongst all of the elected officials and many of our community-based organizations like the local Chamber of Commerce, the Southland CVB, the South Suburban Mayors and Managers, you know, who are just waiting for this Bill because it's going to be, again, another part of regional economic development in the Southland. The other thing folks have to remember, now, from my district office to Dyer, Indiana is about 15 minutes, 15 minutes and when we talk about whether we're recycling, gamblers that already exist, or looking for new folks, I just want to get the people coming back from Indiana. The last time this Bill game up, we were all in the Northwest Indiana Times, matter of fact, a quote of mine about setting up imaginal line that can't be flanked to keep our residents in the state was mentioned in this

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

article. The next time I want to see my name in the Northwest Indiana Times is based on us passing this Bill. We're really looking forward to it; we're in agreement in the south suburbs. We're really looking forward to this proposal passing. So, I hope you will join me in really helping south suburban economic development by passing this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sandy Cole, three minutes."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Mulligan."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan, three minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lang, does this Bill have any provisions for minority ownership as previous Bills have sometimes had?"

Lang: "This Bill does not have provision for minority ownership, but there are goals for ownership and for minority contracting."

Mulligan: "Which Amendments actually ended up on your Bill of the three Amendments that were out there?"

Lang: "Amendments 2 and 3 are on the Bill."

Mulligan: "Your Bill creates an ambiguity with respect to... to respect of power and authority of Gaming Board investigators, the Illinois State Police, the Chicago... and Chicago Police Department within the Chicago casino. I think currently the Illinois State Police are the ones that take care of problems at the current casinos. How would that be handled under your Bill?"

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "The State Police, Representative, work for the Gaming Board, so they're the people the Gaming Board contracts to do this work."

Mulligan: "You think that would be all right with the City of Chicago?"

Lang: "The City of Chicago is for this Bill the way it's written."

Mulligan: "Probably after what happen last weekend they don't want to spend any more money than they have to. It's unclear in your Bill regarding the process for allocating unreserved positions among other casinos that are willing to pay for those positions, is there any provision that says how they would be split up? Or..."

Lang: "The gaming..."

Mulligan: "...is it first come first serve?"

Lang: "Sorry to interrupt, Representative. The Gaming Board would by rule determine how that would happen."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh..."

Mulligan: "So, the Gaming Board would be the one then that would be able to decide how that would happen. So, people that wanted to purchase them would go to the Gaming Board and petition for so many of them and then the Gaming Board would make a decision?"

Lang: "Once this Bill would pass, the Gaming Board would put a procedure together. Once this Bill were passed and signed or otherwise became law, the Gaming Board would put into place a procedure for people to get the extra 400 positions that are available to them, if they want them and then if there are unused positions, those licensees who wanted to

141st Legislative Day

- avail themselves to those additional unused licenses would follow the dictates of the Gaming Board."
- Mulligan: "Don't you think you've overstated revenue projections for the amount and that these projections would not be available, particularly for the coming budget year but perhaps for the year after that?"
- Lang: "Well, Representative, I indicated a wide range of 300 million to over a billion dollars a year. I... if you don't think the higher end is reasonable surely the lower end is reasonable based on any reasonable projection of current gaming revenue and the amount of people from Illinois that go to Indiana..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Time has expired. Representative Lang, do you want to finish your response? Representative Randy Ramey, three minutes."
- Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Ramey: "Leader, just a couple of clarifications, please. In the discussion, you made mentioned that the upfront licensing fee was going to pay bills about 1.2 billion, 1.5 billion."
- Lang: "I think the number is about approximately \$1.2 billion over..."
- Ramey: "Okay. And you mentioned something about some magic dollars that could go up to \$2 billion. What is a the magic..."
- Lang: "Well, Sir, if we take all of this money that's going to old bills and we pay only Medicaid with it or only bills that are matchable by the Federal Government, we can double our money."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Ramey: "Okay."

Lang: "So to speak."

Ramey: "So, that's what you meant by that statement?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Ramey: "Okay. Thank you. With that upfront fees then, it mentions in the Bill that there's a renewal every four years."

Lang: "That's correct."

Ramey: "What is that number for the renewals?"

Lang: "It's an amount just to cover the cost of the license.

They don't... they don't pay for those positions over and over and over again."

Ramey: "Right. But then... that... obviously, that's less than the initial fees, correct?"

Lang: "It's... it's... oh, substantially less."

Ramey: "Substantially less."

Lang: "But it's much more than it is today. Today, I think it's \$5 thousand. I think the Bill says \$100 thousand."

