145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1115, offered by Representative Nekritz, is referred to the Rules Committee. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson for the Committee on Rules reports following committee action taken 28, 2012: on Mav recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 88, Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1531, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1566, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 3277... correction 3722; recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 4 to House Bill 404, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 735, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4242, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4531, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4757, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4761, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4986, Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5016, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5021, Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 5025, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5099, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5111, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5114, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5122, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5278, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5280, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5289, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5330, Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5434, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5450, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5547, and Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5592."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Happy Memorial Day, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Doctor Milton Bost, who is with the Chatham Baptist Church in Chatham, Illinois. Dr. Bost is the guest of his brother, Michael Bost. Members and guests are asked to please refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all electronic equipment and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. Reverend Milton Bost."

Reverend Bost: "Would you join me in prayer? Almighty God, on this particular day, we remember those who have died in the service of this nation, and we thank You for their sacrifice and for the freedom that is afforded to us to even convene today. At today's convening of the Illinois House of Representatives, we're faced with problems and challenges and decisions very much of our own making, and You've given us minds with which to think and therefore, we have the ability to reason. You made us each different from one another, and therefore, we have the ability to form differences of opinion. And these differences of opinion and methods of reasoning can lead and have led to division and conflict. As we begin this Session, unite us for a moment to acknowledge that there is One who is the author of all truths, and One who is the foundation of true wisdom. While not all of us have acknowledged... not all of us acknowledge You, and those of us who do acknowledge You don't necessarily do so in the same manner. As I speak for this Body and offer up praise to You in my own faith tradition, I acknowledge You as holy and righteous and

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

sovereign, the One who stands in power and judgment over each of us. In faith, I humbly ask that You would make each Legislator acutely aware of their responsibilities Representatives of not only their districts, but of the people of the State of Illinois and of their accountability before You. That responsibility is indeed a heavy one and is often not fully clear, nor easily accomplished. For that reason, I ask that You would guide the minds and opinions of each of them to face the problems and the challenges, making decisions that are founded in true wisdom and in higher truth. Grant to each of them understanding beyond themselves to see and be accountable for the fuller effect of each decision that they make. I ask that You might direct these Legislators toward unity and resolve and camaraderie and purpose. And I ask that they may heed Your guidance above all other powers they have faced and come to know. We need Your intervention. Thank You for the faith that You have given me through Your Son, Jesus Christ. And I pray in His name, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "As has become our tradition on Memorial Day, I want to recognize and ask them to lead us in our Pledge: Representative Bost, Representative Chapa LaVia, Costello, Representative Representative Representative David Harris, Representative Jefferson, Representative Krezwick, Representative Jerry Mitchell, Riley, Representative Representative Rosenthal, Representative Sacia, Representative Watson. We appreciate you serving our country, and we ask you to do us the honor of leading us in this Pledge of Allegiance."

145th Legislative Day

- Veterans 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. Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, how are the Democrats doing today?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Feigenholtz and May are excused today."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Reverend Bost's brother, Michael, how are the GOP today?"
- Bost: "Thank you. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Cole, Harris, Moffitt, Morthland, and Pritchard and Rose are excused today on the Republican side of the aisle."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Leader. Mr. Clerk, take the record.

 We have 109 Members responding to the Roll Call, there's a
 quorum present. We're prepared to do the work of the people
 of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk. Leader Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege, unless you want the Clerk to go ahead, whichever."
- Speaker Lyons: "There's no committees, Mike, so go ahead."
- Bost: "Okay. If you could, I've got kind of a special guest besides my brother that was here, who's now going over to lead in the Senate, but my wife, Tracy, which many of you have met. She's here with me, but also with us today is my grandson, Spencer Fred, and today is his 11th birthday."
- Speaker Lyons: "Welcome, Mrs. Bost. Spencer, happy birthday.

 Have a great year. Leader Schmitz, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

145th Legislative Day

- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I, too, have a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Tim."
- Schmitz: "Joining me on the House Floor today is my 19-year-old son, Alex, who we were talking on the way down here today. We think he was probably about this tall the last time he was down here. So, he's home from college, finished his first year at school, in ROTC, and he came down here to make sure I hit the right buttons on the House Floor. So, please join me in welcoming Alex back to the House chambers."
- Speaker Lyons: "Congratulations, Alex. Good to see you here.

 Keep an eye on dad, please. Representative du Buclet,

 personal privilege."
- du Buclet: "Point of personal privilege. Another introduction of a child. I have my son, Julian with me, who's also 19.

 He just finished his first year of college at Syracuse. I drug him down here, so he could see what we do. And I just wanted everyone to welcome him and say hello."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Orange. Welcome to Springfield. Glad to have you. Representative Walsh, personal privilege."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce, today, my daughter, Katelynn Marie, her first time in the House. She is a recent graduate of Morris High School and with high honors and looking forward to attending Western Illinois University this fall."
- Speaker Lyons: "Katelynn Marie, welcome to your Capitol. Enjoy being a Leatherneck out there in western Illinois.

 Representative Costello, personal privilege."

145th Legislative Day

- Costello: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I would just like to personally thank all the veterans and all those who have served in the U.S. military. I'd like to also thank all the policemen, firefighters and emergency workers as they serve our country as well. Memorial Day is a wonderful thing that we have in this country to remember all those who have served and died. While we certainly don't have a perfect form of government as a democracy, there's no other form of government that's any better, and we live in the greatest country on the face of this earth. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Thank you, Representative Costello. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're doing some Third Reading Bills, skipping around a little bit, but I'll start on page 4. There's Senate Bill 1351, Representative Greg Harris. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1351, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greg Harris."
- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 There are a number of items in this Bill, many of which are cleanup language to make our home services program language parallel to what's required of us by the Federal Government. There are two things in here that are very important that I want to draw your attention to. One is a provision that would allow cost-sharing for folks who are involved in the home services program, which is in line with the Medicaid reforms we did last week. And another

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

which was the Amendment we put on the Bill last week that took out language that could potentially be used as a Medicaid expansion so that that language is no longer in there. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, you said the Bill does a few things to go in line with the Medicaid cuts from last week. What do you mean by that?"

Harris, G.: "There... the Bill spells out that there can be costsharing, so that there might be a copay. There might be
some other kind of deductible that could be applied to
persons who are receiving services under the home... home
services program."

Franks: "Besides the copay, is it limiting any other access, or are they throwing people out who might have been part of this?"

Harris, G.: "No. No, it does not... it does not change the services available. It does not increase or eliminate them."

Franks: "Okay. I just wanted to make sure what all..."

Harris, G.: "No. This is not..."

Franks: "...this did."

Harris, G.: "...this is not a cut or any such thing."

Franks: "I'm sorry. It's not a what?"

Harris, G.: "It is not a cut."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lyons: "Any further discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 1351 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Leader Acevedo, would you like to be recorded? Take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, continuing with Senate Bills under Third Reading, Representative Beiser, you have Senate Bill 2822, Dan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2822, a Bill for an Act concerning land. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Beiser."
- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is IDOT's land conveyance
 Bill. Their annual Bill that... the parcels that they no
 longer need for projects that are already completed."
- 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 2822 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? Franks. Penny. Mr. Clerk... Scott. Take the record. On this Bill, there's 108 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Representative Michael Fortner, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 2837. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2837, a Bill for an Act concerning the Secretary of State. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. It's a particular honor to present this Bill for Third Reading and your consideration on this Memorial Day. This is a Bill that will do a great help for the veterans of the State of Illinois, who are deserving and get a lot of services from the state. This will simply provide that on their driver's license or state issued ID there will be an indication whether or not they're a veteran. So, they won't have to carry around extra paperwork, when they want to come and get services from the state. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "Representative, I think this is a great idea. If the card says they're a veteran, you're saying in the Bill that effectively replaces a DD214 for the purposes of certification of veteran status?"

Fortner: "The DD214 would be used as part of the application so that the veteran would be able to indicate to the Secretary of State's Office that they should be so designated on their ID."

145th Legislative Day

- Zalewski: "So, if they apply for a job where a veteran gets special status say for instance, a state job where there's veterans preference, and they simply now only have to provide their driver's license to the... to the CMS to get the veterans' preference?"
- Fortner: "I would certainly hope that any agency in the state would recognize that this has now gone through and been cleared by the Secretary of State and is recognized as such on their official ID."
- Zalewski: "To the Bill. This is a great idea. Oftentimes, veterans, you know, when they realize the job market is light, they don't keep good track of their DD214s. They're not exactly easy documents always to track down. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative Linda Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and happy Memorial Day. Thank you..."
- Speaker Lyons: "You too."
- Chapa LaVia: "...Leader Lyons for the acknowledgement this morning. Will the Sponsor yield?"
 - Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Chapa LaVia: "Representative Fortner, how are they... how are we going to inspect this? Where... what is the control as far as finding out whether somebody is falsifying information or not?"
- Fortner: "Well, this has been worked out between the Secretary of State's Office and the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs. This is agreed language that the veteran who would

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

apply, the Secretary of State would then contact the department and be able to get, through that process, certification that they are who they say they are. It was... they were honorably discharged and would it... it'd be appropriate to so designate them on the ID."

Chapa LaVia: "Right. So, once somebody finds out that somebody's falsified information, what's the process though? That's what I'm trying to get to 'cause we've even had, maybe not in our state but other states, we've had Senators falsify documentation that they were veterans. So, I'm just trying to see what the..."

Fortner: "Well, one of the things is that, of course, any sort of falsification on an application for your driver's license or a state's ID. We already have..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right, is illegal."

Fortner: "...we already have provisions, so this would..."

Chapa LaVia: "But then who's going to inspect to make sure that they are or aren't. That's what I'm saying. The manpowers..."

Fortner: "Well, that's... that will... that will be the Department of Veterans' Affairs communicating to the Secretary of State's Office."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Okay."

Fortner: "So, any question, they can... they would be in communication with the department."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. I want to thank you for running this Bill.

We've been trying to push the likes of this Bill for a
while with Secretary White, and we've always gotten pushed
back because of the cost that is incurred by the personnel
and the time to actually document all these things into the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Secretary of State's database. And I think this is an amazing tool for a lot of things, not just veterans, but if somebody eventually, when we do pass conceal and carry, think there are certain elements that should be recognized when somebody comes upon... law enforcement comes upon somebody that they can organize what that person's about before they actually enter by the vehicle. So, thank you and I strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am asking a question on this Bill because I had great memories of my brother returning from World War II. And on the way to Sunday school as a little girl, I remember him walking and how happy we were for his safe return. But my question to you is, what is the purpose of this Bill?"

