144th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2012: recommends be adopted referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 3514. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."
- Speaker Lyons: "Good morning, 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 Lee Crawford. Lee is the Pastor of the Cathedral of Praise Christian Center here in Springfield. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and pagers, and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Lee Crawford."
- Pastor Crawford: "Let us pray. Most gracious and most holy God in Heaven, the God of all wisdom, the God of all power, the God of all presence, the God of all creation, today we invoke Your blessings upon this august Assembly, upon the Speaker of this House, upon its Leaders, as well as, all of its Members. May they be empowered today with Your wisdom from above. May they be led today by Your precious spirit. Today may they find strength in You, oh God. May Your grace, may Your mercy, may Your peace be with them throughout this day. And, forevermore, we pray in Your precious Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative André Thapedi, would you please lead us in the Pledge."

144th Legislative Day

- Thapedi et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Acevedo and Jones are excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Leader Bost, Republicans."
- Bost: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Hatcher, Poe, Sacia, and Schmitz are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Clerk, take the record.

 There's 109 Members responding to the Roll Call, a quorum is present. We're prepared to do the work for the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Report. Representative Will Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2413. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1113, offered by Representative Jakobsson is... is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lyons: "Members, I'm going to be starting on page 6 of Senate Bills-Third Readings. So, if you want to follow along with me, I don't think there is any Amendments waiting for any of us. So, we're taking them pretty much

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

right down... right down the page 6. So, Representative Hernandez, you have the first Bill, Senate Bill 3677. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3677, a Bill for an Act concerning human rights. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lisa Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Attorney General's Office. Senate Bill 367... 677 gives the OAG the power to enforce a subpoena under the Human Rights Act. Adding subpoena power under the Human Rights Act will allow the OAG to more effectively investigate claims of discrimination. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 36... Representative Chapin Rose."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative, will the Attorney General's Office be issuing the subpoena or would it be coming from the Human Rights Commission?"

Hernandez: "It would be the Attorney General's Office."

Rose: "Well, that... what we're looking at is the Human Rights

Commission. The Attorney General would be going to court to

try to enforce a subpoena."

Hernandez: "I'm sorry. You're right, Representative. It would be the Human Rights Act and it... it would be under the... but it would be the OAG's Office that would..."

Rose: "Well, what are the actions that the Attorney General would contemplate using a subpoena, for that aren't… they

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

can't already do that? And what type of subpoena are we talking about?"

Hernandez: "Well, currently what happens is if there is an investigation that has to take place and there is a subpoena that is... that is placed or submitted, the... those who are subpoena because there is no enforcement into it, can basically not respond to the subpoena; therefore, it... it makes it more difficult for the Attorney General's Office to pursue the investigation."

Rose: "So, how can they just not respond to a subpoena?"

Hernandez: "So, under current law, the OAG must conduct a pril… a preliminary investigation into claims under the Human Rights Act before initiating a civil action against an employer, or another person cover under the Act for engaging in a... what they call a pattern in practice of discrimination. The ability to issue a subpoena is an inse... a essential tool in conducting an investigation. Unfortunately, if an individual fails or refuses to respond to a subpoena, the OAG has no authority under the current law to compel him to do so."

Rose: "Why was the current law enacted without the authority to compel..."

Hernandez: "I'm sorry."

Rose: "Why was the current law enacted without the authority to compel production of a subpoena documents? Why was the current law enacted without the authority of a court to compel a subpoena document?"

Hernandez: "I... I wouldn't know. I don't know."

144th Legislative Day

- Rose: "I mean, maybe there was a good reason. And we don't… we don't know what the reason was?"
- Hernandez: "My understanding is that this is a way to basically dis... disincentify the... from ep... from that escalate. So, if there... if there is an investigation on a claim, before it really just gets out of hand where, you know, subpoenas are ignored, that's why we're looking to... to pass this Bill."
- Rose: "Well, I understand what you're doing, I'm just wondering why it was left out in the first place. There may have been a very good reason for it. So, I'll listen to the rest of the debate and we can move on. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lyons: "No one further seeking recognition, Representative Hernandez to close."
- Hernandez: "I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3677 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, Kelly Burke, Carli, Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Franks, Nekritz, Williams. Democrats, want to record, yourself. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On the Bill, there's 65 Members voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2012: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 1110."

144th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Continuing, Members, on page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Fortner, you have Senate Bill 3685. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3685, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 3685 clarifies that the existing list of amateur martial arts are intended to be not defined as full contact martial arts under the purposes of the Act and it adds Jujutsu and Kyuki-do to that list."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Senate Bill 3685. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Sara Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the record, I was a 'yes' on Senate Bill 3677. I failed... my switch wasn't working."
- Speaker Lyons: "All right, Sara, the Journal will reflect your request. Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3685 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Golar, Skip. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carol Sente, on page 6 of the Calendar,

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

under Senate Bills-Third Readings, you have Senate Bill 3689. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3689, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Carol Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Currently, Illinois has an instant scratch-off game called 'Veteran's Cash'. It benefits veterans and has been created since 2008. This Bill amends the Illinois Lottery Law adding language that can... that net revenues from the special instant scratch off game can now be used for veteran employment and training. It does not remove any of the previous items."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation of the Bill. Is there any discussion? Representative Renée… Leader Renée Kosel."

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

Speaker Lyons: "She indicates she will."

Kosel: "Thank you. When... when the lottery games were first instituted, those moneys were to go to education. And where I absolutely applaud what you're trying to do with this, this again is another diversion from education and the original purpose that the lottery was... was set up for. You are... were you aware that that is what you are doing?"

Sente: "I am aware the original lottery was set up for education, but this fund has been specifically created for veterans and I'm not altering that."

Kosel: "And it is... is it going to take additional hours...
dollars from education?"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Sente: "No. It's... it's adding a category to a veteran's lottery scratch-off."

Kosel: "But... but I guess what I'm trying... what I'm trying to
 figure out, so I know how I want to vote on this, is... is
 will this stay within the allotted one that's already there
 which I did not support?"

Sente: "Correct."

Kosel: "Okay. So..."

Sente: "It will stay in the allotted one. No more will go to...
it will stay within the veteran's category. It will not
subtract any funds from education."

Kosel: "Okay. So, it will not increase the funds in this line it will just divert some for this purpose."

Sente: "It will not increase the line item at all."

Kosel: "Will it... but it will divert some towards job training."

Sente: "Some of the existing funds, correct."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, I thought there were already too many scratch-offs for this and that. I had something in there that would inform people about prosthesis and I was told that this was pretty full. How come you get to add something on to this when other people can't? Is it because you're considered a target? Do you not care to answer that?"

Sente: "Correct."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Mulligan: "Well that's too bad. Perhaps when you're on the floor and you're asked questions you should answer questions or you shouldn't be a Legislator. You should be prepared to stand up and answer questions when someone answers you a question. Good job, Leg... Representative."

Sente: "Thank you."

Mulligan: "I think that's a little right off the bat. When someone asks you specifically why you're allowed to do something..."

Sente: "Do you have any questions about the Bill itself, Rosemary?"

Mulligan: "Yes, I'm asking you why you're allowed to add another scratch-off category when other people aren't."

Sente: "I'm picking up a Sullivan... Senator Sullivan's Bill. It adds a category for veterans. I'm in support of veterans; I'm on that committee. And you may wish to vote on this Bill as you desire, but I think this is a great Bill. Thank you."

Mulligan: "You may think it's a great Bill, but I think the...

the basis of my questioning is why you're allowed to do
something when someone else isn't in this thing. I served
on the group for returning veterans. I let my spot go to
Representative Watson who actually is a veteran. We looked
at this because so many people are coming back without
limbs. That was eliminated, but they're letting you do
something on this because my feeling is because you're
considered a target, you're getting special treatment. I
think this is really a bad way to do legislation. It may be

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

a perfectly good piece of legislation, but I basically think this is the wrong way to work."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're getting a little testy first thing on Saturday morning. I stand in support of the Lady's Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh..."

Harris, D.: "Let's understand what she's doing here. There are already four..."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh..."

Harris, D.: "...separate checkoff... excuse me, four separate scratch... specialty scratch-off games. One is for veterans, one is for HIV research, the other is for breast cancer, and there's one more. I forget what the fourth one is. There are four specialty scratch-off games. This Lady is not adding anything new; she's not adding a new scratch-off. What she's doing is she's saying that the moneys that were initially directed strictly for veterans can now be used in a broader category for veterans training and unemployment assistance. She's not adding a new scratch-off. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Chuck Jefferson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Jefferson: "Representative, I applaud you for this Bill. We, in the State of Illinois, don't do enough for our veterans as they go to serve us, to protect us, to keep us free. And they come back oftentimes not being able to find a job for their families, to support their families, and to do the

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

things they need to do to become productive citizens. Just a couple questions, if you will. Who determines where this money goes? Is there a mechanism in place to make sure these veterans receive these dollars?"

Sente: "The... I can't answer that question."

Jefferson: "Okay. And the reason for that question is that I want to make sure these dollars are getting to the people that we want to receive them because they do need help here in the State of Illinois. And anything we can do to support our veterans I think we need to do. So, when I first came into the General Assembly, I think we were number 45 or 46 in our treatment for our veterans and that's certainly too high for the State of Illinois. We're supposed to be leading by example. Our veterans come back home and can't find work, and can't find housing, can't find things that they need just to go from day to day. So, I applaud you for this Bill. I hope those moneys get to the people they determined to get to. And I will be supporting this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente to close."

Sente: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3689 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Will Davis, David Harris. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 101 Members vot... 101 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no', 3 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional

144th Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ann Williams, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Williams: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect that I intended to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 3677."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your intentions.