Ramey: "Okay. But that money isn't designated for anything specific as the initial fees are, correct?"

Lang: "It goes to the administration of the Gaming Board."

Ramey: "The renewals go to administration. Okay. The \$10 million that was offered to the State Fair because they didn't get any gaming positions, is that a one-time fee that they get? You get 10 million every year?"

Lang: "Yes, it's for annual money for capital and the promotion of the fair; something that we haven't been able to afford to do, so we can bring many more people to Mr. Poe and Mr. Brauer's city."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Ramey: "Right. Okay. I just wanted that clarification. So, estimated you said between 300 and 1 billion dollars every year revenue from gaming, correct?"

Lang: "Correct, Sir."

Ramey: "In addition to what we get right now?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Ramey: "Which is about what do we get right now on the 10 casinos?"

Lang: "It's... it's been a moving target and as you know, our numbers are a little down now because of the economy."

Ramey: "Right."

Lang: "But roughly 400 or 500 million dollars."

Ramey: "So, in addition to we could get maybe upwards to a billion five or at a high number as a revenue source every year?"

Lang: "I... I would hope that happens."

Ramey: "Okay. Is that money... is it... does that just go to general revenue then? There isn't no designation for that revenue?"

Lang: "The it... it's designated in the Bill for education and capital."

Ramey: "That's every year the revenue that comes in from gaming is designated for capital..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ramey, your time's expired. I'll give you one minute, please, to finish your question."

Ramey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Lang: "Capital and education, Sir."

Ramey: "It goes into a special fund?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Ramey: "Does that fund... is that protected from sweeps?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Ramey: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker will be Representative Chuck Jefferson and then Leader Lang to close. Leader Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I want to take this opportunity to thank the Sponsor of this Bill, Leader Lang, for all the hard work that he's put into this. This Bill is very important to me; it's very important to the community that I represent. As a matter of fact, I just drove back in from Rockford because I went home to support a groundbreaking ceremony that's going to create 300 jobs in Rockford. We do what we need to do to represent the areas that we come from. Oftentimes, I have voted for your legislation to make sure your communities are what they should be, what they need to be. I've talked to several of you on the House Floor that said that you will support this legislation. This is very important. It's very important to us in Rockford because we're one of the highest unemployment rate... unemployment states in the city... unemployment cities in the State of Illinois. We also have the opportunity to stop people from going to Wisconsin. We're the gatekeepers to the north. If we can bridge that escape route, we can keep those dollars Illinois. People escaping to Wisconsin, surrounding areas, this would help to keep those dollars in Illinois, help keep those dollars in Rockford. applaud the Speaker; I applaud the Sponsor for this Bill. I think it's a great Bill. It's going to generate revenue

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

that we don't have. However much that revenue is, it's more than we've got coming in today. I encourage each of you to support this legislation because it's important to me, it's important to Rockford, but more importantly it's important to the State of Illinois. We don't have a lot of revenue enhancements on the table. This is one that we know is going to generate dollars for the State of Illinois. So, we can't turn our backs on legislation that's going to produce revenue that we need so desperately to continue to operate this state. So, I would ask you to give it careful consideration and I would ask for your support on this Bill and hopefully we can pass this and get on to bigger and brighter futures in here in Illinois. Thank you very much and I would ask all of you to support this legislation. It's a good piece of legislation. Thank you, Leader Lang."

Speaker Lyons: "Deputy Majority Leader Lou Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we... could I get just a little quiet in here, Sir?"

Speaker Lyons: "Absolutely. Ladies and Gentlemen, for the final closing comments we'd appreciate a little quiet on the floor. Shhh... thank you."

Lang: "Sir, before... before I close I... if Mr. Reboletti would ask his question again we'll try to provide an answer to him."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Leader, I had asked you about the implementation of the table game tax rate. There was a... it delayed implementation until 2014."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Lang: "The... the reason for that delay is to give those who would reach those levels, presumably that is for the City of Chicago, to give them a chance because the taxpayers of the City of Chicago are going to own that operation, to give them a chance to recoup their investment."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you. Now I'm ready to close, Sir. I thank... I thank you all for the comments, the spirited debate, the good questions. It is an important Bill. As I've said many times for me, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've worked on this many, many years but it's not about gaming to me, it's about economic development. It's about the creation of That's what we said to our constituents we would be for when we got elected. We've got a country and a state that is in economic turmoil. Yes, it's getting better, but as we go through the budget process we see that we're not doing well enough. We haven't created enough jobs; we don't have enough revenue. Is this a panacea for all of our ills, of course not. Can it be a step to build... to build a better economy? Absolutely, it can. And so, all I say to you today this is a step forward to improve the State of Illinois. It'll bring people back from other states; it'll cause not only casinos but restaurants and hotels and infrastructure to be built, improving communities all over the State of Illinois due to revenue sharing agreements that all of the communities that may get a license have gone... have planned to enter into. Again, I mentioned the City of Rockford with almost 20 percent unemployment about to have a huge mega complex built less than 20 miles from