Fortner: "Well, currently a veteran, who wants to get services from the state or anything else where we provide for something for the veteran, they would have to come along with all their other paperwork as one of the previous questioners mentioned, they would have to make sure they kept track of their discharge papers, their DD214s. They have to keep track of something that would provide that. Most of us, I would say, are used to using our state issued driver's license or other state ID as something that identifies us for who we are. And in this case, this will simply aid the veteran to get that service that they won't have to go through the process of being verified each and every time when they want to go and get the services that are due them by the state."

145th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "So, the Secretary of State is now in support of this legislation?"
- Fortner: "That is correct. This is language at his suggestion as to how to properly implement this and make it not an undue burden on his office."
- Davis, M.: "You know, I believe you have very good intentions, and I will probably vote for this; however, I am very concerned when we continue to have thoughts that a driver's license is more than identification showing that you have passed a driving test and that you have insurance. The other day we passed a Bill that says if you haven't paid your child support then you don't have a driver's license. If you don't comply with a judge's visitation order, then you can't get a driver's license. I hope the State of Illinois does not go into a mode of the driver's license meaning more than your ability to drive. I respect veterans. I believe they should have all kinds of preferential treatment, but I'm just really concerned when we decide to use that driver's license for a lot of different things. Now, I notice in our analysis it says that no other group can come forward and ask that they have their identification on a driver's license. Is that correct?"
- Fortner: "Yeah. That was at the request of the Secretary of State's Office. And it's because of the number of unique services the state provides for veterans that would not be applicable to other groups and the fact that carrying around the other paperwork and having to frequently have to

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

have that updated if they were to go to different agencies where they would..."

Davis, M.: "So, are..."

Fortner: "...get those services."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. Are you saying that if you're dishonorably discharged, you won't have veteran on your driver's license?"

Fortner: "I believe that is what it's... I believe that is the indication. This applies to honorable discharge from the military."

Davis, M.: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I, too, have great reservations in reference to this legislation. I know that veterans are very proud of the work they've done, and I know that they don't want to have to go through a great deal of providing information. And the feeling is that this driver's license will say on there that they're veterans, and they won't have to answer any of the questions about their service or where they served or how long they served. We'll just... or if they were disabled, but this will just state that they are a former person that went to the service. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure how we should vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is another one of the cons... or intended consequences is that the State of Illinois will have a better database of who's coming back from Iraq and who's coming back from Afghanistan so that we can better

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

serve that veteran population when we see that there's an increasing amount of PTSD among our veterans returning home?"

Fortner: "That's certainly one of the things that we are conscious of and we want to be able to serve."

Reboletti: "And... but... and you also laid out that there was issues with making sure that when they're filling out paperwork, they can just prove it without having to go find all their separation papers and everything else?"

Fortner: "That's... that's right. We want to, if you like, have provide one stop shopping that once that we, the state, have identified and in response to the previous quest... the previous questioner, recall that for those who do not drive, the Secretary of State also issues a state ID, and this would apply both to the driver's license or the state ID for those who don't drive. So, it's really that aspect of the Secretary of State's Officer that's coming into play here."

Reboletti: "Well, I think it makes a lot of sense, and sometimes we hear on the floor, like the previous speaker, that we're concerned about how stringent things should be when we look for identification on some things and how long a veteran may or may not have served. But I think at some point in time, there's other things that people are a little bit more relaxed on. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mike McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

McAuliffe: "I was looking on the Bill, Representative, but I wasn't sure that this would be another example of how this could help. Recently, I experienced where a veteran passed away, and when you go to the funeral home, they will have military honors, but unless you find that DD214, you're pretty much at your word whether the local VFW will do that. Would... in this case, if somebody would die, whether it was planned ahead of time or someone died, like of a heart attack and the family didn't have plans to find where the DD214 was, could you use this ID as a... an honor to have a military burial like we do here in Illinois?"

Fortner: "I would certainly hope that whatever group was looking at that would recognize that that issuance of the ID was based on the very DD214 that you mentioned. My father, who served in both World War II and Korea, passed away last year, and we had to do that. We had to make sure we had his DD214s for the recognition, when we had him buried, that we had a military presentation for that burial. But any group should now be able to recognize that pursuant to State Law, should this become law, that that person would have an indication that they were a veteran and are deserving of all the recognition that goes with that, and that would certainly include funeral provisions that you've mentioned."

McAuliffe: "Thank you for answering that question. I think this is a good Bill. And just for the example I gave, if somebody passes away, you know they're a veteran, you're not able to find their DD214s. What a dishonor that would be if the local VFW wouldn't be able to honor them properly

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

at a cemetery and give them the burial that they should have just because they... you couldn't... the family couldn't produce a DD214. So, for what... that reason and many others, I urge a 'yes' vote and hope the Bill passes. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Fortner to close."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. You know as we reflect on Memorial Day, this is another way that we can show what it means to be a veteran by recognizing that, you know, we don't want to have to make people go through more bureaucratic hoops and hurdles than is necessary. And this will give them the ability to show to anyone that they have been recognized officially as a veteran for the services that they deserve. I'd ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 2837 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 Kelly Cassidy, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Brady, on the middle of page 5, Dan, you have Senate Bill 3171. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3171, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Dan Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3171 has been changed and the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

purpose is simply for cleanup regarding the legislation when it was enacted, which is an initiative of the Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois Trial Lawvers Association, Illinois State Medical Society dealing with medical records and not having to open an estate depending on a deceased individual. After implementation of the law, it was found that HIPAA as a health care provider also has the authority to disclose individuals' protected health information or personal representative. And what we want to do is come in line with the Federal Law, so this is an initiative from those associations that I talked about. It's an agreed to Bill. I am not aware of any opposition. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3171 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? Chris Nybo, André Thapedi, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on the bottom of page 4 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 2578. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2578, a Bill for an Act concerning health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an initiative... excuse me... of the Illinois Public Health Association and it is supported by, I think, virtually every public health department, a local public health department, county department across the state. This would expand the pool of people available... eligible to become directors of our state Department of Public Health. Today, you must be a medical dir... doctor in order to qualify. This would, instead, substitute a clear expertise and experience generally in the field of public health. And when it comes to the medical director, that individual would indeed continue to have to be an MD, and that individual would have clear control over some of the actual medical things that happen in that department. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none... Representative Al Riley."

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

Riley: "Leader Currie, I was just curious as to... and I know what the Bill is trying to do, but why wasn't a consideration for a doctorate in public health, you know, the main consideration rather than a masters degree... a DPH?"

Currie: "This... as I say, this was an initiative of the Illinois

Public Health Association, and I think there was a concern

that we not reduce the requirement any further than the

doctorate degree. Apparently, they believe that there will

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

be a very adequate pool of available candidates if we make this change."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Cur... Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the passage of Senate Bill 2578. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 103 Members voting 'yes', 9 Members voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Costello, on page 5 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3241. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3241, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Jerry Costello."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Costello: It's very fitting that on Memorial Day we run this Bill. It's the veterans' tax credit. So, this Bill would actually give tax credit to businesses that employ... employ unemployed veterans. This credit would be 20 percent of wages up to \$5 thousand. The COGFA estimates on this... and very important for everyone to hear this... is that it would approximately \$300 thousand. state considerably less than, I think, most people would think. I it's extremely, extremely important acknowledge our veterans and do whatever we can for those men and women who are coming home from Afghanistan and

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Iraq. The second thing that this Bill would do is it allows counties and municipalities to abate property taxes for the spouses of fallen soldiers. This would create parity with they're allowed to do with police officers, firefighters and rescue workers' spouses. And the third thing that this Bill would do is it would create a sales tax exemption for roof bolts in coal mines. And what I would tell you about that particular situation is from 1990 to 2003, the coal industry employed... excuse me. In 1990, the coal industry employed about 10 thousand people. From 1990 to 2003, that went down to approximately 3 thousand people. And currently up until about 2010 the industry has employed, oh, let's say, about, 3200 people. Just recently in the last year, the industry has started to grow, and now it employs about 4200 people. This exemption is extremely important for the coal industry which employs people in over two-thirds of the State of Illinois. I thank you. I would ask... answer any questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thanks."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rosemary Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Mulligan: "I'm going to go to the last part of that first. How did you happen to put the exemption for the coal industry in a Bill like this and don't you think that this is not... would not be pertinent to the Bill and shouldn't be part of this Bill under the constitutional law?"

Costello: "No, Representative. I would disagree. I think it's a very pro-business, pro-Illinois, pro-jobs part of the Bill.

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

As I said, if you look at the coal industry and the 10 thousand people that it used to employ, that went down to approximately 3 thousand and just in the last year, the coal industry has added, oh, approximately 33 percent in employment. I think it's very, very, very important for the State of Illinois to work with employers which..."

"Representative, I am not disagreeing with you about Mulligan: the fact that it's an important Bill that works with employers. What I am disagreeing with you about is that subject matter under this Bill should not be in this Bill. You have all veterans' deductions and things that have to do with giving deductions for veterans. I'm assuming the amount of money that you're saying the state would lose is not what the state would lose. It would be money that the state wouldn't collect under veterans, and that you're giving them all kinds of things that would be veterans first which we've always done, but to add something that has to do with coal mining into this Bill, I think and for legislative intent when the Governor goes to sign this that this should not be part of the Bill. And is your Bill severable, so that if part is cut out that the rest of it would still be in the legislation?"

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mulligan, I think we've indicat...

I think something's been indicated that Representative
Mautino could answer that question. Frank, did you want to
answer that question?"

Mautino: "I can go ahead after her questions here. I just have legislative intent and a brief explanation on the coal side. So, I'll wait until her questioning is done."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Back to you Representative Costello on Representative Mulligan's inquiries on severability."

Costello: "Mr. Speaker and Representative, they're all related to the tax exemptions, obviously, and it's revenue."

Mulligan: "Well, to the Bill. I doubt seriously that's the case and for legislative intent, as far as it goes, when the Governor goes to sign this Bill, I do not think that this should be part of the Bill. It definitely is one of those issues that we've had before where you cannot include something that's totally off the mark of what the rest of Bill says to put into a Bill. And as severability, if he wants to be able to have a Bill that goes ahead that helps veterans and says that he helps veterans later on in his... when he's talking legislation that he may have passed, it's one thing to say you're helping veterans, it's another thing to add an issue on coal mining. And I think this is wrong. And I think when the Governor goes to sign this, it should be struck out of the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. And I simply rise in support of the legislation. And for the purpose of legislative intent, I wanted to go ahead and ask a question of the Sponsor. Is it the intent that this Bill be retroactive to January 2004?"