 Representative Robyn Gabel, you have Senate Bill 3690. Read
 the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3690, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Robyn Gabel."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3690 amends the long-term care rebalancing section of the state budget law by including the definition of long-term care rebalancing. A specific consideration of the costs associated with medically compromised older adults that require institutional care and older adults that only require community support services. The purpose is to just give some guidance to the executive branch and to help them keep in mind that the very frail elderly need more help when they are considering moving people from long-term care facilities to community settings. Appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3690 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Monique Davis, Dunkin, and Mussman, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill,

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Jim Watson, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

- Watson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect I intended to vote 'aye' on 33... Senate Bill 3367."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Watson, the Journal will reflect your request. Representative Carol Sente, you have Senate Bill 3693. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3693, a Bill for an Act concerning crime victim's compensation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Carol Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3693 is a Crime Victim's Compensation Cleanup Act and an initiative of the Attorney General. This program is jointly administered by the Attorney General and the Court of Claims and the changes focus on three main areas. It broadens compensation to create parity. For example, if a victim's spouse is now added to the list of members that can obtain counseling. Number two, the Bill allows for a greater recoupment of funds; for example, funeral and burial expenses were set in 1998 and are increased in this Bill to 7500 from 5 thousand dollars. It also cleans up the restitution process where a payment has in the past occasionally been made to both the hospital and the victim and obviously, we don't want to do that. The third area is it codifies existing case law and it clarifies terms making the program easier for the victim and his or her family to understand their rights and

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

navigate the process. This Bill has had unanimous support in the Senate and none of these changes proposed in the legislation result in any increase in the general revenue fund."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Representative Cha... Brad... Brady... Representative Dan Brady... Leader Brady."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brady: "Representative, you indicated in your remarks there's no increase to the general revenue fund with... with this Bill. Is that correct?"

Sente: "Yes."

Brady: "You also indicated that funeral and burial reimbursements are increased to \$7500. Is that correct?"

Sente: "Yes, I did."

Brady: "How's... how's that happen if there's no increase in revenue?"

Sente: "Because there are net savings in other places. For example, the other thing I explained is sometimes were... they were sending reimbursements both to the hospital as well as the individual. That would be a double payment. In this area it would be a savings. And so, that's where there's a no net change in the revenue fund."

Brady: "That's very... very interesting. When we're roughly \$10 million behind in Medicaid, public aid, funeral reimbursement payments in this state, how current are we through the Attorney General's Office of paying funeral

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

reimbursements which now will be moved to \$7500? What... in other words..."

Sente: "How current are we?"

Brady: "...what... what is the... what's the turnaround time of issuing a check?"

Sente: "Okay. It's actually not the Attorney General's Office that pays that out; it's the Court of Claims. And we don't have information on how quickly they turn that around."

Brady: "The Court of Claims pays it, but it's coming through the Attorney General's Office budget. Is that correct?"

Sente: "I'm sorry, could you repeat that?"

Brady: "The Court of Claims is issuing the check. Is this coming through the Attorney General's budget or the Court of Claims budget?"

Sente: "Through the Court of Claims."

Brady: "Okay. So, with your remarks earlier that there's no increase in the general revenue fund to the Attorney General's Office, it's actually... there appears to be no increase to the general revenue fund as it pertains to the Court of Claims budget. Is that correct?"

Sente: "Did you say also no change to the Court of Claims funds?"

Brady: "Correct."

Sente: "That is also correct."

Brady: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

144th Legislative Day

- Tracy: "Representative Sente, do you know how much money is currently in this fund?"
- Sente: "We're going to look that up for you, Representative."
- Tracy: "Okay. And... and also I was wondering do we know if those funds have ever been swept?"
- Sente: "A substantial portion of that fund is federal money, but we do not know if that fund has been swept."
- Tracy: "Okay. And I'm also wondering, it's... it's been my understanding that in the past this fund has often not been enough, or yielded enough, to pay the claims that were presented to it. Is that your understanding?"
- Sente: "There is a balance right now. I don't know in years past, but currently there is a.m. excess balance in that fund."
- Tracy: "Okay. Well, as I said, it's been my understanding that there have been inadequate funds in this... this fund to pay out the claims that have been presently made over the years and I'm just wondering if we expand the amount, it seems like we'll be able to serve less victims."
- Sente: "As I mentioned, there are several items in this cleanup Bill and many of the items have nothing to do with the expenses. But part of what we are trying to do is make sure that there are not double reimbursements going out for the same item to two different vendors, a person and the hospital. And so, it feels like that the… the net… the net difference will be the same and the fund will have the amount in there. We're really just broadening some of the language. So, again, a different type of victim can get some help and then the victims themselves can navigate the

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

process on their own. That is also a substantial part of this Bill."

Tracy: "Okay. I do think, though, it will be critical to find out if the funds have been inadequate in the past to pay existing claims... claims and likewise, if the more victims...

I mean, if more compensation is paid to one victim then it seems like if the fund has been inadequate then we will compound the problem of the inadequacy of payment to victims by increasing the amount, say, in the amount of funeral services. I certainly want... I can understand why we might want to enlarge the amount, but it just seems like if it's already inadequate, then we'll just be complicating the problem even further. Also, do you know what the backlog of payments is? As far as how timely they're made?"

Sente: "No, we don't have that answer."

Tracy: "Okay. There again, I think there is a backlog and if we compound the amount that is paid per victim that likewise we'll be creating more problems than we're solving with this. I... I certainly do understand that we want to compensate victims and I think the enlargement makes sense in many ways, but I... I just think this fund has had some... some problems in the past and I don't see that we're going to help them much by adding to it. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente to close."

Sente: "I would like to add before we close that there is a cap on the amount an individual victim can get from this fund.

I do urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3693 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cole, Representative Osmond, JoAnn. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 4 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brauer."

- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You might need to send the electrician up here. On Senate Bill 3689, I should have been recorded as a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request.

 Representative Patti Bellock, you have Senate Bill 3718.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3718, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Patti Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3718 came about after all the hearings that Representative Dugan and Representative Moffitt had for the EMS System throughout the state last year. They had 17 hearings throughout the state and this is one of their suggestions that came from it. It's agreed upon Bill and it mandates that the Department of HFS set up criteria through JCAR rule regarding non-emergency transportation. And what this Bill does is say that transportation service needs to know upfront the appropriate level of transport being delivered and getting paid for that transportation at that level of service."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. The Chair recognizes Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Bellock: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, for the purposes of legislative intent, will Senate Bill 3718 as amended affect the processes by which a managed care company pays for ground ambulance services under its current contract to serve Medicaid recipients?"

Bellock: "No, it will not affect that service."

Reboletti: "And to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, with respect to this, you have ambulance companies that were required by doctors to take patients to and from various places with the assistance of an ambulance and when they went to submit their bills they were told that it was an inappropriate transportation method and they were denied any reimbursement. So, hopefully this will correct that deficiency. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Don Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to commend Representative Bellock for all of her work on this and certainly hope everyone will vote for it. Our emergency services like our ambulances, some of the bureaucratic regulations that they have to deal with, some of the things that came up in the hearing. Just as an example was, there's a situation called post/prior/approval, which, you know, they have to respond and yet they have to get approval but it's after they've already made the… the call.

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

It's trying to bring some common sense to reimbursement. We certainly need our emergency responders. Representative Bellock has worked hard on this and the only way we're going to continue to have that good service is make sure that they know the terms, the rules, the conditions that they're dealing under. So, I'm glad that this is moving forward. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to support the legislation. I appreciate the hard work of the Sponsors, particularly Representative Bellock, Representative Dugan and her group worked very hard to pull this together. And I appreciate the hard work of the people in the industry who spent a good deal of time trying to put a Bill together that actually worked for all sides. I think this is a Bill we should strongly support. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Karen May."

May: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

May: "Yes. I just have one rather technical question and... and I do appreciate your work on this, but I understand that we can save money if we don't use an ambulance, for instance, to take someone back to a nursing home. Does this in any way prevent from using a less expensive method of transportation in a non-em... you know, if it's not lifethreatening or if a doctor would approve an alternative method?"

Bellock: "No, Representative. This particular legislation does not address that issue."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

May: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dugan."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I, too... as colleagues have said, this is something that is almost unbelievable it even happens. We ask for ambulance services to provide services and they are regulated really by what the doctor or the medical physician that is taking care of this patient, if they say they need an ambulance service to be able to be transported. For the state to turn around and say and deny 68 percent of those ambulance trip costs just because they believe or someone that may be working under contract for the state agency to say we think afterwards that maybe that wasn't needed, I don't think that's the ... the call of a state agency when a medical physician says an ambulance needs to transport this patient. And that's all this is trying to do is when patients need ambulance service then they should get it and the ambulance provider should not be penalized because someone within a state agency believes that it really wasn't needed. So, thank you Representative Bellock, certainly my colleague to Representative Moffitt who we've worked very closely and the whole task force. This is one of the issues that was brought up. We need to correct it to make sure people are protected and get the services that they need. I certainly would like an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock to close."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And again, I think this Bill really addresses the issues and all of us at one time or another have to rely on ambulance service and this

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

provides a lot of transparency. And I want to thank all of the other Representatives for their comments, but especially Representative Dugan and Representative Moffitt for all the time and energy they put it traveling around the state holding 17 hearings to listen to the concerns of all the EMS providers throughout the state."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3718 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Currie, Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Michelle Mussman, Senate Bill 3724. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3724, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3724 is an invi... initiative of the Home Builders Association of Illinois to update the adoption rules of the Energy Efficiency Building Act. It makes adjustments to the timeline for reviewing, amending, and adopting the new Code and requires training programs for builders, designers, engineers, architects to help them implement these new standards. The Bill is an agreed Resolution with no known opponents. And I am happy to answer any question."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3724 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bradley, Gordon, Mautino, back row Democrats, would you like to be recorded? Skip Saviano, Michael McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Zalewski, Senate Bill 3726. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3726, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. This is an initiative of the Illinois Supreme Court. They simply want to remove some statutory reporting requirements on mandatory arbitration and they want to address the statutory clarification regarding videotaping in a courtroom. There was an old antiquated statute that dealt with witness... witnesses giving testimony in front of a video camera. Based on the courts recent efforts to become more transparent and allow for limited instances of courtroom proceedings being allowed to be videoed, we're addressing that concern. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none... Representative Mike Bost. Leader Bost"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, we're noticing that... that there was obviously an issue in the Senate. Has that been addressed?"