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

them that will take money right out of northern Illinois. We can do better than this. Before I close, two more items. First, I'd like to thank many of you who have been helpful in this process. First, Leader Cross and thank you for Ed Sullivan. I appreciate your help, lending me Sullivan in the process of this Bill. And across the way, Senator Link, the Senate Sponsor, along with Senator Murphy. We've had people involved in this Bill from... on all four caucuses and I appreciate all of your involvement. One final comment, many of you have told me that you're going to watch the board like we do sometimes. We're you're not going to vote; we're going to watch the board. I would urge you not to do that, especially those of you who committed to me to vote green. Those of you who committed to vote green, put those green votes up there. And if you leave those green votes up there, there's going to be quite a good Roll Call for those who believe in economic development, the creation of jobs, and improving the State of Illinois. Please vote 'aye'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a very thorough discussion on this. Representative Bradley has asked for verification, so, Members, you must hit your own switch. That having been said, Representative Lang moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1849. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 69 Members voting 'yes', 47 Members voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This

141st Legislative Day

- Bill having received the Con... that's right. Mr... Representative Bradley has indicated he does not want to pursue his verification. Therefore, this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader David Leitch, for what purpose to you seek recognition, David?"
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as a 'no' on Senate Bill 3367, please."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your wishes, Representative. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."
- Currie: Thank you, Speaker. Could the record please reflect that Representative Kelly Burke will be excused for the rest of the day?"
- Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk and the record will so note, Leader.

 Thank you. Leader Currie, on the Order of Resolutions, on page 22 of the Calendar, Barbara, you have Senate Joint Resolution 70. Mr. Clerk, Senate Joint Resolution 70."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Joint Resolution 70, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The National Conference of State Legislatures has chosen Chicago to be the host city for the annual meeting in early August of this year. Talk about economic development; we'll have thousands of our colleagues from states across the country visiting Illinois and legislative aids and lobbyists, and all the rest will be here too. A great opportunity to showcase Chicago. Senate Joint Resolution creates the host committee. There will be three

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

appointments each by the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leaders in both chambers, and ex officio Members will include the mayor of the City of Chicago, the Governor of the State of Illinois, and the head of the Chicago Convention and Tourism Bureau. Resolution does not count on any direct appropriation but it would permit the host committee to collect funds, to ask for contributions from one and all. of I'd appreciate your support for adoption the Resolution."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 70. Is there discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of its adoption signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Dunkin, Franks, Norine Hammond, Lou Lang. Would you like to be recorded, Leader Lang? Jack Franks? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Resolution, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And Senate Res... Joint Resolution 70 is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll be moving a few Bills on Second Reading, House Bills-Second Reading, we'll be... some ... some of the Amendments are ready. So, if you've got a Bill on page 3 of the Calendar I'd appreciate you following with me. Representative Berrios, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Berrios: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Toni."

141st Legislative Day

- Berrios: "Could wait a little bit. I'm just reminding everyone about the Black Caucus/Latino Caucus end of Session party that will be tonight starting at 6:00. There will be soul food and Mexican food available, so come on down and celebrate with us on Edwards and College, caddy-corner from Boone's. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative. Representative John Bradley, Representative Bradley, on page 3 of the Calendar, House Bills-Second Reading, you have House Bill 4204. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4204, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bradley, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley on the Amendment...
 Floor Amendment 1."
- Bradley: "I move for the adoption of House Floor Amendment #1, move it to Third, and hold it on Third."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on the Amendment. Is there any discussion? 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: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley on Floor Amendment #2."
- Bradley: "I also move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Mike Zalewski, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, Michael you have House Bill 4239. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4239, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1, 3, and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski, Floor Amendment #1."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #1. It addresses some concerns that were made by the Township Assessors and the… and it's language we think we can work out with the landlords. So, I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. Representative Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. What... what's the... inquiry of the Chair. What's the status of Amendment #4?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerl... Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "I believe, Representative, you have 1, 3, and 4. Would you like to withdraw Amendment 1?"