Costello: "It is."

Mautino: "And there have been rulings that have allowed the tax-exempt status for mining equipment to be done under the manufacturers' exemption. I was the Sponsor of that a number of years back so that they would receive it in that

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

other area of the Code. So, for legislative intent, sales taxes on the roof bolts have not been paid in the prior period, and what is... what does that mean here going forward?"

Costello: "So you know, Representative, it is not a case where the state would have to refund any moneys because these moneys have not been paid. To be truthful, this is more of a technicality, and it clears up the technical aspect to show that roof bolts in coal mines are not taxed."

Mautino: "And without roof bolts, you do not have mining..."

Costello: "Correct."

Mautino: "...for the people who have not grown up in mining areas. So, and for that reason, the letters of intent from Revenue have basically, in those rulings, maintained that tax-exempt status. It is proper to be in the Bill. This is a Bill affecting revenue, and it cleans up and it clarifies what the existing practice has been. So, it sets it into place, and no refunds will be asked for or paid."

Costello: "Correct. And again, in order to give tax credits to employers, these soldiers have to have jobs to come home to. The coal mines are in about two-thirds of the State of Illinois. Aggregate mines, which this would apply to as well, are in 69 of the 102 counties in our state."

Mautino: "I appreciate your work. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Mike Bost."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, we need to go through a couple things.

First off and it was asked from my side of the aisle by a

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

few people and I'm... I'm in support of the roof bolts legislation. Does this become retroactive? In other words, would the companies then go back and be able to claim something after the fact and that would have to be reimbursed?"

Costello: "It is retroactive, but they will not be able to go back and claim something after the fact. And the reason is is because this hasn't actually been paid as a tax. What's happened is in audits, in the audits that have happened in the coal mines and in the aggregate mines, some audits have found it to be tax-exempt, some have found it to not be tax-exempt. So, this is just clarity in a technical error, I believe."

Bost: "Okay. That's what I wanted to clear up, and I stand in support of that part of the Bill. There's some concerns I have now on the veterans' side. What are the two issues that are the tax grants that are avail... or tax waivers that are available? I know there's one at the city... or at the county and city level as far as property tax?"

Costello: "So, what would happen is a spouse of a fallen soldier, the municipality or the county would have the ability to abate taxes at any percentage with... which they deem."

Bost: "But it would be up to the county to make that call?"

Costello: "Absolutely. The county..."

Bost: "Okay."

Costello: "...or the municipality."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Bost: "So, this gives them the authority so your local county board and/or your local tax assessors would have to go to the county board to get approval to do that, correct?"

Costello: "Correct. Just like they're able to do with the spouses of fallen police officers, firefighters and rescue workers."

Bost: "Okay. Now the other part is the actual tax abatement for... is it, and it's fallen?"

Costello: "Correct."

Bost: "Okay. Here's the concern I have. On House Amendment...

Floor Amendment #2, on page 120 of the Bill, lines 13... 11

through... I'm sorry, page 128 and I think it's lines 11

through 13. In there, it is... it is site specific on where

they had to fall. Now let me clarify that. It says

Afghanistan or Iraq. Now the problem with that is we have

many fronts. We have people in Korea. We have some covert

operations that might be going on. If all of a sudden a

soldier, marine, airman, naval personnel... sailor falls,

what about them? I'm... I'm concerned with that."

Costello: "And Representative, I do completely understand where you're coming from, but I will tell you this. This is specific also parity to the language in the Bills with fallen police officers, firefighters and rescue workers. And that's how..."

Bost: "Okay."

Costello: "...we came up with the language. One second, please."

Bost: "Okay."

Costello: "Also, so you know, this is language that came out of Senate... or excuse me, yeah, Senate Bill 2503 which has

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

already passed the Senate. It did not get to the House Floor."

Bost: "But I'm still concerned about this. Each Bill we have the opportunity to change and/or modify. I believe that it should be any veteran serving if they fall in the line of duty because it's the same way with police officers, firefighters. It doesn't matter whether they fall in Murphysboro, Belleville, Chicago, Springfield. They have that benefit. It shouldn't matter whether the service person falls in Afghanistan, Iraq, on the Korean border, wherever, Somalia."

Costello: "Yeah. And Representative, this was a Republican initiative. So, it's language that came from a Repub..."

Bost: "I don't care who wrote it."

Costello: "No. Listen. Listen. So, I... if you'll let me finish..."

Bost: "Okay."

Costello: "...please?"

Bost: "All right."

Costello: "Okay. So, I would be more than happy to maybe, you know, we could expand on this later, but I believe that the current language is good language. And if we want to expand on this later..."

Bost: "Yeah..."

Costello: "...we can."

Bost: "...that's why I wanted to bring it up. I'm not disagreeing with your Bill in that respect, but I do believe it would be... we need to be very clear. I don't care where you serve."

Costello: "And..."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Bost: "I don't care."

Costello: "...and I agree with you."

Bost: "And I don't care if the Republicans wrote it or if the Democrats wrote it. If it's wrong, it's wrong. And I would ask that we would come back and just make it real clear that any, any place where we have putting soldiers in harm's way that that should be included and to make sure that this benefit is available to all, regardless of what battlefront they're on."

Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rich Brauer."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I think this is a real good Bill you have in front of us. Although, I would prefer it be a single subject. I think both of them certainly have a lot of credibility. And just for a little clarification, what does the Bill talk about in mining equipment?"

Costello: "In the mining equipment, it specifically refers to roof bolts. And so you know, the question in the roof bolt issue is the fact that they're actually drilled into the roof of the mines. And so, you know, in these audits the question has been is it tangible property because it becomes a part of the mine. Okay."

Brauer: "Well, this to me is more of a safety issue. You might explain what the roof bolts are designed to do."

Costello: "The roof bolts are designed, along with plates, to hold the mine roof, obviously and it is, you know, completely around safety so you don't have a cave-in."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Brauer: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Understand what these roof bolts do. They hold up... after they mine the coal, they hold the roof up. It becomes a huge safety issue. It becomes an issue that this should have our support. I believe this is a good Bill and would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dwight Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

- Kay: "Representative, I'm curious. I think you held out the warrant that there would only be a \$300 thousand credit, so to speak, involved with this particular piece of legislation. Is that correct?"
- Costello: "What I said is that's COGFA's estimate. So, currently the 10 percent, \$1200 tax credit that's currently in place for the state, last year, it cost the state \$33 thousand... 33 thousand, the entire state."
- Kay: "Well, tell me how we reached that number. That seems
 remarkably low."
- Costello: "Right. It says that it reported by the Department of Revenue."
- Kay: "Well, how many... how many people do you anticipate would
 be involved in this credit? Let me see if I can't back into
 this."
- Costello: "So, if we look at the situation right now, and you look at, like, for instance, the federal tax credit. In the State of Illinois, about 500 people have applied for that credit, but just over 200 have been found able to receive it."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Kay: "Okay. So, your belief is that this will only affect 200
veterans?"

Costello: "That's not my belief. As a matter of fact, the one thing that I do believe estimates are that over 2011 to 2016 in the country, we should have close to a million veterans coming back. And I'm hoping, obviously, every person we put to work, they're going to drive revenue. These tax credits for businesses, like I said, it's probusiness, pro-jobs, pro-Illinois."

Kay: "Representative, how long would one of these individuals have to work for a business before the credit kicks in?"

Costello: "So, in order to qualify for this tax credit, they would have to have been unemployed for four of the previous six weeks."

Kay: "So, they wouldn't have to work for 12 months or anything
 like that for the credit to kick in?"

Costello: "No, they would not."

Kay: "So, they could be a trainee for four to six weeks, not
 get the job and become eligible for the credit?"

Costello: "And I'm sorry. I misunderstood what you said. No, they'd have to work for 185 days..."

Kay: "Okay."

Costello: "...and I apologize."

Kay: "Okay. Thanks."

Costello: "And I'm sorry. I misunderstood your question."

Kay: "No, that's okay. I think this is probably a good initiative, Representative, but let me just say this. I continually wonder why we don't do an omnibus Bill for veterans. And that's something you may want to think about

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

as we move along here because we have had one credit after another after another, and it doesn't just veterans. It applies to a lot of people; it goes back to last year. I think when we're in a budget pinch like we're in, we need to be very, very careful about giving away too much money in any form. And I would suggest that maybe you look at that so we can get this done maybe once and for all. The other... I guess the other issue is this. And I am not a constitutional expert, but I do remember a little bit this. I'm not sure but what the previous Representative doesn't have а point here constitutionality and the appropriateness of this Bill with regard to the coal piece. I would just have to suggest to you that my, you know, my humble opinion is it probably doesn't fit, but I'm going to support your Bill. We'll let it sort itself out, but again, I would ask you take those suggestions I offer up to you. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "To the Bill. Representative Bost made a good point. When you look at the language, I think there's a way we should make this a better Bill, and because it cites specifically two arenas in Afghanistan and Iraq, I think it is a bit narrow. Let's look at all the scenarios where there have been... our troops have gone into very dangerous situations. It was only a year ago where we had our Navy SEALS drop on a top of a roof in Pakistan to take out a certain person who gave us terrible problems to the United States. I can think of situations where Navy SEALS and also

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Navy men have on the coast of Somalia have rescued individuals who were captive from pirates who were in very dangerous situations. I think we should take out that last line in that Amendment, where it says serving in Iraq or Afghanistan, and have it completely apply to all servicemen who are... who are killed during the line of duty. I don't think that they are any less deserving than the individuals who lose their life in Afghanistan and also Iraq. And I think that we've got time to do this. And I would strongly recommend that if we do it, let's do it right. And that's how you do it right."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Costello to close."

Costello: "For Representative Bost and Representative Durkin, I would be more than happy to work on future legislation and cosponsor future legislation to resolve some of this. I think this is a great Bill. It's good for veterans, it's good for jobs. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3241 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? Barickman, Leader Kosel. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 110 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Chuck Jefferson, you have, on page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3257. Out of the record. On the bottom of page 5, Representative Cynthia Soto has Senate Bill 3320. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3320, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Floor Amendment #2 removes all references to the Department of Human Services Ambassador Pilot Program from 33... Senate Bill 3320 as amended by House Committee Amendment #1, which was adopted in Revenue and Finance Committee on 5/24/12. House Committee Amendment #1 adopted is a gut and replace Amendment which amends the State Finance Act, Illinois Lottery Law, and the Department of Public Health Powers and Duties Law to Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Committee Amendment #1 creates three special funds within the State Treasury, which will be funded through optional taxpayer checkoffs in the State of Illinois, income tax forms, which includes the Childhood Cancer Research. Those funds will go for pediatric research. The Children's Awareness Charity Fund which goes to Ronald McDonald House, the Housing... the Housing for Families Fund, Habitat for Humanity, the Hunger Relief Form, the Diabetes Fund, and also we have the HIV Quality of Life lottery scratch-off game. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you. And I'm open for questions."