Zalewski: "I believe so, Representative. We added an Amendment to the Bill that probably addressed all concerns. I haven't been told that there's been any concerns with this Bill."

Bost: "It... yeah, any time it comes over and we see that many 'no' votes we're just trying to figure out, ooh, you know what... what occurred in the debate there, what the concerns might have been."

Zalewski: "Again, Representative, I have yet to hear of anyone having any sort of concern with the Bill as... as amended."

Bost: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3726. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Monique Davis, Krezwick, McAuliffe, Saviano, last row, GOP. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 2 Members voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, Senate Bill 3727. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3727, a Bill for an Act concerning health regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Department of Public Health. As you know, there has been a terrible backlog with respect to the swimming pools across in the inspections municipal pools, park pools, all those that are open to the public. This measure is a response in part to the fact that the department is seriously understaffed and that there is a major backlog in part created by new rules having to do with drains that have such powerful suction that people's lives were at risk. This Bill will prequalify architects and engineers who will be entitled to do the designs for the program. It does significantly raise fees in order to help deal with the backlog. I would be... it has support from the Park District Association, the Chicago Park District, the local public health departments who themselves would be qualified to do the inspections and I believe that it is also supported by all those who deal with municipal and public swimming pools across Illinois. I'd be happy to answer your questions. We really need to get rid of the backlog. We need to give the department the resources it needs to do the job that our public health and safety requires."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. There's many people looking for... to respond. I'll put the two-minute timer on. I'll be as respectful as I can. Representative Brauer, you're the first speaker."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

144th Legislative Day

- Brauer: "Leader, we have a facility in our district here called Knight's Action Park and the increase that they have will be prohibitive as far as what they'll get in return. Is there any... any additional services, 'cause we're looking at a fee somewhere around \$5 thousand?"
- Currie: "Well, let me just say, I've heard from that individual as well, Representative, but I have not heard from others. First, the fees have not been increased in 38 years. Most people who operate public pools recognize that we have to do something and I know the department has written to that particular owner and I think they make the point quite responsibly that we can't let this backlog continue, we can't leave pools closed during the summer months, we have to... it's a crisis. I would say we have to do something and I would just reiterate that that is the only pool operator that I have heard negative comments from. The park districts, the municipal people, they all recognize that we really have to do this."
- Brauer: "Well, I think if we haven't raised fees for 30-some years we should be commended."
- Currie: "Well, if we could do the job without raising fees, I would absolutely agree, but the reality is that without this measure the department is not going to be able to provide safe, healthy swimming pools for our children all summer long."
- Brauer: "Well, the Governor's Office explained to me that I was mistaken, that Doug Knight was mistaken and that they would like to actually send somebody over to our office to explain it to us and they never did."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Currie: "Well, I'll make sure that they do. I apologize for their lack of civility."
- Brauer: "Well, one final question. There's also talk of raising the minimum wage."
- Speaker Lyons: "Brauer, your time expired. I'll give you time to finish your question."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so, with the raising of the minimum wage, with the raising of this fee here for the inspection, it's going to put a huge burden on this operator. Is there any way that we could look at these operations like this because, quite frankly, it only takes four hours for that inspection and to charge him, you know, \$3, \$4, \$5 thousand to me is a little burdensome."
- Currie: "But Representative, a minimum wage increase in not part of Senate Bill 3727. This deals only with swimming pool inspections and examinations."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kosel, two minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Kosel: "Thank you. When this appeared before committee, we talked a little bit about the effective date. Is the effective date still a year from now or were you able to get it moved up?"
- Currie: "I talked to the department after the committee on exactly that point, Representative, and what they say is that it's going to take that long. Even if we moved up the effective date, for them to put the rules in place will take long enough that they don't see the passage of this

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Bill is going to be able to get rid of the backlog immediately."

Kosel: "So we will be..."

Currie: "I think your point was very well-taken."

Kosel: "Yeah."

Currie: "But what they told me after committee was that the time that it will take to do all that needs to be done to get the new program up and running and in place is just going to take a little more time."

Kosel: "Wow. So, we're going to have this backlog and I'm going to be hearing from my operators for at least another 18 months?"

Currie: "Well, they tell me that they think they're going to be able to get through this coming summer season with difficulty. One of the big problems is that they are down headcount by at least 12 in the swimming pool inspection department. So..."

Kosel: "As... as many of our other state departments are also.

We're all doing much more with much less, as we should be.

So, thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser, two minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Beiser: "Majority Leader Currie, I think you mentioned in your opening remarks about the understaffing. Is the number... what... how many people are they down in that department?"

Currie: "They tell me they are down 12 in the swimming pool licensing part of the Department of Public Health's program and that's a significant lack of... of personnel in order to

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

get these inspections done. And as I say... as I said to one of the earlier comments that the fees have not been increased in a very long time and without either more general revenue, which everybody in this chamber knows we don't have, or some kind of fee increase, they're not going to be able to hire people to perform that... that activity."

Beiser: "And I know when I approached you earlier about this legislation, I was concerned about that. It seemed maybe we were adding staff, but we actually since we are down staff we're just trying to bring that staffing level up to where it should be so they can perform their statutory duties."

Currie: "Exactly. This is not like a lot of new people that we never had before; this would enable us to fill a lot of vacancies."

Beiser: "And... and once these people are in place, this backlog should come to an acceptable level and then they'll be able to perform that so we do not have another back level of this magnitude. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Beiser: "Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, two minutes."

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

Speaker Lyons: "She... Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Leader Currie, I'm looking at the fee structure we have and I want to make it clear to everyone what the changes really are. So, is everybody at an application fee of \$50, with a license renewal fee of \$50, and a late fee of 20, and then a construction fee of 50? Is that the same

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

across the board no matter what type of swimming pool you're building, or opening, or inspecting? Or is it always based on the footprint of the pool or water park?"

Currie: "I believe it's based on the footprint of the pool, Representative."

Reboletti: "Is there a particular percentage increase in the fees across the board or is it, again, based on the size of the surface area?"

Currie: "I think it's the size of the surface area. As I say, the fees schedule has not changed in a very long time."

Reboletti: "Do you know when the last time the fees were changed?"

Currie: "I believe 38 years ago."

Reboletti: "And are these fees that can be swept?"

Currie: "I don't think so."

Reboletti: "I just wanted to make sure 'cause if we do vote for this that these fees actually go to hire the people we need to do this. When I was a prosecutor, we had a case in Will County where one of the hot... motels was not inspected and a child ended up drowning because they were drawn down to a drain that..."

Currie: "To the suction, right."

Reboletti: "...had not been inspected. And I don't think this will be looking to prevent those types of tragic incidents."

Currie: "Right, right. And in fact, part of the reason for the backlog is exactly that there are new regulations because of that the drain suction activity, that meant that they

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

had to do a lot of retro fits. So, that also has made the program subject to backlog."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tryon, two minutes."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "You know, every industry that we regulate costs money. I own an environmental testing laboratory. I have seven employees. My licensing fee to run that laboratory is \$3800, but the industry as a whole equally shares that in a graduated structure based on the license vou Especially important that we have the necessary resources for something like swimming pools, which is a public health problem, to have 12 inspectors down when we don't have enough people to license, not enough architects to review, not enough ways to manage these devices and look at them. People get sick; you get all kinds of dermatitises, you get all kinds of infections from going into swimming pools that aren't properly maintained and properly regulated. So, a fee that hasn't been raised in 30 years for something like this, or 38 years, I think it's time. I think it's time that this industry has to bare the shoulder of that cost, not the taxpayers, just like we do in many, many other industries. And I think this is a good vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Frank Mautino. Leader Mautino, two minutes."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A question of the Sponsor."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady awaits your questions."

Mautino: "In the... I see in the analysis on the Bill that this will allow some of the local health departments to play a role in the visual portion and inspections."

Currie: "Exactly."

Mautino: "Is that correct?"

Currie: "And... and they will then be compensated when they do that... when they perform those tasks."

Mautino: "Okay. I think that's a very important point of the Bill. I have... in our area there were many of the... in the school dist... the YMCA's, a major water park, who had permits that were going back and forth for about a year and a half. There are two people who review those permits and then once they review them they need to go and physically inspect them. And so, the Peru Pool, the Spring Valley Pool, the YMCA, the Grandbea... Grand Lodg... Grandbear Lodge actually had to be closed down over a holiday for a number of days because no one could physically come and look at the plan that had bounced back and forth for a year and a half. And so, the idea here would be to allow some of the inspection process to go to property... properly licensed places."

Currie: "Exactly."

Mautino: "Now, I have a number of pools who, this being Memorial Day weekend, have not been given the authorization to open for their people because there's not an approval for the two screws that go into the grate that has to be visibly seen by one of our two state inspectors. Will that be addressed going forward in this Bill?"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Currie: "Well, we'll have..."

Mautino: "They can't do it today."

Currie: "...we'll have the personnel to do the job and that's precisely why..."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mautino, your time's expired. We'll give you a minute to finish up your questions. Barbara Flynn Currie."

Mautino: "No, I... those... those are some of the concerns. Five hundred pools for public access, YMCA's, communities have been behind this bureaucratic nightmare because there's no one actually to do the work. So, I do support your Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. We need to modernize, we need to make more efficient, the operation of pool inspection in Illinois. This is an issue of public health. It's an important issue to protect our children and our grown-ups from infections and from other kinds of problems. This measure has the support of local health departments, of the park district, of the people who operate public pools, and I would certainly appreciate your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3727 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 59 Members voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', Leader Currie."