141st Legislative Day

- Zalewski: "So, Mr. Speaker, I ask to withdraw my previous request and only adopt Floor Amendment #4. Withdraw 1 and adopt Floor Amendment..."
- Speaker Lyons: "You wish to withdraw... the Gentleman moves to withdraw Floor Amendment #1. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, do you wish to withdraw Floor Amendment #3?"
- Zalewski: "Correct, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves to withdraw Floor Amendment #3. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lyons: "I think this is the one you want, Representative, Floor Amendment #4."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to adopt Floor Amendment #4.

 It's the... I gave the..."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor

 Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Seeing none...

 Representative Dennis Reboletti on the Amendment."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, does this Amendment remove any of the opposition to the leg... the underlying legislation?"
- Zalewski: "So, Representative, what I know to be true about the current status of who's opposed and who's again... for this Bill is that, with the adoption of the language in Floor Amendment #4 the landlords are... are in favor of the Bill. I

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

cannot speak to the Township Assessors or Metro Counties but we continue to work with them and we're simply we're running... I'm running out of Calendar here. So, I... I wish to keep the process moving."

- Reboletti: "I understand that. Is it your hope that you'll be able to work out those issues with those entities prior to going to a full vote?"
- Zalewski: "I... I think so, Representative. I think if anything we can get this resolved in the Senate and bring it back but I think we're there on agreement. I just got to qui... make sure the... that the Township Assessors and the Metro Counties are aware of what I'm trying to accomplish. We had a meeting today, I think I made a pretty good case. So, we'll see what happens."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tracy on the Amendment... on the Bill? We'll get there right back to you, Jil. Representative, we're going to take that Bill out of the record. Representative Jil Tracy, personal privilege."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have a point of personal privilege. One of our House colleagues, Representative Paul Evans is celebrating his 25th wedding anniversary today with his wife Sandy, who is not going to get to be with him today, but at... he gets to be with us. Isn't that great? So, let's all wish Representative Paul Evans a happy 25th wedding anniversary and many more."
- Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, Paul. Paul, good blessings for another 25. Representative Dan Burke, on the Order of House Bills-Second Readings, you have, on page 3 of the Calendar,

141st Legislative Day

- House Bill 4277. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4277, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Dan Burke."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke on Floor Amendment #1."
- Burke, D.: "Actually, Mr. Speaker, I just want to do Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, we've been advised that both Amendments need to be adopted. Leader Burke, we've been advised that both Amendments need to be adopted. Out of the record. Representative Reboletti... Representative Reboletti. We have on page 5 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Readings, Senate Bill 180. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1073, offered by Representative Bellock. House Resolution 1074, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 1075, offered by Representative Gordon. House Resolution 1076, offered by Representative Beiser. House Resolution 1078, offered by Representative Kosel. And House Resolution 1080, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, would you please advise

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

the chamber on the House Committee schedule. There's a purple sheet of paper, but we'll have the Clerk read through the committees which will be immediately after Session adjourns."

Clerk Bolin: "Three committees have been scheduled following adjournment. Agriculture & Conservation will meet in Room D-1, Elections & Campaign Reform in Room 115, and Personnel & Pensions will meet in Room 413. All three committees meeting immediately upon adjournment. Two committees will meet tomorrow morning at 9:30. The Revenue Committee will meet in Room 115, and the Disability Services Committee will meet in Room 413. These two committees are meeting tomorrow morning at 9:30."

Speaker Lyons: "And now, seeing no further business to come before the Illinois House of Representatives, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned to the hour of 11 a.m. But please note, Members, the hour of 11 a.m. tomorrow could change like it did today. So, staff, secretaries, please make a note, the hour is set for 11:00 now, call the office first thing in the morning in case that changes a little later. So, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned to the hour of 11 a.m., tentatively, on Thursday, May 24. All those in favor of adjournment signifor... by saying... signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And allowing Perfunctory time for Clerk, the House stands adjourned to Thursday, May 24, tentatively, at the hour of 11 a.m. Have a great evening, everyone."

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Second Reading of Senate Bills to be held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 179, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 402, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 953, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1567, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Senate Bill 2315, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2332, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2348, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2390, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2394, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2424, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2428, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2437, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2456, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2979, a Bill for an Act concerning the economic Senate Bill 3168, a Bill for an Act development. concerning public employees. Senate Bill 3245, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 3522, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Senate Bill 3629, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 3802, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6174, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation.

141st Legislative Day

5/23/2012

Correction... House Bill 6174, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 6175, offered by Representative Cavaletto (sic-Costello), a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. First Reading of these House Bills. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."