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

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Illinois is cutting HIV services and programs. In FY13, the budget is proposing to cut HIV services by \$4 million. That's a 50 percent cut. A 50 percent cut for HIV services would break the back of

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

our state's HIV prevention and care system. The human consequences are dire. More than 100 additional HIV infections will occur next year, adding 40 million in lifetime health care costs to the state. Five hundred sixty-three people with HIV will lose medical care, mental health services and other vital supports. These funds will not restore the 50 percent in GRF in the House budget, but it will allow our communities to help the hardest hit communities. Over the past two decades, the community response has been critical component to reducing new HIV and AIDS infections and increasing treatment. That is why it is critical that the General Assembly extend the quality of life Red Ribbon lottery. And I am asking for an 'aye' vote today. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Soto to close."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. And I'd... appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3320 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? Kent Gaffney, Karen Yarbrough, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 97 Members voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Continuing on the Senate Bills-Third Readings, on page 6, Representative Will Davis, you have Senate Bill 3415. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3415, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3415 is an initiative of the Illinois State Police, and it is an effort to reduce school violence. Under current statute, if a child is a victim of a certain criminal offenses in their home school, school personnel are mandated report... are mandated to report that type of abuse. However, if the same student is a victim of similar crimes while at school, there is no requirement for school personnel to report incidences. The focus of Senate Bill 3415 is on those students that are victimized. It requires specific criminal offenses to be reported to law enforcement with the intent of reducing school violence, to keep the violence from escalating to the point that serious injuries occur and is ultimately aimed toward preventing a potential school shooting. Under the current School Code today, only attacks on school personnel are required to be reported. Students are also people, and they, too, deserve the same protection since they are indeed more vulnerable. I'd be more than happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Davis, M.: "Representative, is the Chicago Public Schools still opposed to this legislation?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, I believe they are."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Davis, M.: "Chicago Public Schools is opposed to this legislation. And did they give you a reason?"

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry?"

Davis, M.: "Did they give you a reason?"

Davis, W.: "They're concerned about the assault and battery being included in this Bill."

Davis, M.: "I believe your Bill states that whenever an incident occurs, the principal has to notify the police before he or she notifies a parent. Is that correct?"

Davis, W.: "Well, the police would ultimately notify the parents, but essentially what you said is correct."

Davis, M.: "So, the parent would be the last to know?"

Davis, W.: "The last to know?"

Davis, M.: "The parent would be the last person to know?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I guess if it's notifying the police and then notifying the parent, yes, you're correct."

Davis, M.: "Well, I think some other organizations have a problem with that. And the feeling was that school personnel, they are usually very aware of children and their parents, and they would like to make the determination of who they should call first. For example, if a parent is working a long distance from that school and can't get there for a very long time, the principal might feel let me call... let me call the parent. I know how supportive they are. I know they'd want to be here. And then the question is, how many people want their children questioned by the police before they're available?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Davis, W.: "Well, Representative, I don't think this is necessarily about questioning children. This is about reporting the incidences to the police first."
- Davis, M.: "So, in other words, we're removing the State Law that juvenile records are sealed and only a school or where that... where an incident occurs can have those records?"
- Davis, W.: "This has nothing to do with records, Representative. This is about reporting an incident."
- Davis, M.: "So, why we..."
- Davis, W.: "It has nothing to do with a juvenile's records."
- Davis, M.: "But if you're reporting an incident, you're reporting his record."
- Davis, W.: "I'm sorry."
- Davis, M.: "That's what you're doing. If you report an incident, it's not going to stay in the air. It's going to be written down someplace."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. I mean, we're talking about reporting an incident, and you're going all the way to sealing to whether or not a juvenile's records are sealed or not sealed, but we're talking about reporting an incident."
- Davis, M.: "So..."
- Davis, W.: "We're simply saying that the incident would have to be reported to law enforcement first. I assume that if there was an incident currently that you're right, the principal could call a parent, and then they'd call law enforcement. So, again, we're just switching the order. We're not necessarily suggesting that has anything to do with an individual's records being sealed or not sealed."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Davis, M.: "The Bill provides that instead of the principal notifying the student's parent after an incident the law enforcement agency must notify the parent."
- Davis, W.: "Correct."
- Davis, M.: "Instead of the school notifying the parent, the law enforcement agency notifies the parent. You don't see a problem with that?"
- Davis, W.: "Actually, I don't, Representative. If anything, the problem would be how a principal, who is not a law enforcement personnel, may report an incident versus how it may officially be reported by a law enforcement person. If anything, that's... I don't... I don't necessarily see a problem with that."
- "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. We send our Davis, M.: children to school, and when they're in school, the school becomes the parent. If an incident occurs currently, it is the authority of the school to notify the parent first, to notify the parent first and then the police can be notified. But to transfer the records of children, records that should be sealed, will now remove the privacy of juvenile behavior into the public. The Chicago Public Schools is opposed, and they rarely oppose what we do down here, very rarely do they oppose anything we do down here, but they realize that this is a piece of legislation that will criminalize children for the rest of their lives. There will be a record, public record, of what a juvenile has done, and who knows what can happen behind that. I know you have good intentions. I know someone gave you this Bill, but you have a child today. And you, as a parent,

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

should want to know first if your child has violated any rules or any laws. Surely, you don't want the police called on a six-year-old first. How will a six-year-old respond if a policeman is questioning him without a parent in his... just around, just to be there. Every child deserves that right. Every child deserves a right of the protection of a parent, even when they've done wrong. Not that you condone it, but you're there to protect his or her rights. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. I urge a 'no' vote. Let's not criminalize our children. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, we do have about five or six speakers, so if you keep your comments within a reasonable time frame, we would all be very appreciative. Representative Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, I appreciate where you're trying to go with this, and I support the Bill about 95 percent. Why do you include the crime of assault with these other things where an assault can be somebody who swung and missed somebody else, somebody who verbally assaults somebody else with a threat? Why... as a Class C misdemeanor, why would we put that in there with crimes that are aggravated criminal sexual abuse, which you're looking at Class X Felonies?"

Davis, W.: "Well, Representative, if I understand my conversations that I've had with representatives from the State Police, I think they see something like assault as something that could very easily escalate into something else. And I think the purpose of reporting these incidences

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

is about trying to prevent escalations that may occur in school. So, I think in their mind, they see assault as something that could possibly escalate into something else, and they'd rather err on the side of caution versus allowing it to escalate before it gets to something a little bit more serious."

- Reboletti: "And I can appreciate that scenario. So, if a teacher witnesses an assault in the hallway, what is their responsibility at that point in time?"
- Davis, W.: "I am told that initially it would be to notify the principal or school leadership who would then take it from there."
- Reboletti: "What responsibility would the principal have or whoever the superintendant is once they're notified that an assault occurred during the passing period between third and fourth period?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, once it gets to the administrative level, principal or the school leader, if I understand the Bill, then it would be their responsibility then to subsequently call the police, subsequently, and then allow the police to then call the student's parents."
- Reboletti: "And after... it says here that the police are required to fill out a police report. Usually that's also discretionary depending on what their investigation details. You're saying that the police officer must respond, must fill out a police report, and file the police report?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Reboletti: "Then why wouldn't we do this pretty much for any crime that we might see in a school? I mean, pretty... I see what you're saying about trying to stop the violence, and we've... we saw this last weekend. You had 35 shootings, 6 people dead in the City of Chicago, and there's no doubt that there's issues that we have to address, but why wouldn't we just add all crimes and if somebody sees a crime occur, why wouldn't we just report it and have the police respond to it?"
- Davis, W.: "Could you repeat your question? I'm sorry."
- Reboletti: "Why wouldn't we just have anytime any school official witnesses a crime, why wouldn't we just have them report it to the superintendant or the principal?"
- Davis, W.: "You said why not just any crime versus these crimes?"
- Reboletti: "Right. That's correct. So, if they found somebody with a small amount of marijuana, would that... why would we have them report that to school authorities?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I am not suggesting that those crimes should not be reported, but for the purposes of this Bill, the State Police have identified certain particular offenses. Again, I think the idea is these are offenses that could escalate into something certainly more serious as we've seen certain incidences have happened in schools, and so this is what the State Police have identified."
- Reboletti: "The police aren't required to make any arrests at this point, are they?"
- Davis, W.: "No, they're not."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jerry Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative, why have the Chicago Public Schools opposed to this Bill?"
- Davis, W.: "I'm told that they're concerned about assault and battery being included in this list of particular offenses."
- Mitchell, J.: "Isn't there an increase in the reporting structure as well..."
- Davis, W.: "I'm sorry?"
- Mitchell, J.: "...and don't they have... I said, I believe there's an increase in the reporting structure as well in this Bill that causes them to file more reports, one with the State Board of Education, one with the police department. Isn't that also a concern?"
- Davis, W.: "I'm told that the answer to your question is no, and that the Board of Education, State Board of Education, is subsequently notified by the police department... by State Police, I'm sorry."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. And there's a couple of more opponents to this Bill. Why would the Juvenile Justice Initiative be opposed to your Bill?"
- Davis, W.: "I'm told that they're more interested in seeing a more individualized approach to, I guess, addressing these types of concerns."
- Mitchell, J.: "So, in other words, it takes away any judgment or decision-making on the part of the school administration?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Davis, W.: "You mean... hold on, let me make sure I understand you correctly, Representative, whether or not the individualized approach takes away ability from school personnel?"
- Mitchell, J.: "To make any judgments other than the immediate call in, in other words, to decide whether or not this warrants a call to the State Police?"

Davis, W.: "Well..."

Mitchell, J.: "It's almost an automatic thing. Whenever anything happens, they must report to the State Police."

Davis, W.: "Well..."

Mitchell, J.: "Is that correct?"

- Davis, W.: "...again, they just currently have indicated that they want a more individualized approach, maybe in the sense that every situation being different that they want to be able to look at every situation independently. I don't see how this necessarily groups individuals together, it's just suggesting that if a potential incident happens that this is how this incident is reported."
- Mitchell, J.: "And we've also got the health and disabilities advocates that are opposed to this. What's their reasoning?"
- Davis, W.: "They are concerned about students with special needs being lumped into some of these categories."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Let's say the principal happens to be away from the school when a particular incident happens and he has not designated anybody to report this in his absence. What's the penalty for not reporting this?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Davis, W.: "Well, we're told that it would be school leadership. So, presumably, at a school you have a principal; you probably have various assistant principals. So, school leadership in the absence of the actual principal would then have this responsibility."
- Mitchell, J.: "And what's the penalty if it's not recorded?"