Currie: "Postpone."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Postpone."

144th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Clerk. Leader Currie. Continuing under House Bills... Senate Bill-Third Readings, we have Senate Bill 3746, Representative Moffitt. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3746, a Bill for an Act concerning volunteer emergency responders. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation would designate the third Thursday in May of each year as Volunteer Emergency Responder Appreciation Day. The original Bill included a new... would have included a new license that would have generated money for helping emergency services, but we're not doing new license plates so this strictly deals with designating the third Thursday. We also had a Resolution just for this year that designated the third Thursday; this would make that on a permanent basis. Just a way to show appreciation for our emergency responders."
- 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 3746 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? Like to be recorded, Cunningham, Mitchell, Sullivan, Pihos. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pat Verschoore, for what purpose do

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

you seek recognition, Sir? The Gentleman does not seek recognition. Continuing on page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Zalewski, Senate Bill 3764. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3764, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code. It makes a number of changes that simply update the Code pursuant to What the National Conference and Commissioners on Uniform State Laws would like. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, didn't we do this already?"

Zalewski: "What's that?"

Reboletti: "Didn't we have a House Bill like this?"

Zalewski: "We had a different House Bill, Representative. The...

my Bill... the Bill you're speakin... I think you're referring

to dealt with instances where a person files a false U.C.C.

claim with Illinois Secretary of State and it's false and

there's no current remedy in the law for that... for the

victim of that crime to... to get this claim off of their

credit report. So, that set up that structure. This is a

modification of Article 9 of the U.C.C., which as you well

know in your expertise in the... Article 9, deals with secure

transactions."

144th Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "I do remember the class very well. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's discussion. Repre...
 Zalewski to close."
- Zalewski: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3764 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Nekritz, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Tryon, you have Senate Bill 3792. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3792, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3792, it simply extends the time that a contractor can place a lien on a commercial piece of property from three to five years. In this economy, that is needed; many projects are taking even longer than five years and they have to extend the lien from the time the commencement of the project starts. This is an agreed to Bill with the bankers and the mortgage companies, and the contracting industry. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

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 3792 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Krezwick, Pihos, Durkin, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Top of page 7, Members, if you have a Bill, heads-up. Representative Mathias, you have Senate Bill 3798. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3798, a Bill for an Act to revise a law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3798 is the 97th General Assembly's first revisory Bill. As you know, every year, basically, Senator Haine and I present the revisory Bills. And what they do... and these are initiatives of LRB... is to renumber multiple versions of Sections amended by more than one Public Act. It makes stylistic changes that have... to eliminate duplications, corrects obsolete cross references. There are no substantive changes in the law in this Bill; there's probably about a thousand corrections. I'll start with number one if the Speaker wants me to continue."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "I think we can do without the thousand listing there, Representative."

Moffitt: "Thank you. Then I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, it will take 71 votes to pass this. So, that having been said, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3798 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? du Buclet, Morrison. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 'no'. This Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Jim Durkin, Senate Bill 3800. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3800, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3800 grants the Illinois Student Assistance Commission the authority to recover moneys due from delinquent borrowers."

Speaker Lyons: "Heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3800 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting... You put that light on real late Representative, real late. Representative Franks on Senate Bill 3800."

Franks: "I apologize. I was trying to read the Bill. This here,

Representative, is the ability to garnish wages you're
saying for ISAC?"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Durkin: "For those who are currently in arrears on paying back student loans it gives ISAC the authority to garnish wages for individuals who currently have student loan debt. There's \$260 million note that was taken out a few years back; there's \$30 million left which they have had no... where borrowers have not complied. Let me just tell you that 70 percent of those borrowers are University of Chicago graduates. So, I believe that..."

Franks: "Well, I'm... I'm not questioning there's a problem with student loans."

Durkin: "Uh huh."

Franks: "When you read the paper you see that's the next bubble. My question here is what kind of procedural safeguards will one have because I don't want some university saying, this guy owes me some dough and as a result I'm just going to garnish his wages. What kind of procedural safeguards do we do so we make sure that people aren't being garnished that may not own... may not owe the money?"

Durkin: "When a borrower is 90 days without payment, there is a 30-day notice given to the borrower in which they can negotiate with ISAC some type of structured repayment system. They have an ability to... if they challenge the ability, ISAC's authority at this point, they can appeal to an ALJ either in person or by phone in which there can be a negotiated settlement between both sides, but there is... there is an authority, there is notice. They have the ability to contest."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Franks: "But... wait... why do we... this is... this is an extraordinary measure for a governmental entity without a judicial safeguard because what you're asking is to allow a garnishment, and not a voluntary garnishment, but a garnishment without a court order. Isn't this extraordinary? I've never seen this before without a judgment."

Durkin: "They currently do it to recover federal loans at the ISAC. ISAC is currently... administers, but the Illinois Department of Revenue currently has that similar process."

Franks: "The Department of Revenue does?"

Durkin: "Correct."

Franks: "But this..."

Durkin: "And also ISAC currently does it to collect federal loans."

Franks: "Well... well, wait a second. I understand they're... they may be owed money, but they're not owed... they're not any... any different than any other creditor who might be owed money. So, let's assume... let's assume, for instance, that this person actually does owe some money to the university, whatever university it may be, but this person also might owe money to a bank, or to a credit union, or to a contractor who did work on his house. So, what you're saying is the student loan folks should get paid before anybody else, even if there is an existing judgment prior to them which would give them a superpriority over any other judgment creditor."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Durkin: "I don't know if that's the case, but under this the ISAC can no... cannot recover more than 15 percent of the disposable income."

Franks: "Well, that's exactly what a garnishment law is right now..."

Durkin: "Correct."

Franks: "...in the State of Illinois. You can get up to 15 percent, but the difference is you have to have a judgment and you also have to do it in line. So, if there's multiple judgments, the people who get the first judgment get collected first. What you're saying now is they get to jump in the head of line over everybody else and every other creditor is going to be pushed to the end."

Durkin: "I don't... I haven't..."

Franks: "How is that fair?"

Durkin: "I don't read that in the Bill. I mean, I..."

Franks: "Well, that's exactly what this Bill does. This is a nonjudicial garnishment for 15 percent."

Durkin: "Well, here's... here's the situation, Representative. At some point someone's going to have to pay this back whether it's going to be the taxpayers or..."

Franks: "No. Well, they can't... I agree, let them pay it back, but they should do it in line."

Durkin: "Well, the thing is, I don't know if you understand, but this is a process in which ISAC is allowed great flexibility to work with them..."

Franks: "Why should they be a more important creditor than somebody else who already has a judgment? Let's assume somebody owes you money and you sued them in your law

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

practice because you went and did something for them and they didn't pay you. So, you went and got a judgment and you get... and then you say, okay, I'm garnishing. What this Bill does is say it doesn't matter that you've got a judgment, Durkin, we're taking the money for the school. How is that fair to the other judgment creditors?"

- Durkin: "Well, I... I... you raise some very interesting comments and points, but the fact is, at the end of the day, the State of Illinois and ISAC has to recover their money and this is a..."
- Franks: "Well, they do need to recover the money, but why can't they be like everybody else? Why do we have to always say, government gets theirs first? Why is it that private businesses can at least have equal level playing field with our government? Why is it that the government gets to take our money before private individuals? I don't see why we want to make that a policy of the State of Illinois."
- Durkin: "All right. Well, you know, I guess you know, we'll differ on that and I..."
- Franks: "To the Bill. I understand there's a problem, but there's a lot of people who are owed money. To put a governmental entity before anybody else is not fair to everyone. It's also not fair because there is not a procedural safeguard to the judiciary system. And when you have existing creditors that have already played by the rules and have gotten the judgments and have filed their liens, they're going to be pushed farther down. This is a huge change from the civil practice law. It is really poor public policy because it's not fair and no one should be

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

treated as a priority. Everyone should be treated fair; we should have a level playing field, but we should not allow the government to jump to the front of the line. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Rep... Representative, I have... you... you know why I'm on this Bill. And quite frankly, Representative Jack Franks is absolutely correct. So, my question is, how many organizations in this state, excuse me, state agencies are following a similar process?"

Durkin: "ISAC currently does this to recover federal loans that they administer and also the Illinois Department of Revenue, which state..."

Dunkin: "What other agencies are administering a similar process..."

Durkin: "Revenue."

Dunkin: "...here in the state?"

Durkin: "IDOR."

Dunkin: "ID... what's IDOR?"

Durkin: "Revenue."

Dunkin: "Department of Revenue. Boy, that's a different entity given the fact... given the function of what they do, but is there... are... is there any other agency outside of Revenue that does this exact same practice?"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Durkin: "Yes, ISAC currently does this to recover federal loans that they administer. It's currently they have the garnishment authority to recover those... those loans."

Dunkin: "Is that a new approach?"

Durkin: "No, that's been in place for sometime."

Dunkin: "So, to Jack Franks' point, is there a precedent where we receive our dollars first and foremost over some of these agencie... over private entities? I mean, I really didn't understand the response to that."

Durkin: "I... I'm not quite following that, but you know, we've had this... you know, a robust discussion a few minutes ago. I'm not sure if exactly that's the law, but you know, I guess that's up for individuals to make that decision. But what we're saying is that there's \$30 million that has not been collected over bad... from student loans in the State of Illinois. ISAC needs to recover that money, if they do not, they will default. That means at some point they're going to have to recover from the Legislature or ISAC is no longer going to be able to receive credit to be able to issue those loans in the future and they will go out of the business of providing student loans for Illinoisans."

Dunkin: "So, and what... what other states are doing this very similar..."

Durkin: "I don't know."

Dunkin: "...piece of legislation?"

Durkin: "I don't know. It... I have no idea..."

Dunkin: "Come again?"

Durkin: "I have no idea. I don't know what other states do that."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Dunkin: "So, Representative, if our state's economy wasn't so bad, would this legislation be even called or considered?"

Durkin: "Yes, it would be called because the thing is, individuals have signed it... on for these loans. They have guaranteed the ISAC that they would pay over time. ISAC is doing what a responsible state agency is doing on behalf of the taxpayers to recover these moneys. And just to remind you, that 70 percent of the individuals owe the \$30 million graduated from a very prestigious university on the south side of Chicago."

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, just so you know, I'm... I'm one of those individuals who graduated from the University of Chicago and I'm current with my payments, so you know, I haven't defaulted. So, you know, that's... that's an amazing stat. I guess, you know, people are strapped for cash all across this country, certainly across this state and is this a fair way right now given where the economy is, government pushing and forcing its way in the pockets of citizens? You know, no one is proud to be in debt, or foreclosed on, or defaulting on their loans. I just think this is further pain on citizens here, Representative. Don't you agree?"

Durkin: "No, I don't. And what it does is it gives... it allows them to... in cases... this is not... we're not going after individuals who earn minimum wage. This... we're talking about individuals who do have disposable income; they are not going to ask for more than 15 percent of the disposable income in the order."

Dunkin: "What if they're not..."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Durkin: "But this..."

Dunkin: "...what if they're not working?"

Durkin: "No, no, no, hold on. You know, this is... we're... we're getting down the road here in Illinois where everything is free. The fact is, you... ISAC provides a very valuable resource to individuals who need assistance to go to college. They sign up knowing full well that there has to be a repayment of these loans. They have great flexibility to work with the... the student or the young adult to find a reasonable way to repay these loans. They have the authority to negotiate for less than 15 percent if they negotiate and work with ISAC. But the fact is, someone's got to pay this and it's not going to be the taxpayers."

Dunkin: "What if..."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin, in all due respect, I'm...

I'm not using the timer. We'll let you continue here, but

I've got a lot of other speakers. So, Ken, if you could...

bring your remarks to a close."

Dunkin: "What if they're... what if they're not working, Representative?"

Durkin: "Pardon me?"

Dunkin: "What if they're unemployed?"

Durkin: "Then they will not be... if they're unemployed then ISAC will not be seeking... they will not be seeking any assets or any moneys from any assets they have."

Dunkin: "What if they're working a part-time job under 20 hours?"

Durkin: "No, no. They will not be..."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Dunkin: "I'm trying to discern where that is in the legislation."

Durkin: "They cannot garnish wages of anybody working at minimum wage or someone who's working part-time whose wages don't add up to more than the full-time minimum wage."

Dunkin: "So, they... if they're not receiving benefits, they're not considered for garnishment?"

Durkin: "They are not going to be garnished."

Dunkin: "To the Bill. I... I, you know, the Sponsor is someone that I have the utmost respect for especially with ISAC legislation over the last... over this last Session and last year. I just think that there are a number of problems with this today in today's economy given the fact that so many people are hurting and we're using the power and the weight of government to grab ours first and to reach in and further suffocate individuals who are struggling to make ends meet. We're doing it just because we can. And I understand that ISAC has some obligations as well and I respect the fact that that's the case, but if you default on a loan, that is a major mark or impediment on your credit history. It's already... a default is already damaging enough, it's as bad as a foreclosure on your credit report. and so, I get it. I know we're strapped for cash in a lot of directions. And as a matter of fact, we're in debt. What happens if we don't pay our own money? Eighty-three billion dollars in a pension bind, we owe providers and other foll... vendors tons and tons of money. Can our wages be garnished? Can our state be garnished for this year? I mean, we're struggling to pay our own bills. And so, to further put an

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

albatross on citizens here who are not proud of the fact that they're in debt is wrong at this time. I would like to see this legislation proceed maybe when the economy picks up because right now there's still opportunity for banks to go after individuals that simply do not pay their bills. So, I'm going to vote 'no', Representative, because I don't think the economy should support us just gangstering people's money at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy. Please be respectful, Representative, we've got a lot of people that want to speak to this. Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Okay. Thank you... thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Representative Durkin, wouldn't it be... the reason that...
is it safe to say that the federal loans are funded with
federal tax dollars? The federal loans that have a priority
are funded by federal loans... or federal taxpayer money. Is
that correct?"

Durkin: "Yes."

Tracy: "And so, wouldn't it be safe to say that the state ISAC student loans are funded with stack... state taxpayer money?"

Durkin: "Precisely."

Tracy: "And so, wouldn't that be why they would have a priority over other creditors?"

Durkin: "Well, I think there's an issue... I don't believe there is anything is the legislation which states that this garnishment has a priority over any other judgment."

Tracy: "Okay. But it is using... I mean, it is..."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Durkin: "A federal loan will go first though; I know you have to do that."

Tracy: "State taxpayer money funds state student loans."

Durkin: "Correct."

Tracy: "So, also, isn't it true that if more of the state taxpayer money is refunded or cumulated back into this and returned to the student loan program that there'll be more money for student loans?"

Durkin: "That's correct."

Tracy: "So, in the end we're helping students who want to avail themselves of the student loan program."

Durkin: "Right. I mean, this... ISAC extends great flexibility to those who are currently delinquent to work out... and in cases there's forbearance when they don't have the income available to pay off the loans but at the end of the day, if ISAC cannot pay this... pay the balance of this note, as I said earlier, the consequences I think are going to be very difficult on taxpayers, but also, I think ISAC will go out of the business of issuing student loans in the future because they will not have the credit to be able to get a note."

Tracy: "Thank you. That's what I thought was..."

Durkin: "Because if they... if they default on this... this note which they took out."

Tracy: "Thank you. That's what I was hoping we would clarify is the source of the student loan money is taxpayer money and that if we return more money to the student loan program, more students will be able to access student loans. Thank you."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Greg Harris."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, G.: "Mr. Durkin, I seem to remember a couple years ago, when Congress changed the National Bankruptcy Law, didn't they say that the… one of the few exceptions to be able to discharge a debt in bankruptcy is student loans? Yes."

Durkin: "I'll... I'll defer to you."

Harris, G.: "I believe that that is the case. So, we now have a situation where under Federal Law you cannot discharge a student loan debt as part of a bankruptcy proceeding."

Durkin: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "You are... you are urging us here to say that every other creditor, whether it is a mortgage, a bank, a hospital, any other kind of provider, a credit card company, has to wait in line while these folks go first."

Durkin: "It doesn't say that. It doesn't say that in the legislation."

Harris, G.: "But that... that... I believe that that is where we are going with this. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I think this is creating a situation where you know, just... it almost seems reminiscent of the housing bubble where a lot of guys, you know, issued loans that they probably 'ought not to have lishion... issued, maybe they extended credit where they 'ought not to have, but here we're giving them a chance to get priority over everyone else to be repaid. We're allowing them to garnish people's wages; people cannot take this out in a bankruptcy under Federal Law. I

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

think this is something that we should think very seriously about and I would urge 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention for a second. A number of very critical questions have been..."

Speaker Lyons: "Shhh..."

Pritchard: "...raised and the information we've been given is misleading. There is nothing in this Bill that gives ISAC priority over any other creditor. I've talked with the ISAC agency just a few minutes ago. They do not have any priority. What they're trying to do is capture repayment from people who are ignoring any effort to recapture that loan or to repay that loan. There are people that haven't responded to the agency's request for payment in over two years. There was also a question raised about whether this is a unique program. The agency tells me there are over 32 agencies across the country that have exactly the same kind of program. This is not new; this is not cutting edge. And the final question that we all 'ought to be concerned about is what will this do to the ... to the individual's credit rating if the state sues them, as has been suggested. Ladies and Gentlemen, we'll ruin their credit history if we sue them. So, the effort to garnish wages is an effort to help them, to get them back on the payment schedule and to help the state recover money that the state owes. We've just gone through a terrible budgeting process where we made lots of cuts 'cause we don't have the revenue; right here is one place where you could get more revenue from

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

people that owe it to us. I would urge a strong 'yes' for this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ed Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I was actually going to turn my button off as Representative Pritchard did such a good... fine job. We're taking the short-eyed approach to this; let's help the people that aren't paying by voting down this Bill at the expense of two things. One, future students; if we don't have the money to continue this program because we default on these bonds we are hurting future students. Second, we just went through a discussion about cutting Medicaid because we don't have the money. Well, if we default on these bonds, where do you think that money is going to come from? Money we don't have, so we'll have to cut somewhere else. So, if you want to take the short-sighted approach and say we want to protect people that refuse to even discuss their debt, then that's fine, but you vote 'no' at the expense of future students and the potential of having to cut our budget more to pay these bud... these numbers back. So, that's the option here before us. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "We have three speakers and then we'll bring this discussion to the end. Representative Reboletti, Representative Lang, and then Representative Franks whose name was used in debate. So, Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Well, thank God, Representative's Franks name was used in debate so we can hear him go on. He didn't even put his button on time and I know you were very courteous to the Gentleman from McHenry, but I... this is breathtaking

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

here that, you know, oh, I've got my student loans, and I've got my degree now and I can't pay so, too bad. So, I know what I'll do, I'll ask Reboletti's constituents let them pay for it. This whole sense of entitlement that this society has has got to stop; go pay your debts off. When the IRS asks you to pay, you don't say, oh, maybe the bank should get my money first or Chase Bank should get it or the credit cards. Guess what, when the IRS comes, they don't care. They take priority; then they take the money. All we're trying to do is recoup money that's already been sent out by the taxpayer to bring money back to help other students. Why is this such a complicated issue? God forbid, people have to pay the bills that they owe; nobody's asking anybody anything different. People entered contractual arrangement with ISAC that we would loan them money and they would pay it back. These individuals are not paying it back; they're in default. And in bankruptcy, you can't discharge fines or penalties at a courthouse that happen in 102 counties around the state. Why is this so difficult? We're not trying to take any money away from anybody; we're not trying to get in line in front of anybody. The people of Illinois are entitled to their money back after people have had a chance to go to college, no matter it it's University of Chicago or anywhere else. The Gentleman has a good Bill. This is an important piece of legislation to get money back in to help future students. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lang."