Davis, W.: "We're checking."

Mitchell, J.: "What's the penalty to the principal if he doesn't report that within..."

Davis, W.: "We're checking."

Mitchell, J.: "...with the immediate?"

Davis, W.: "Hold on. Hold on just a minute."

Mitchell, J: "Okay."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Davis, I do have about four or five more speakers."
- Davis, W.: "According to the legislation, Representative, it says knowingly and willfully failing to comply with this is a petty offense."
- Mitchell, J.: "Representative, isn't there... the possibility of opening yourself up as an administrator to a lawsuit from an individual for reporting this if it's not founded?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess in any circumstance, Representative, any incident that happens in the school, whether it's subject to this legislation or prior legislation, I think school districts are always subject to a lawsuit, and at that point, you have to let the legal process take its course."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, but when you have 24 hours to make a decision on that, there's at least some built-in protection

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

that's to having a little time to investigate the incident prior to reporting it to the State Police, and you find out that it's not as serious as you thought it was."

- Davis, W.: "Well, again, the idea, Representative, as the State Police have explained it, is that the idea is to stop certain things from escalating. So, while I guess some would disagree, I think the objective here is to err on the side of caution and to try to move in that vein versus not doing anything or not making the appropriate gestures and then ultimately something a little bit more serious happens in school when it maybe could have been prevented."
- Mitchell, J.: "And this is the... this is the reason why the State Police are in favor of this Bill is so that they can stop any escalation that they think may be happening within that school?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, the State Police also want to streamline the reporting process. But again, and I could run through a list of incidences that have happened at schools that they provided for me, but I think the objective here is to try to prevent these types of things from happening in our schools."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, certainly it might help with the possibility of retaliation for an incident that has already happened in a school, but you have to wait till the attack or till the incident has happened before you report it, so it's not going to stop the incidents reported. Possibly escalation could do that. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I can understand where the State Police are coming from. I have some grave concerns about this Bill and

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

some of the ways that it's worded. I'm not so sure that it's going to do what the State Police think it's going to do. I think you're going to find a lot of school officials and the Illinois Association of School Administrators taking a long, hard look at this Bill because of the concerns that have been already explained. I think you better think very seriously about how you vote on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

"To the Bill. This is a follow-up on Durkin: Representative Reboletti said earlier, but any assault to this legislation is absolutely insane. Here's a definition of assault under the state statutes. A person commits an assault when without... when he or she without lawful authority engages in conduct which places another reasonable apprehension of receiving a battery. No punches thrown. No injury is done to an individual. That means when, under this legislation, we're talking someone from sixth grade to the end of grammar... end of high school who says... who sees another student who's wearing a uniform or an outfit that is the same as theirs. They get mad. Kids are going to be kids. They say, you know what, I am going to punch you because I don't like the fact that you're wearing my outfit. That means that that is a bad... that is an assault under the law in Illinois. And we're saying that that 6... that 11-year-old, that 12-year-old will then have a police report that is going to be registered in Illinois State Police database 'cause that's what legislation says. It says that the local law enforcement

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

agency shall report the incident to the Department of State Police Illinois Uniform Crime Reporting Program in a form, matter and frequency. So, that seventh or eighth grade who... seventh or eighth grader who mad a verbal comment who was angry about something. Basically, kids are... kid being a kid is now going to have a police report sent down to the Illinois State Police database center. That's crazy. I'm sorry. This is wrong. And secondly, we're telling a principal if he says this is crazy, I am not going to report this; the second time he does it, he's now going to be subject to Class C misdemeanor. You know what that means. That means he's going to be processed. He's going to be fingerprinted. He's going to have a rap sheet. This is wrong. I'm sorry. The Sponsor is a friend, but this is going too far. Realize what you're voting for. This is wrong on so many levels. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Cavaletto. Representative Mary Flowers."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Flowers: "I mean, Sponsor yield? Representative, when I send my child to school, did I give up my rights as a parent?"

Davis, W.: "I don't believe you did."

Flowers: "Well, why is it that instead of you notifying me that they have to call the State Police?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I don't think this is saying that if you notify the parent first, you don't notify the State Police.

This is suggesting that you notify the State Police first, and then they have the responsibility of notifying."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Flowers: "Who has the responsibility, the State Police?"

Davis, W.: "The State Police or the police department."

Flowers: "But I didn't send my child to the State Police. I sent my child to school."

Davis, W.: "Yes, Ma'am."

Flowers: "And if there's something that happened on that campus, that school is supposed to notify me as the parent."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I believe that's the way it currently is."

Flowers: "And so this..."

Davis, W.: "This Bill suggests that..."

Flowers: "...Bill would be changing."

Davis, W.: "...it would change."

Flowers: "Oh, so now I'm acquiescing my authority over to some strangers, and I don't know what happened to my child, and they could report... it doesn't say that the parent has to be notified within 12 to 24 to 48 hours. It just says that the state board must notify the Illinois State Police. So, there's nothing to say that I have to be notified at all."

Davis, W.: "Well, I don't know... you said the state board?"

Flowers: "The State Board of Education. It also clarifies that the data share in the..."

Davis, W.: "Well, according..."

Flowers: "...recording requirement of the State Board of Education and the Department of State Police."

Davis, W.: "Well, according to what I am being told, as we think the legislation as drafted, the principal or school leader would notify police, then police would notify

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- parents. And that's only for the offenses that we have listed here."
- Flowers: "Well, let me just ask this. Is a criminal... is a person that's charged with a crime, are they innocent until proven guilty?"
- Davis, W.: "I believe they still have to go through that process, yes."
- Flowers: "So, according to this legislation, a child is already guilty. According to what we have here, this Bill would require the State Police to be called and that the data must be shared with the district. The data must be... the State Board of Education shall compile the data by the school district and make it available to the public."
- Davis, W.: "Well, that's the collective data that's already shared. So, I don't know how, without going through a legal process, an individual is guilty."
- Flowers: "But if you call the police first, already you assume that my child has done something wrong, and you have found... you or someone has made the determination that my child is guilty."
- Davis, W.: "Well, that school personnel is the one making that call, Ma'am."
- Flowers: "And so I don't ... I don't recall..."
- Davis, W.: "So, I guess they're making the decision."
- Flowers: "...that we've given any laws here or any rights here to a school personnel to be the final arbitrator whether or not a child has committed a crime or not and sentence them indefinitely to someone else interpretation of a crime."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Flowers: "For instance, again, let's talk about the assault situation. Children assault each other every day, but they don't consider it as an assault. They consider it as playing around. You know, we... the kids... horseplay, you know, kids that, for the schools who do have recess, children push and shove each other every day. Now a teacher or a principal or an adult that work at the school may decide that this is a criminal offense, and they... by law, they have to contact the State Police because the children do child-like things on school property. And we're going to make that a criminal offense. Is that realistic, Representative?"

Davis, W.: "Well, that's not a criminal offense necessarily.

It's up to the school personnel to make that determination..."

Flowers: "Oh, so..."

Davis, W.: "...whether they feel..."

Flowers: "...I asked the question, Sir. When did I acquiesce my authority as a Legislator to have school personnel to be the judge, the jury, and the executioner?"

Davis, W.: "Well, they are..."

Flowers: "And they can make a determination."

Davis, W.: "...well, they are neither. Well, they are neither, Representative, but if a school personnel calls you, then they're still making a determination on your child, are they not?"

Flowers: "Well, there's a difference. I'm the parent,

Representative. You cannot compare the authority."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Davis, W.: "But you're making the distinction between who gets called first, not necessarily who makes the determination. In your previous example, you still have concerns about who makes the determination about your child. The school personnel is still making the determination about your child, whether they call you first or whether they call law enforcement first."

Flowers: "Well..."

Davis, W.: "Are they not? Are they not?"

Flowers: "Representative, Representative..."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Flowers: "...let's be realistic."

Davis, W.: "I am just trying to answer your question."

Flowers: "If they call... if they call me, if I'm called up to the school because my child has a behavior problem, I will come up to the school. I will talk to the principal. I will talk to the teacher. I will reprimand my child. I will take him or her home."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Flowers: "If the police is called, the State Police is called, then the State Police will not necessarily call me. The State Police..."

Davis, W.: "Well, no, they're supposed to call you by way of the legislation."

Flowers: "Where's is it... is it in this legislation? Was it written in this legislation?"

Davis, W.: "The local law enforcement agency will contact the parent."

Flowers: "No. No."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Davis, W.: "It's in... it's in the legislation..."

Flowers: "It's not in the legislation, so therefore, it's not required to do. Representative, let me just ask this."

Davis, W. "Please."

Flowers: "Are all adults right? Are all adults perfect?"

Davis, W.: "No. I wouldn't necessarily say that."

Flowers: "And so why is it that I would want to put this authority in the hands of an adult, knowing the things that we've heard about and know about that happened in the schools in regards to teachers trying to mess with the younger students, take advantage of them. And so, it'll be easy for a teacher to intimidate a child by saying if you don't do what I say do, this is what could happen. I could call the police on you and have you locked up."

Davis, W.: "Well, I would like to think, Representative, that that same feeling of fear would exist, if they said I will call your parent on you, as well. Again, we're not suggesting... suggesting that school personnel don't... They already have that kind of discretion because, as you stated earlier, they can call you as a parent first. Correct? Well, they're already making a determination on the child based on whatever happened. This Bill just simply says they have to call law enforcement first. That's all."

Flowers: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. You know, I think we have done enough harm to our children. We are not educating them properly. We are not protecting them from the gangs, the crime, the drugs. And now because children will be guilty of children, we're going to take the keys and have them locked up. For what? For what? Because they

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

happen to be a child, doing child-like things. This is a very, very bad Bill. I think all of us think very highly of our children, and this is not necessary. There's nothing that's going on in the schools that's so egregious that the State Police and everybody else have to be notified, and it has to be made public information before parents are found out. I would appreciate a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 3415. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final two speakers will be Representative Rose and Representative Sacia and then Will Davis to close. Representative Rose."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Rose: "Representative Davis, why did you choose the Illinois State Police, rather than our local police departments in this Bill?"

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry, Representative, can you repeat that for me?"

Rose: "Sure. Why did you choose the Illinois State Police instead of our local police departments for this Bill?"

Davis, W.: "I didn't choose. Again, this is a Senate Bill, so that decision was obviously made when the Bill was introduced, but..."

Rose: "Okay. The State Police will spend their entire day at schools in Illinois. There aren't enough State Police to cover every school in Illinois. I'm actually stunned and shocked that the State Police would support this Bill because they, if anybody, should know that they can't and don't have the time to chase down every last kid on a

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

schoolyard that says I'm going to kick your tail. I mean, that's what it does. Representative Davis, have you ever worked with developmentally disabled individuals?"

Davis, W.: "Worked with whom?"

Rose: "Developmentally disabled individuals? Autism, Asperger's, DD?"

Davis, W.: "Not directly. No, Sir."

Rose: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "Not directly."

"Sometimes a DD individual through... because of the stimulation that's coming in will Commonly, they will hit someone. My wife has a masters degree from Rush University, St. Luke's Hospital in Chicago in occupational therapy. She deals with developmentally disabled individuals every day. Well, before we had the twins anyway. Now it's about once a month, but routinely gets hit by her patients. She's trying to deliver a level of care to her patients, but the patients perceive that because of things that misfire in their brain, they can't handle it. They'll bite. They'll spit. They'll slap. They'll hit. Those people don't deserve to have the police called on them. The State Police certainly don't have ... deserve to waste time coming to school to deal with a developmentally disabled individual, who's doing what everyone knows they do. It's clinical. It's a clinical issue, one. Two, how many kids... how many people in this room said something they regretted on a schoolyard at some point in time in their life? How many people on the House Floor have said... here the definition of assault is a

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

reasonable apprehension of battery. I don't like you. I'm going to get you. How many people have said something like that anywhere from first grade all the way up to senior in high school? And now, the teacher on a schoolyard has to call the State Police, and the State Police might be investigating a murder or a rape. Now, mind you, if it's a sexual assault, a sexual battery, they're already required to report it. If it's a sexual assault, a sexual battery, they're already required to report it. You can't have police, referees... the schoolyard referee, the cafeteria worker calling the police every time somebody says something stupid. I mean, whatever happened to sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me. I mean, this is ridiculous. The simple fact of the ... get back the developmentally disabled. Ιt is commonplace, Representative Davis, for those who work with developmentally disabled to get kicked at, spit at, hit at because that individual... it's not 'cause they want to, not because they intend to, but because that individual's clinical diagnosis causes them to act out. We're not going to call the police every time someone with Asperger's or an autistic student acts out in a class. That would be silly, but that's what this Bill does."

Davis, W.: "Well, Representative, I think you raise a valid concern, and just like with any piece of legislation that we have, if it passes, you always have the ability to come back and to modify it. We do that all the time. So, if the concern is about how this Bill addresses and works with developmentally disabled individuals, I don't see any

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

reason why the Senate Sponsor, nor myself, would want to... would not want to come back and maybe make Amendments to this..."

Rose: "Well, take it out of the record..."

Davis, W.: "...Bill for that purpose."

Rose: "...and we'll do it before we leave. School will start before this Session comes back, hopefully. Maybe we'll be here all summer."

Davis, W.: "Well, unfortunately without being able to have some dialogue with the Senate Sponsor, I don't want to just make necessarily arbitrarily do that. Now, if the Bill..."

Rose: "But so, we'll arbitrarily tell every..."

Davis, W.: "Representative, Representative..."

Rose: "...developmentally disabled worker..."

Davis, W.: "...can I finish?"

Rose: "...in this..."

Davis, W.: "If the Bill fails, if there is still interest in moving this type of legislation forward, then I'm sure the Senate Sponsor will come back to the starting board and pass another Bill."

Rose: "So, you're arguing we should..."

Davis, W.: "I mean, this is not the end of the world, but I don't think you would want someone to just arbitrarily take your Bill off the record necessarily. We're in the last... we're in the last few days of Session. So, if enough..."

Rose: "So, you're arguing that we should..."

Davis, W.: "...enough Members... if enough..."

Rose: "...kill the Bill to fix it?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Davis, W.: "...if enough individuals in this chamber don't see the need for this Bill to pass, then obviously the Senate Sponsor will have to come back and do something differently."

"Well, then let me close by saying this. Ladies and Rose: Gentlemen of the Illinois House of Representatives, if you are related to anyone who has a developmentally disabled individual in their family or works with a developmentally disabled individual, you will know that oftentimes a developmentally disabled individual will act out, not because they intend to hurt their caregiver, not because they intend to hurt some of their family member, but they act out because the clinical diagnosis, the disorder, causes their brain synapses (sic-synapse) to misfire. They can't handle the incoming input, and so they'll... their arm will flail, they'll bite, they'll spit. They don't mean to do it, but the caregivers, the loved ones, are there because they love that person and want to help that person. They know what's coming. You know, quite frankly, my wife has come home with bruises. She's been bitten before, but she does it because she loves to help her patients. It would be absolutely ridiculous to tell those folks they have to call the State Police every time that happens. And then to petty offense them and then Class C misdemeanor them, I mean, my God, what... the State Police have far better things to do than to deal with that. So, I'll take your advice. Let's kill this Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Our final speaker is Representative Sacia."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor, Representative Davis knows I hold him in the highest esteem. Many of you here know that I carried a badge for 30 years. This Bill is bad, bad, a bad badly put together piece of legislation. It deserves to fail. Please vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, because of the interest or because of specifically what was said about developmentally disabled children, and I can certainly appreciate that response from the individual, I respectfully would like to withdraw this Bill from the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "After 30 minutes of a spirited debate, we'll take this Bill out of the record. And perhaps I will use the timer for the rest of the day, with all due respect. You're smiling now. We'll see after I start using the timer. Representative Hernandez, on page 6 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3458. Out of the record. On the top of page 7, Representative Cross has Senate Bill 35... 3572. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3572, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Jil Tracy on Senate Bill 3572."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3572 is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Lake Committees, and it amends the Common Interest Community Association Act. The purpose behind the Act is to modernize and update certain terminology within the Act. It has no Senate... it passed the Senate without any opposition. And I know of no current opposition. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on Senate Bill 3572. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of the Bill signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady and Chapa LaVia, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 85 Members voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Dan Burke. Leader Burke, you have Senate Bill 3629 on page 7 of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3629, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Leader Dan Burke."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Senate Bill 3629, as amended, would limit the service credit available to park employees who work under the stopgap 6-month fiscal year proposed in the Bill to a half year's credit. Under the article, employees hired after 1973 are entitled to three-fourths of a year of service for working between 6 and 8 months. Those hired before 1973 are entitled to a year's worth of credit for 4 months of service. Employees working for the full 6-month fiscal year would earn 6 months' time for that service, not 9 or 12. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is 'Should

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Senate Bill 3629 pass?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Monique Davis. Representative Jakobsson and Sente, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 112 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, back on page 6, Leader Lou Lang has Senate Bill 3497. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3497, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman from Cook, Leader Lou Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As you Lang: know the state has now authorized the sale of online lottery tickets, but they had left Powerball out. So what 3497 does is allow the Department of the Lottery to sell Powerball tickets online. It also creates a lottery study committee and allows them to create rules but not emergency rules. Additionally, it gives them the authority to appoint investigators. This was an issue in committee, but the fact is that all of the investigators had recent... had previously been hired by the Department of Revenue, and all this simply does is allow them to rehire the same people so that they can do the work to investigate in the Department of the Lottery. Additionally, for legislative intent, before I forget to do this, relative to the lottery study committee to determine the impact of the Internet pilot program on lottery licenses and to determine the feasibility of the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

sale of stored value cards by lottery licensees as an option for playing the Internet games. For purposes of legislative intent, one of the two appointees to the study committee from the lottery licensee community shall be a representative of a statewide association representing petroleum marketers, and the other appointment shall be a representative from a convenience store doing business in the State of Illinois. I would ask your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation.

Representative Mike Bost."

Bost: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Leader, I noticed that in Amendment 1, it eliminates the provision that requires the Department of the Lottery must establish or a verification process for age eligibility security purposes. If we don't have that in there, how do we know those who are playing are over the age of 18, which is the legal age for gaming?"

Lang: "Can you ask your question again, Sir?"

Bost: "I can. Thank you. Basically, with the House Amendment 1, it says that they will take away or eliminate the department's establishing a verification process for age eligibility for security purposes. How does that... how are we going to then, while selling online, know that we don't have someone who's underage doing this?"

Lang: "Representative, it's my understanding that all Amendment 1 did was delete the department's ability to create emergency rules."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Bost: "Okay. That was in our analysis. So, even if that's out of the way, let's ask this. How do we verify, while selling online, that the person on the other end is of legal age to game?"

Lang: "Representative, the lottery has created rules that they have in place. Remember, we have two games that they sell online now. We're not reinventing the wheel. They already have two games. We're adding a third game."

Bost: "Well, then..."

Lang: "Nothing else has changed."

Bost: "...then how do they do that?"

Lang: "I don't have that information with me, Sir."

Bost: "Okay. So most probably they can. I mean, I just... I would hope..."

Lang: "Let me just add this. When you set up... my guess is some people on this House Floor have signed up to buy lottery tickets online particularly when that mega million game was \$8 bazillion, however much it was. And they go through a process when you apply to verify your age. I don't recall what it is."

Bost: "Okay. Okay. Well, just so you know, I wish I would have won that, but unfortunately, no one bought me a ticket because, you know, they couldn't, but... on the Bill, itself. Can you repeat... I know you went into this pretty long, but what exactly is the reason for the change here?"

Lang: "Sir, all we're doing is adding a game to the existing law."

Bost: "So, will it make it easier to play online?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Lang: "No. This has nothing to do with easier or not easier.

We're adding a game. The original law that we passed allowed for two... two different lottery games to be sold online. We're simply adding Powerball is all we're doing. We're not reinventing the wheel. This is not any big deal gaming Bill. All we're doing is allowing the lottery to sell an additional game online."

Bost: "Okay. I'll listen to the rest of the debate. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lyons: "The Gentleman awaits your questions."

Reboletti: "Representative, I was looking at the Section regarding investigators and their investigative power. My understanding was that we privatized the lottery and that... that private company would be managing all the operations. And why wouldn't they be managing this if we added this game to the games that are already online?"

Lang: "So, Sir, in the past, it was the Department of Revenue that did this work. The Department of Revenue had investigators, but the Department of Lottery was not authorized to do this. Since the Department of the Lottery is now going to be responsible for administering this and enforcing the law, they need the investigators."

Reboletti: "So, then that's where the additional headcount would come from. They'll be investigators assigned to the Department of Lottery?"