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

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Lang: "Mr. Durkin, I think you would agree with me that it's not necessarily true that if somebody votes 'no' on this Bill it means they don't want to collect the money, right?"
- Durkin: "Well, you know what, we can have that discussion on a lot of Bills that we've had over the last few days, but I'm not going... you know, that's more of a rhetorical statement. So, I..."
- Lang: "Well, it... it is except we've had a lot of people say if you're against this Bill it means you... you're for deadbeats, you don't want to collect the money. That's not really true, but let's move on. So, my interest is not necessarily, and what I've heard about on the floor, relative to priority liens, my interest is in due process. And so, as I understand this Bill, ISAC can simply garnishee the wages of people who have a debt without any court process. Is that correct?"
- Durkin: "They will issue after 90 days, and for individuals who do have the wherewithal to pay, they will be issued a notice. They can respond. It'll be a 30-day notice. They can challenge it and go to an ALJ, work out a settlement or they can challenge the... the actions by ISAC. So, there is a... an administrative procedure in place with an administrative law judge."
- Lang: "How do they determine if somebody has the wherewithal to pay? What process do they use?"
- Durkin: "They have a collection department. I... I don't know the... the nuances of how they go about that, Representative."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Lang: "So, Sir, I'm familiar with the collection department at ISAC and this is not a bunch of collection experts, right? So, if they... if they were using members of the Creditors Bar Association of Illinois, they'd have a bunch of experts, but they don't have a bunch of experts, they have a bunch of state bureaucrats. So, they... these state bureaucrats are going to determine who can and cannot pay and then they're going... they're going to decide on their own how much they owe and simply garnishee wages after this process you described. Is that correct?"

"Again, I have confidence in the staff at ISAC to be able to make a proper determination of what moneys are due. They've been doing it already with the federal loan program, but there are safeguards in place which will protect these individuals who owe an obligation to ISAC. It's not hard and fast. ISAC has given tremendous flexibility to determine whether or not, under what conditions these individuals can make payments and they can enter into long-term payment plans and I think that's the responsible thing to do. Ι don't think this overreaching; I believe this is responsible. And again, if we are going to not allow ISAC to go down this road and collect these types of loans, they're going to be out of the business of providing student loans to students in Illinois 'cause they're not going to get credit to be able to take out a note or any type of obligation down the road."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Lang: "Mr. Durkin, why can't they just sue these people? How many people have ISAC sued this year that owe money to the State of Illinois?"

Durkin: "You think... I don't think that's going to help the student's credit rating if they're going to be sitting in judgment named as a defendant in a Circuit Court action. But anyway, who's going to pay for the attorneys on the state side; that is the problem. It's going to take years and years. And you know as well as I do of the slow-moving Circuit Court of Cook County."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. You know, for many years I was a creditor's attorney and I've been on the floor defending the rights of creditors to collect money that's due and owing to them from... from debtors. And I share with Mr. Durkin and have worked with him on legislation regarding ISAC and regarding the collection of money due the State of Illinois, but we still have to proceed with due process. We still have to proceed with something other than one bureaucrat looking at a piece of paper and deciding what a graduate student owes the State of Illinois. That we cannot allow a state bureaucrat, or a state bureaucracy, or a state agency to simply pick a number, the number may be correct but the number may be incorrect, and decide without a court process, or without due process, or without service of summons, or without a... a court proceeding to determine the balance that a debtor owes. I think even debtors are entitled to due process of law. And yes, it is true that almost all of these people owe the money. And yes, it is true that if the system ISAC puts into place, if it's a

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

good system, the balance will be correct. But we cannot allow a system to move forward where a handful of people have their wages garnisheed when it's not appropriate, or have their wages garnisheed when they've been making payments, or have their wages garnisheed if we don't know the exact balance. You know, Bill Black, who used to be among us, used to talk about people going to Chicago from his community and getting parking tickets, but except they were never in Chicago. And they were forced to pay parking tickets that weren't theirs. We run the risk with this Bill that that same thing will happen. We have to collect the money, and I'd be happy to work with Mr. Durkin and ISAC to make that happen, but we should not and cannot allow debts to be forced on people, wages to be garnisheed without due process of law. This should be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker, whose name was used in debate will be Jack. Jack, please two minutes. Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I apologize for my tardiness before. And I really appreciate the indulgence of this spirited debate. I find it very ironic that our state, which is the largest deadbeat entity in the world who doesn't pay anybody is saying now, we're going to go garnish people who don't pay. Maybe every vendor we have in the State of Illinois 'ought to be able to garnish us. Why not? Because that's what you're saying; we're a deadbeat. We don't pay; take the money. Listen, ISAC has the power right now to sue just like every other creditor. They have the ability, they just don't use it. They do not need to

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

have any special privileges and nobody is saying that people shouldn't pay their bills; all we're saying is that the creditors should be treated similarly. Right now, there's record student debt. It is the next bubble. What this Bill would effectively do is kick people while they're down, it will force much more bankruptcies, it will spike our foreclosures, it will hurt our economy. One of the previous speakers said that this was not a priority. Of course it's a priority because what you're saying is you don't have to go to court, you don't have to get a judgment, you can just take people's money. Now, people want to also try to budget as well. Now, let's assume they have high interest rate credit cards, let's assume they may have mortgages and cars they have to pay. So, what you're saying is everybody else isn't going to get paid, we're going to get our student money. It's the wrong policy. And I just think it's wrong for the state to be doing something like this and really statutory allowing of larceny. It's just wrong. We need to have the procedural safeguards pushed in for any defendant. Every person should have their day in court; this takes that away. Please vote no."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Durkin to close."

Durkin: "You know, this is really interesting. A lot of the comments that I've heard have absolutely nothing to do with this Bill. One, there's absolutely no priority that's in this legislation that is given to this loan. Secondly, anybody who is subject to an administrative proceeding does have the ability to appeal to the Circuit Court, an administrative decision. So, there is process in place, but

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

at the end of the day, ISAC needs to get their money repaid. They are very, very thoughtful and considerate to individuals who do currently owe debt. We're talking individuals who are 90 days out of making payments and I want to emphasize, 70 percent of them are University of Chicago graduates. And at last time I checked, the University of Chicago graduate diploma usually gets you a fairly good paying job. By the end of the day, if we don't make... allow ISAC to recover this money, they will go out of the business of providing student loans in the future. This is a good Bill; it's responsible. Let them do their job, let them pay their bills. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "After a thorough discussion, the question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3800 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bradley, Connelly, Farnham, May, Nekritz. Bradley, May, Nekritz. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 63 Members voting 'yes', 44 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Chad Hays. The Gentleman does not seek recognition. Connie Howard, on page 7 of the Calendar, Connie, you have Senate Bill 3823. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3823, a Bill for an Act concerning child visitation, which may be referred to as the Steven Watkins Memorial Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Connie Howard."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3823 creates procedures for the suspension of parents' driver's licenses if they do not comply with a court's visitation order. It creates a method for issuing a restricted driver's permit for necessary transportation such as work, doctors' visits, transportation from school, et cetera, if the parent's license is suspended. And it adds incentives for the parent to follow the order through added penalties such as a \$500 fine, suspension of driving privileges, placement on probation, and imprisonment, not to exceed six months. I urge a 'yes' vote."

"You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there Speaker Lyons: any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3823 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Cole, Hammond, McAuliffe, Jerry Mitchell, back row GOP. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, going back to page 3 of the Calendar, there are two Bills on Second Reading and we'll be moving them forward. On page 3 of the Calendar, under House Bills-Second Reading, Representative Zalewski, you have House Bill 5192. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5192, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- #3, offered by Rep... offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Zalewski on Floor Amendment #3."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. It adds some technical changes to the Bill that I'm happy to discuss on Third Reading, but the technical changes are purely technical in nature."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 5192, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Mike Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 5192 creates the Illinois Independent Tax Tribunal. As the Body well knows, last fall Chairman Bradley of the Revenue Committee convened a series of hearings and then we pas... acted upon any number of tax reform measures. One of the components of that Bill was the creation of an Illinois Independent Tax Tribunal. Due to the hard work and negotiation of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Taxpayers' Federation, Leader Currie and myself, along with Spokesperson Harris, the... the product of our work is before you today. There are a number of components of the Bill, but the important parts

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

of the Bill and the important thing to remember is this, going forward we will add another mechanism by which a taxpayer, if they believe that the Illinois Department of Revenue has made a mistake or there's been an inaccuracy or other, some sort of form of wrong conducted upon the taxpayer and the threshold level is over \$15 thousand, that taxpayer will be able to go to this independent body that's separate from the Department of Revenue and exercise their due process rights in a hearing. Again, the Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Taxpayers' Federation support this Bill. It's my understanding that, and I have a letter stating such, that if we were to implement this legislation our ranking would improve significantly amongst states in which to do business. So, again, I'm happy to answer any questions, but this is an important piece of legislation that is a result of part of the tax reforms we did last spring... or last fall and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "I'll put the timer on again for two minute.

We'll certainly be as lenient as we need to be with that,
but I appreciate everyone staying within the time frame.

Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do stand in support of this legislation. As the Gentleman said, it was a result of the Bill that we passed last year in the fall that said we should create a tax tribunal which gives individuals that have a complaint pending with the... with the Department of Revenue an opportunity to move that outside of the Department of Revenue to a more independent body. As the Gentleman said,

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

the Council of State Taxation, by implementing this change in our law, it would raise the ranking by the Council of State Taxation of Illinois's business-friendly attitude. The Gentleman has spent many, many hours in many meetings negotiating the Bill. The Chamber of Commerce is fully in support. The one issue that came up which I think is valid but one which we really couldn't get over is the threshold is \$15 thousand. So, if a.m. if a problem is less than \$15 thousand, it perhaps disadvantages a smaller taxpayer but it generally those larger taxpayers especially in the business level that need this sort of independent advice. There is a... a fee for filing of \$500. We think it's reasonable especially when you're talking about larger sums of money that are involved. It avoids... hopefully, it avoids having to go to court, but you still have that remedy if you choose to go that way. So, it is a bipartisan Bill. It was agreed to. It's agreed to by the Chamber of Commerce. Again, I stand in support and urge a 'yes' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Riley, two minutes, Al."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will make an attempt.