Lang: "My understanding is that there will be people moving over or already maybe have moved over from Revenue to the Lottery."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Reboletti: "So, there won't be an additional headcount that's..."

Lang: "My understanding is no, but if somebody thinks I'm wrong, I suppose they can correct me, but I think that's my understanding."

Reboletti: "And all the other games are already available now online or will be set up online?"

Lang: "I'm sorry. I missed the question, Sir."

Reboletti: "Are the other games already available online right now?"

Lang: "Yes, Sir. You could go on your computer, although it's probably not a good idea right now and sign up to buy lottery tickets."

Reboletti: "And this will just add this game then, right?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Reboletti: "It says these Department of Revenue... are these sworn officers then? Will they... or are they investigators basically, and then they're able to turn things over to the Illinois State Police or somebody else?"

Lang: "They are sworn officers, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Ken Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just curious. Some of us only play the lottery when the Mega Powerball is huge, and we're sort of a part of the hype, but when we go to those stores, we often make purchases as well. I'm curious. Is this a correct, on my analysis, where it has IRMA or the Illinois

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Retail Merchants Association, they're supportive of this Bill?"

Lang: "The reason that they don't have a problem with the Bill is that we put the study commission in the Bill to determine what impact this will have on convenience stores and other members of that organization, and we can adjust this as we go. There's also the ability to talk about what we call stored value cards, where people could buy them at a convenience store or some other facility where people would have to go in and buy them and then use that to make purchases of lottery tickets online, rather than using a credit card."

Dunkin: "Okay. Maybe I missed this, but how do we police those individuals when they're on the Internet, online?"

Lang: "The department has rules in place that do that. And remember, all we're doing is adding a game. They already have rules in place on the other two games. I assume they'll adapt the same rules to an additional game."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3497 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? Brady, Davis, Hays, McAuliffe, Tryon. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 62 Members voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. This Bill, having

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Going back to page 4 on the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Readings, we went through Bills that we knew Sponsors were prepared to run. Now, we'll kind of through the entire Senate Bill-Third Reading Calendar again to verify if people are interested in moving their Bill. Representative Jack Franks, Senate Bill 408. Out of the record. Representative Cyndi Soto. Leader Acevedo, on page 4 of the Calendar, you have Senate Bill 1064. Out of the record. Leader Acevedo, on Senate Bill 1617. Out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar, Representative Bradley, you have Senate Bill 3420. John Bradley on the floor? Out of the record. Representative Lisa Dugan, you have Senate Bill 3441 on the Order of Third Readings. Out of record. Representative Mike Zalewski, on page 6 of Calendar, you have Senate Bill 3514. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3514, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Should we take a vote on it? Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "It's good to see you, Leader Lang."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Zalewski: "Senate Bill 3514 is an initiative of the Illinois Medical District Commission, Mr. Speaker. We had to do several things under new leadership at the Medical District Commission to bring them up to speed after a change in... after a change in leadership. I'd be happy to answer any questions, but it deals with the status of the entity, what

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

they can do with their assets. And it's pretty straightforward legislation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, what's a medical district?"

Zalewski: "Representative, I had a feeling you would ask about this particular piece of legislation. Illinois Medical District Commission is a body politic. It's a, hopefully upon the Bill's passage, it'll be unilocal governed that deals with the planned upon which several hospitals along the Eisenhower Expressway in Chicago sit."

Franks: "Why do we need to have a medical district? Why do we need another unit of government?"

Zalewski: "Well, Representative, several years ago, this Body created a body politic with its own board and its own management of that particular piece of property. All this Bill does is say that it's a unit of local government that shall be separate and distinct. It's a clarification more than it is creating another unit of local government."

Franks: "But if they're already somehow organized and it's private... is it private property or is it public property?"

Zalewski: "It's public property upon which sits private hospitals and non-for-profit hospitals and other medical..."

Franks: "So it's..."

Zalewski: "...facilities."

Franks: "...is the property owned by the village, or is it the City of Chicago who owns the property? Is there..."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Zalewski: "No. The Medical District Commission owns and operates the property."

Franks: "Right now?"

Zalewski: "Correct."

Franks: "And this would create a medical district."

Zalewski: "No. No, Representative, all this would say is in addition of being a body politic, we're simply clarifying that it's also a unit of local government."

Franks: "And what's the benefit of being a unit of local government?"

Zalewski: "So, what I... what I think the answer to that question is, Representative, is by being a unit of local government, the current director and the board over there has more flexibility in the management of their assets, and what they can and can't do and what they can do to reduce the problems that the previous administration had in that particular entity."

Franks: "Well, as a unit of local government, for instance, would they have the ability to exercise the right of eminent domain?"

Zalewski: "I don't believe so, Representative. I believe we cut this particular parcel property out when the hospitals were already on there."

Franks: "Would they have the ability to an... to do annexation?"

Zalewski: "Could you repeat that, Jack?"

Franks: "Would they have the ability to utilize annexation?"

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

Franks: "Would they have the ability to institute a tax?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Zalewski: "Only... I don't believe so, Representative, 'cause that's not in the current statute with regard to the Medical District Commission right now."
- Franks: "Well, then I don't understand what a unit of local government would do for them. If they can't tax, and they can't have eminent domain and they can't annex, what do they do?"
- Zalewski: "Good question, Representative. What they do is they...
 they have assets, and they... they can leverage their assets
 for limited debt service. And that's the problem they're
 having is their debt service has been less than ideal and
 they can't do what they need to do to fix that issue under
 the current statute. They need to be a unit of local
 government and have more power."
- Franks: "I appreciate your answers. I just don't really get it 'cause I know we've got hospitals where I live out in the country, and they don't need to be a unit of local government to take care of their issues. I just don't understand why this entity would need to become a unit of local government to handle their issues. Can you enlighten me or you don't know either?"
- Zalewski: "I won't... I don't know that I'll ever be able to satisfy your concerns about the existence of the Medical District Commission. It was put in the statute for the management of that particular parcel of property. What I will say is the way the statute is constructed right now, for the purposes of the Medical District Commission to regain its footing financially, we need to make these changes in the statute to make it stronger, to make it

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

clearer and to better manage that particular parcel of property."

Franks: "Do you know what that issue is? Could it have been a bond issue?"

Zalewski: "Crain's did a piece on this, Representative, a few months ago. My understanding is that the bond issues never met a certain ratio that they thought they would meet. I'm not a bond expert, so I don't know the exact specifics. When that happened, it put their status in jeopardy and the Governor made a change to fix the Medical District Commission's leadership. And Warren Ribley has stated that this is what he needs to fix that and to ensure that the stability of that particular area remain strong."

Franks: "Representative, was Amendment #3 ever adopted or just 1 and 2?"

Zalewski: "It was adopted, Representative."

Franks: "So, what Amendment..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir. There's still three people wishing to debate this Bill."

Franks: "I want just talk briefly about Amendment #3. That would take off the maximum cost of an audit by the Auditor General at 100 thousand? So, there could be an audit done on this by the state's Auditor General that could cost the taxpayers in excess of \$100 thousand? Is that the meaning of that Amendment #3?"

Zalewski: "The Medical District would pay for the audit under Amendment #3."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "But where do they get their money from? That's what I don't get. If they're a body politic, where do they get their money?"

Zalewski: "They lease the property to the hospitals."

Franks: "But they don't own the property?"

Zalewski: "Correct. They're management... they're a manager. They're a property manager for that particular area along the Eisenhower Expressway where Rush... I don't... off the top of my head I forgot what else is over there, but there's a series of hospitals that sit over there that are upon the Medical District Commission's property."

Franks: "I'll let the other three people who probably have more intelligent questions than me go forward..."

Zalewski: "No. Those were good questions..."

Franks: "...but thank you."

Zalewski: "...Representative. I'm sorry I couldn't answer them better."

Speaker Lang: "There are still three people wishing to debate this Bill. Mr. Bost, Representative Mulligan, Representative Nybo, two minutes each. Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Okay. I don't know how much more intelligent questions
I'm going to ask because I'm still just trying to figure
this out. This is like a new creature in government,
correct?"

Zalewski: "No, Representative. Yeah. I want to steer clear of that... of that perception that we're creating..."

Bost: "No. No, don't steer clear. I need to know."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Zalewski: "Well, I just don't want the Body to believe that we're creating a new body... we're creating a new unit of local government here. It already was a body politic. A body politic is its own government. What we're saying is, we're clarifying in the statute that it's also a unit of local government so that the management can more execute the powers that it's given."

Bost: "So, we're not going down the path that we're going to identify why and how it was created in the first place. We just want to give it more power?"

Zalewski: "Mike, I can't hear you. Mr. Speaker..."

Bost: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Bost: "We don't want to go down the path..."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Please, let's pay some attention to the speakers on the floor. If you must speak, please go to the rear of the chamber and let these folks have their debate."

Bost: "Trust me. We're just trying to figure out exactly what this does. And you say you don't want to go back to the past to try to explain they're already an established... they're not really a government. They're an established political..."

Zalewski: "They were a body politic. What we're adding is the language 'a unit of local government'."

Bost: "Which means they will be now become a local government and have a power of a local government."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Bost: "So, we are creating a new local government."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Zalewski: "No, we're not. I don't want..."

Bost: "I'm really just trying to understand this."

Zalewski: "...I don't want to disregard what the Body has already done with regard to the Illinois Medical District Commission. Several years ago, I'm not sure which... when, this Body, the Senate, and then the Governor signed a Bill, which stated there would be a parcel of property that would be called the Illinois Medical District Commission that would have a board, that would have specific duties, and would have an executive director. That already exists. There's been some problems with that particular entity. We're trying to address those problems by inserting the language 'unit of local government', which makes it... their jobs that much easier to bring into line some of the problems they've been having."

Bost: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost, your time has expired, but I'll extend you an additional minute, Sir."

Bost: "And I wish that we did have more time because I don't think you presented your argument to the point because I believe, in my mind, that we have created... now, all of a sudden, we're going to give them more power. You say it's not taxation at this time, but you are creating a new government in the fact that you're taking originally something that was quasi government, and now it is becoming a government by this language. And you are trying to give them more power here. Am I wrong?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Zalewski: "I will acknowledge that under the Bill they have better abilities to manage the Medical District Commission than they had prior if this Bill were not to be enacted."