Representative Zalewski, what's the threshold, the dollar threshold which would, you know, have a person or an entity go before this tribunal?"

Zalewski: "Fifteen thousand dollars."

Riley: "How much?"

Zalewski: "Fifteen, one, five."

Riley: "Okay. What consideration that was... I mean, how did that threshold... how was it determined? You know, why not people

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

with a lower threshold who, you know, maybe more aggrieved with their situation?"

Zalewski: "There's... there's... an excellent question, Representative. The... the best answer I can give you is the Department of Revenue hand... previously handled most of these cases. We're of the opinion that in order to not inundate this new agency with several hundred tax cases going forward and bury it just like we experienced with PTAB, the Property Tax Appeal Board, we need to see if the \$15 thousand threshold works, make sure that taxpayers are getting their fair hearing, keep the smaller taxpayers with the Illinois Department of Revenue, which can be a more informal process and if we determine that, in fact, small business... or that business owners are... and taxpayers are using the tribunal and it's working the way it was intended, we're a continuing Body, we can always come back and reduce the threshold. But for now, in an interest of making sure efficiency and fairness rule, we're going with the \$15 thousand threshold."

Riley: "But don't you think this could be viewed as, you know, another... another out or another resort for businesses to appeal their, you know, their problems with revenue rather than an individual?"

Zalewski: "It's... what I... what I..."

Riley: "So, it gives those businesses another chance to maybe get out of, you know, their... their tax liability."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative, your two minutes are over.

We'll give you another minute to finish your discussion."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Zalewski: "So, what I would say is this was the Illinois business community request and when... one of their requests when we did the tax reform package last fall..."

Riley: "And that's my point, it was their request."

Zalewski: "Excuse me, Representative?"

Riley: "I said, that's my point, it was their request and so all I'm saying is don't you think there may be a perception that this measure is just geared for businesses rather than individuals who may have, you know, more of a... of an impact?"

Zalewski: "Well, we're of the opinion that the \$15 thousand threshold is the appropriate way to separate those instances where there's a significant liability at issue and we can resolv... we can give that business a fair hearing; where the smaller taxpayers, should they choose to... if there's a liability, most... most times those instances with smaller liabilities go to the Department of Revenue. It's simply a clerical error or the document was missing or some other explanation. The Department of Revenue in an informal process can better handle manage those matters."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bradley, two minutes, John.

Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I rise in support of this piece of legislation. I wanted to compliment Representative Zalewski, Representative Harris for their terrific work on this. This was a piece that wasn't completed when we did some other work last year, but we believed in the democratic process

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

and this is an example that both parties working together for the common interest of the people of the State of Illinois that democracy does work. And I just want to compliment this committee for putting this together. I would strongly recommend and encourage an enthusiastic 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how much do… will these administrative law judges be paid? I noticed there's…"

Zalewski: "I'm sorry. Representative, can... I... Mr... Mr.. Mr. Speaker, I can't hardly hear."

Speaker Lyons: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there's a discussion on a Third Reading House Bill. The Sponsor's having a hard time hearing. Could we bring the noise level down. Shhh..."

Zalewski: "Rep... Representative, did you ask what the compensation level for the Chief ALJ is..."

Reboletti: "Yes."

Zalewski: "...or the Chief Judge of the Tribunal?"

Reboletti: "Right."

Zalewski: "It's going to be the… commensurate with the Department of Revenue director's salary which is… I don't mean to break… divulge this information, but it's \$108… \$138 thousand last year."

Reboletti: "Well, I assume that's public information. Where will these additional individuals be located? Will they be in Springfield, Chicago, or divided up, and travel?"

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Zalewski: "What... what... what we said... what we said in the Bill, Representative, is they must maintain separate and distinct offices from the Department of Revenue to ensure that the perception is there of independence. So... with the principal offices in Springfield and Chicago. So, assuming the state has enough office space, we'll find... we'll find... they'll be located in one of those two places but separate and apart from the department."
- Reboletti: "Will they travel back and forth to Chicago for individuals that are up near us to go have their hearings or will individuals have to travel down from the Chicagoland area to Springfield to have a hearing?"
- Zalewski: "So... so, in those instances where they're within a 100 mile radius of either Cook or Sangamon, when appropriate, those will be their respective locations. If they're outside of that 100 mile radius, they can request a hearing closer to their... to their place of business or where they are located and that request will likely be granted."
- Reboletti: "And once the body comes up with a decision is that...

 can that be appealed in Circuit Court?"
- Zalewski: "It's going to go directly to the Illinois..."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, we'll give you another minute."
- Zalewski: "It's going to go directly to the Illinois Appellate Court."
- Reboletti: "Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Zalewski to close."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Zalewski: "Thank you to Chairman Bradley, to Leader Currie, to Spokesperson Harris, to staff Justin Cox, to everyone that helped out with this piece of legislation. It's a good piece of legislation and it's going to help Illinois's businesses climate. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should House Bill 5192 pass?'
 All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Mautino, and Ramey, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, we have some Amendments pending. We'll go through some Bills that are ready to move. And on page 8 of the Calendar, Representative Greg Harris, you have Senate Bill 1351. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Greg Harris, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Harris on Floor Amendment #2."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd like to briefly describe what this Floor Amendment does. This was some language that Representative Bellock and I worked out after committee. This is to be sure that there would not be

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

room within the underlying legislation to have any kind of program expansion within a Medicaid funded service. So, this was worked out on a bipartisan agreement. And I'd appreciate your support on this Amendment and then we'll talk about the Bill."

- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading and we'll hold that Bill on the order of Third Reading. Representative Golar, Esther Golar. Representative... Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, you have Senate Bill 1673. What's the status of that Bill, Mr. Clerk? Out of the record on request of the Sponsor. Out of the record. Representative Ken Dunkin. Representative Dunkin on the floor? Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on the bottom of page 9, Leader, you have Senate Bill 2578. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2578, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments.

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading, Leader. Esther Golar, you have Senate Bill 1531. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1531, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Golar, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Golar, on Floor Amendment #4."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #4. And it states, if the premises for which a license was issued or located within in a city, village, or incorporated town, having a population of 1 million of more inhabitants and the local liquor control commissioner has a reason to believe that any continued operation of the licensed premises poses an excessive risk to the health, safety, or welfare of the community then the local liquor control commissioner may upon the issuance of a written order stating the reason for that conclusion and without notice or hearing, order the licensed premises closed for not more than 30 days giving a licensee an opportunity to be heard during that period provided that if the sale of alcohol liquor is incidental through the sale of food or other goods and services then the order shall other... only apply to the sale of alcoholic liquor."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Golar, that's the Amendment?"

Golar: "Yes."

Speaker Lyons: "Or is that the Bill? The Amendment? Leader Bost on..."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Bost: "Is there another Amendment in the Rules at this time?"

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, status on this Bill."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 has been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #5 was filed today."
- Bost: "Floor Amendmen... okay."
- Speaker Lyons: "Take that Bill out of the record. We'll get that squared away, Leader Bost. Thank you. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing on some Second Readings. We have, on page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2643, Representative Lilly. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2643, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor. No further Amendments. A fiscal note as amended by House Amendment 2 has been requested but not filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll hold that Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Jackson, under the Order of Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 2761. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2761, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Beiser, you have Senate Bill 2822. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2822, a Bill for an Act concerning land. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for consideration by Representative Beiser."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Beiser on Floor Amendment #3."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor... this is the IDOT Land Conveyance Bill and simply what House Amendment... or what Floor Amendment 3 does that it clarifies the property rights to be transferred in Woodford County for \$500 is a release of an easement and not a transfer of a quitclaim. And it corrects two technical drafting errors."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Fortner, you have Senate Bill 2837. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2837, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Fortner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Fort... Fortner on Floor Amendment #1."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, Floor Amendment 1 is agreed language with the Secretary of State as to how they would implement the veteran's designation."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor of its adoption signify by saying 'yes'; those

144th Legislative Day

- opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Feigenholtz. Is Sara on the floor? Leader Dan Brady, on the bottom of page 10, Dan, you have Senate Bill 3171. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3171, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read 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 Chapin Rose, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Chapin?"
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I could have your attention, as it's Memorial Day Weekend. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask you maybe get some attention here."
- Speaker Lyons: "Shhh... Ladies and Gentlemen."
- Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, down on the first floor of the Capitol is a monument to those heroes from our state who have fallen in the line of duty. We are all very proud. I've just spend about 15 minutes looking at them and over 10 years went to many of those funerals. And we're here today working and I think we should all remember those who gave their all for our country, for our state. I also want to recognize, and many of you may not know this, I want to recognize Cameron Schilling, from the Governor's Office he's in the back, and he tried... he didn't want to do this, but wave, Cameron, if you would. Cameron's my constituent

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

from Mattoon and he has... those are his drawings, those are his drawings. Cameron's a great young man and he told me the story last night of how it started; it is, as you could imagine, very touching and heart-wrenching and for any of those here who have attended a funeral, you know, and wish, and pray that for those who haven't been to a funeral, you don't have to go and we never have to go through that again, as much as we know we probably will. And so, with that, I just think while we're here today, leaving soon I'm sure, that we should all have a moment of silence for those who have given their all for our state and for our country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would urge everyone on your way out today to take time to stop, and reflect, and review, and in some cases I... you know, friends of mine, their kids are on that board. So, anyway, thank you for our heroes, thank you for their families, and I hope that everyone will take a look at the drawings on their way out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lyons: "May their souls rest in peace, Amen. Page 11, Representative Costello, on Senate Bills-Second Readings, you have Senate Bill 3241. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3241, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Costello has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. It adds a five-year sunset to the

144th Legislative Day

- sales tax exemption for coal and aggregate mining equipment. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Chuck Jefferson, Rep... Leader, you have Senate Bill 3257. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3257, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader, you wish to move that to Third Reading? Third Reading. Representative Soto, on page 11 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3320. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3320, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Soto has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Floor
 Amendment #2 removes all reference to the Department of
 Human Services Ambassador pilot program from Senate Bill
 3320 as amended by House Committee Amendment #1 which

144th Legislative Day

- adopts in the Revenue & Finance Committee on 5/24/12. This is a check-off Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "On the adoption of the Amendment, all those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Will Davis, Will, you have, on page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 40... 3415. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3415, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Lisa Hernandez, on the bottom of page 11, you have Senate Bill 3458. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3458, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hernandez, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Hernandez on Floor Amendment #2."
- Hernandez: "Yes, Speaker. The Floor Amendment #2 is basically addressing the concerns of the opposition. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes';

144th Legislative Day

- 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Page 12 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, Representative... Leader Lang, you have Senate Bill 3497. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3497, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. This Bill was read 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 Zalewski, you have Senate Bill 3514. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3514, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Floor
 Amendment #3. It removes the Central Management Services
 oversight over the Illinois Medical District Commission."
- Speaker Lyons: "All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

144th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Currie, on the bottom of page 12, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 3669, Barbara. Out of the record. Leader Currie, you wish us to put that Bill back on the record? Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Yes. Go ahead and move it to Third."
- Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Mr. Clerk, status on 3669."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3669, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Jil Tracy, on page 12 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Readings, you have with Leader Cross, Senate Bill 3572. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3572, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tracy on Floor Amendment #1."
- Tracy: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would like to withdraw Amendment #1 and ask for the adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, the Lady moves to withdraw Floor Amendment #1. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Tracy on Floor Amendment #3."

144th Legislative Day

- Tracy: "Yes. This Amendment we're asking to be adopted. It clarifies a number of meetings that will be held on the underlying Bill Association."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Going back to Senate Bills...

 House Bill on Third Read... Senate Bills on Third Reading, on
 page 4 of the Calendar, Representative Reboletti, you have
 Senate Bill 180. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 180, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Dennis Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the... of the House. Senate Bill 180 is a Comptroller initiative to allow circuit clerks to enter into a program that we allowed last year when municipalities were collecting parking fees. This will allow the circuit clerks to use the Comptroller's Office to collect past due fines on speeding tickets, DUIs, you name it, whatever it is. I would ask that the Body support it. We took out a... a fee... a minimum fee of \$75 that some Members on the other side objected to. And I would ask for its approval. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Leader Lou Lang."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, I, of course, support the Bill, but I also supported the part you took off the Bill. And so, I have understood that you've committed to spend part of your summer working on that issue to try to work that out. Is that correct, Sir?"

Reboletti: "I would look forward to working with you in a bipartisan fashion Leader to find another vehicle. And if we can't do it this year, maybe do it in Veto Session."

Lang: "All right. So, I look forward to working with you throughout the summer on this important issue, Sir."

Reboletti: "I can hardly wait."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti to close."

Reboletti: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 180 pass?'
All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell, Rich Brauer, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Tryon will be excused for the rest of the day."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk will so note, Leader. Representative Bill 408. Franks, Senate Out of the Representative Soto, I believe your Bill is still waiting for an Amendment. We'll pass that one by. Representative Acevedo, is Ed missing today. Representative Chapin Rose, on the top of page 5, you have Senate Bill 2... 2999, Chapin. Out of the record. Representative Lisa Dugan, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3441. Out of the record. Representative Sullivan, Ed, you have Senate Bill 3450 on Order of Third Reading. Out of the Representative Mussman, on the Order of Third Reading, on page 5, Michelle, you have Senate Bill 3544. Out of the record. Representative Dan Biss, Dan, you have, on the Order of Third Readings, Representative, Senate Bill 3619. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3619, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dan Biss."

Biss: "Thank you, Speaker. We adopted a Floor Amendment yesterday to this Bill which essentially put on it language from House Bill 5440 that we adopted unanimously... that we passed unanimously a couple weeks ago before it was then taken for other purposes in the Senate. That language corrects a technical fix in the sunset of the business location incentive that's sort of an add-on to the EDGE Tax Credit Program. It's a technical thing to make existing law consistent. The underlying language of this Bill is a tightening of the restrictions on the Angel Investment Tax Credit. The point of that is the following: the way the

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Angel Investment Tax Credit works is if a business is qualified to be the recipient of that investment then the investor makes the investment then they get a tax credit. The thing you want to do is you want to make sure that we're not giving tax credits to people who are already going to be making the investments anyhow. You want it to be targeted to people who are incentivizing to actually do something different. So, what the Bill does is it makes sure that the person has to have applied for the qualifications to make the investment before they actually write the check otherwise they're just kind of asking for a handout from the state post hoc. Happy to take any questions and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3619 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, Sandy Pihos, Al Riley. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Mike Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Leader."

Bost: "As... as we're working and trying to get things done here.

There was in... an event that happened in my hometown and I was wanting to let the Body know about. And while looking

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

through the paper, there was an elderly woman who received a notice in the paper about a... her marriage at 80 years old... at 80 years old she got married for the fourth time. I very impressive. And being that was Representative that I am and I wanted to call. I called her and I congratulated her. And I asked her, you know, what is it your husband does. And she says, well, Representative, thank you for asking, but he's a mortician. And I said, well, that's wonderful and I know you've been married before. She said, yes, I've been married three times. And I said, well, can you tell me about each of those husbands? And she said, well, I can. She said whenever I was in my twenties I married... when I was in my twenties I married a banker. And it was a wonderful marriage and he passed away. And in my forties I married a ring master of a three-ring circus, an amazing man he was. Well, he passed away and in my sixties, I think she was she said, I think it was her sixties, she said I married a Southern Baptist minister. And I said, that's wonderful that you've had these marriages, but she... I said I just don't understand the diversity. Normally your life would be that, you know, you'd be tied somehow. She said, oh, no, no. You must understand, one was for the money, two for the show, three to get ready, and now four to go. I'm really hoping that before long it's time to go."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost will be performing over the weekend at the Chicago Theater. Times are available on the Internet. Thank you, Leader. Now back to something serious.

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

We have a Third Reading Senate Bill, Representative Sara Feigenholtz, Senate Bill 3594. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3594, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3594 requires that an... the appointment of a guardian cannot be suspended just because a post-judgment motion is filed contesting guardianship. I'd be glad to answer any questions. This is an initiative of the Cook County Public Guardian and there... I know of no opposition."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, are there any new fees in this piece of legislation?"

Feigenholtz: "There are not."

Reboletti: "And how does this effect the appointments of the guardian ad litem? I know many of times they're appointed either for children or for the disabled so that their interest can be represented in court. How does this change their role, if... if it does at all?"

Feigenholtz: "The court continues to have discretion on who to appoint, Representative."

Reboletti: "And that includes anything that's postjudgment as well?"

Feigenholtz: "Doesn't change that at all."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Feigenholtz moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3594. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 107 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of clarification. If any of us decide we want to practice our comedic chops here on the floor, do we have to have those jokes vetted by somebody first before we present them here or can we just go for it?"
- Speaker Lyons: "I would suggest that we kind of put that on the back burner for right now. It's always appropriate to have to..."
- Davis, W.: "No, no. I don't have a joke. I'm just concerned about somebody else that might. That's all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Yeah. I would... I think there's enough discretion on behalf of our Members, Representative, that they'll use best interest for what we should say in public on this floor so. But nice job, Representative Bost. Representative Dan Burke, you have, on the Order of Third Reading, Senate Bill 3513. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3513, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Burke."

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3513 is an initiative of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and it would amend the Pharmacy Practice Act expanding the inoculations that pharmacists can administer and it would also reduce the age to 10 of those patients that would be seeking inoculations. Be happy to answer any questions."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Leader yield?"

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

Reboletti: "Representative, this is an agreed Bill then? I know the Med Society was involved in the negotiations as well the other groups. This is an agreed upon Bill?"

Burke, D.: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Burke moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3513. 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? Bellock, Chapa LaVia, Flowers, Gabel, Hays, Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 105 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, Representative Feigenholtz, you have Senate Bill 3592. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

144th Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3592, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Dan Burke, on page 12 of the Calendar, Dan, you have Senate Bill 3629 on the Order of Second Readings. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3629, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "On Amendment #2."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Amendment #2 is identical to House Amendment #1. And this Bill had passed out of committee without any... without the Amendment being adopted, so it's a technical adoption. I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration."
- 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 Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Representative Feigenholtz, on page 10 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second

144th Legislative Day

- Readings, is Senate Bill 3146. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3146, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Mayfield is excused for the remainder of the day."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Clerk will so note. Thank you, Leader. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1102, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 1103, offered by Representative Connelly. House Resolution 1104, offered by Representative Williams. House Resolution 1105, offered by Representative Unes. House Resolution 1106, offered by Representative Farnham. House Resolution 1108, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 1109, offered by Representative Fortner. And House Resolution 1112, offered by Representative Saviano."
- 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 adopted. And now, seeing Resolutions are no further business to come before the Illinois House Representatives, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned to the hour of 12 noon on Monday, May

144th Legislative Day

5/26/2012

28, Memorial Day. All those in favor of adjournment signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stands adjourned to the hour of 12 noon on Monday, May 28. Have a safe and enjoyable weekend and spend a moment if you can with that beautiful mural on the first floor in the north corridor. God Bless, everybody."