Bost: "Okay. I hope others will bring up other items on this 'cause I'm still trying desperately to understand, and I don't understand."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To this district. This district used to come through the Human Appropriations Committee for a number of years. It was a set up district there where there was appointed people for it. The original interest in what was going on there was it was an incubator for start-up businesses, and in that particular area, they use that area for businesses that were interested in starting up. I'm trying to think. There was one very famous one, unfortunately, that business, when it was finished, went to California. What we wanted to do was make sure that the businesses that went through the incubator stayed here. It sits on part of the property that used to be Maxwell Street, and then it went to the University of Illinois. And they took control over it, and I don't think it's an incubator any longer. I think it's part of theirs in the medical district, and that they use that property. So, over the years, it's been before the Human Service Commission. It's had different directors, and there were different uses for it, but the main use originally was for a start-up for new businesses, which was an interesting thing to do here in Illinois and which we should do in order to encourage businesses, but we should

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

make sure that the businesses are obligated to stay here in Illinois. Now, I don't know if the Representative would like to challenge me on anything that I've said, or what he's changing, but my feeling is, it's still hanging out there, and so now you're trying to do something with it. Is that my understanding or..."

Zalewski: "Representative, I think you're correct in your assertion that it started out... its intent was to give the hospitals over there some of... some flexibility to purchase equipment. I think that's a perfectly fair representation, and I have a hard time disagreeing with what you said about the purpose of the district commission. I would say that its duties have grown, and we're, again, we're trying to simply modify its powers to ensure that it doesn't run into more financial trouble that... more financial trouble. So, I appreciate what you said. I think it's been helpful to the conversation as to what the Medical District was originally for. I would say its scope may have gradually increased over the last few years."

Mulligan: "And I don't if the university..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, your time has expired, but I'll extend you an additional minute."

Mulligan: "...I don't know if the university actually still controls it. I'm not positive about that because it's been a long time. It no longer comes through the Human Service budget that I can remember seeing it, but I would definitely like to see it go back to being an incubator. In some countries, particularly say like Israel, their incubators are very productive, but you should make sure

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

that whatever happens that the business stays here in Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Nybo for two minutes."

Nybo: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Nybo: "Representative Zalewski, I just have one question regarding one personal provision of this Bill. My analysis says that the Bill removes an outdated reference subjecting the Medical District Commission to the hiring provisions of the Personnel Code."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Nybo: "Why is that an outdated provision, and why is it being removed?"

Zalewski: "I don't know why your analysis says outdated, Representative. Following along with what we've been talking about under the new leadership, because of the unique nature of the Medical District Commission dealing with hosp... upon hospitals, and they're called upon to do, maybe, purchases and hiring of certain instances in the health care profession, the Personnel Code could be restrictive in that regard. So, what we're trying to say is if we're going to clarify what the purpose of the commission is, then the State Personnel Procurement Code shouldn't apply."

Nybo: "This is kind of a big change, if I understand this and I think everybody should be paying attention. Right now, the medical district is subject to civil service practices, and what we're saying is that no longer will the Medical District Commission in its hiring be subject to routine

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

civil service provisions, testing, applicants have to meet certain requirements, et cetera."

Zalewski: "What... I would argue that that... by striking that language, your assertion is correct, Representative, but I don't necessarily know that this Medical District Commission is currently hiring your PSAs and your SPSAs. They have very unique, specific calibrated needs at that commission. Part of the problem they're in, the troubles they're having is because they weren't able to do some of the things they were... they needed to do under their restrictions in the current statute. So, to fix the problems they have, we need to enact this Bill."

Nybo: "It seems somewhat troubling to me and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I mean, in an era where government is getting more restrictive and organized with its hiring practices, moving towards merit systems that we would be excusing or exempting this Body from the same practices that a lot of organizations are now adopting."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close."

Zalewski: "To the Bill. I appreciate the concerns I heard from both sides of the aisle about the expansion and the purpose of this... of the Medical District Commission, but let me assert for the record, my intent that this not an expansion of government. This isn't something that would be considered, in any stretch of the imagination, creating a new unit of government that doesn't already exist. What you call it in the statute is up to the person reading the statute, but I can tell you right now that if we don't enact this legislation and don't give the new leadership at

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

that Medical District Commission the tools that he or she needs going forward, we're going to be down here every year dealing with this particular issue. And I understand the concerns that were brought forth, but this is a very narrowly tailored piece of legislation that will enable the Medical District Commission to do its job in a narrow way. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

"Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; Speaker Lang: opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Moffitt. Mr. Reis. Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes' and 56 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman wishes Postponed Consideration. on Next Bill the Calendar is Senate Bill 3544, Representative Mussman. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3544, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman."

Mussman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3544 amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act by allowing the department to keep all prior unfounded reports of abuse and neglect beyond 12 months, if there is a pending report involving the same individual. Under current law, the report will be expunged after 12 months without exception. This is a recommendation of the DCFS Office of the Inspector General. There is no known opposition. I am happy to answer any questions."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulligan. Representative Mulligan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3593, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3593, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Senate Bill 3593 is an initiative of the Cook County Public Guardian. It amends the duties of the public guardian so that the guardian is exempted from maintaining insurance on a ward's property upon the issuance of an order of the court finding the real or personal property of a ward lacks sufficient equity, or the estate lacks sufficient funds to pay for the insurance or the property is otherwise uninsurable. Current law requires the public guardian to prepare an inventory of the... a ward's belongings and assets and maintain insurance on all of the worlds... ward's real and personal property. I ask for an 'aye' vote and welcome any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mulligan. Lyons. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3621, Mr. Acevedo. Out... out of the record. Senate Bill 3765, Kelly Burke. You get two in a row. Please read the Bill. Out of the... having trouble with your hand signals. Out of the record. That one I understood. Senate Bill 3824, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Returning to page 6 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 3420, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3420, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Initiative of the Health Care Council; it clarifies language allowing the owner of a nursing home to serve as a relative's representative to assist the resident with care. Know of no opposition to this Bill. Would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 3450, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan, do you wish to move this Bill? Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, appears House Bill 4239, Representative Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4239, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #6, Representative... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Want to just quickly tell us..."

Zalewski: "I'd prefer... I would prefer to re... discuss the Bill on Third Reading. It simply does a minor modification to the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "I was wondering what that minor modification was on Floor Amendment #6?"

Zalewski: "What was the question, Representative?"

Reboletti: "What's the Amendment do?"

Zalewski: "What we had noticed, Representative, was that the original... in previous Amendments, we weren't clear about the as amended versus full language of the Bill. The Bill, itself, creates best practices for regulation of the homestead exemption and extends a deadline for a regulation of tax sales, and it requires, on the homestead... back to the homestead piece, a notarized signature by both the tenant and the landlord."

Reboletti: "Does Amendment #6 become the Bill, or is it add to the previous five?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Zalewski: "It becomes the Bill, Representative."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 4239, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Body well knows, we've been dealing with the issue of who's entitled to a proper homestead exemption under the state's statute. What this Bill does is institute best practices, so that should a township assessor choose to implement a system by which they can guarant... they can determine if a landlord is properly deriving the benefit of the homestead to the tenant. It's included in the statute. It also extends... we did a significant piece of legislation along with Representative Kay last spring dealing with tax sales. The Department of Revenue is to promulgate a rule certifying equipment. We weren't exactly on the same page on that rule, so we're going to extend the deadline out. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. I'd be happy to answer questions."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Reboletti: "Representative, does Amendment #6 then remove any opposition from the Realtors' Association?"
- Zalewski: "The realtors are not opposed to the Bill. They're neutral."
- Reboletti: "And then you were talking about the assessors would have to make up their own rules regarding the people who were following the homestead exemption or not?"
- Zalewski: "No. What this Bill would do, Representative, is institute what are called best practices. If the Chief County Assessment Officer chose to implement these rules... some township assessors do a better job than we could ever do of managing these, but some don't. And what we're saying is in this statute if you were looking for some guidance on how to best regulate homesteads that are derived to the tenant, this is what we would argue would be the best way to go."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1338, Representative Howard. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #3 was adopted in a committee.

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Howard, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Howard."
- Howard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 becomes the Bill. We're simply trying to make certain that the committee has enough time to do its work. The original date was too soon, so we're now changing the deadline date for the report from September 1, 2012 to July 1, 2013."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

 Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1531, Representative Golar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1566, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Frank Mautino. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino. Out of the record, please, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1967, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1967, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 4 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #5... Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Dunkin, has been approved for consideration."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin. Mr. Dunkin, before you commence.

Could we have some order in the chamber, please? Thank you.

Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm moving that we adopt

Amendment #6."

Speaker Lang: "Can you give us a 10 second explanation of the Amendment, Sir?"

Dunkin: "Absolutely. This Amendment provides that the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, in determining the number of annual grants to be offered, shall in no instance assume greater Monetary Award Program or the MAP moneys than that program received during the previous fiscal year. In other words, we're trying to anticipate our costs with allocating dollars in the first semester and in the fall semester. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is there any additional staffing needed to assume this greater responsibility?"

Dunkin: "No. I don't think so. I doubt it."

Reboletti: "Excuse me?"

Dunkin: "No. That's... you know, additional staffing?"

Reboletti: "Yes."

Dunkin: "No."

Reboletti: "They don't need any additional staffing? Well, I know that they're trying to get some of that money back

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

from... on Saturday when they tried to get \$30 million back, and I know that there are issues with that. Does this address any of those issues?"

Dunkin: "No."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Does these provisions include any academic standards
for MAP grants?"

Dunkin: "No."

Kosel: "So, we will continue to give MAP grants without academic standards in them?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Lang: "Have you completed your questions, Representative Kosel? Representative Kosel? Yes. The answer is yes. Mr. Rose, getting advice from Representative Kosel."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is designed to prevent what happened last year, and the chairman of the Higher Education-Appropriations Committee has brought it forward to prevent the scenario where ISAC overspends, not knowing what is appropriated to spend. They go out and hand out scholarships as if their, you know, money grows on trees, and then we don't appropriate to a level. And then, a) which obviously puts the General Assembly in a box, but then, b) what happened last fall is when they knew that they had a shortfall, rather than spread that shortfall over two semesters, they doubled it

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

up into a single semester, which took a \$17 million hole and turned it into a 33 million... \$34 million hole. And it became far worse. And so this, I think, is more than fair to make sure that we don't end up in that position again like we were last Veto Session. I salute the chairman's persistence in this effort. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Hays: "Representative Dunkin, one of the issues that I have heard is particularly at community colleges, as it relates to MAP grants, as many of those students are making the determination to attend college later than some of the traditional students; therefore, they were kind of frozen out of the process. Will this Bill do anything to address that dynamic?"

Dunkin: "No, it will not. You'd have to be eligible for the MAP based off its various criteria. This has nothing to do with that."

Hays: "Thank you."

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

Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On page 11 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 3794, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3794, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley on the Amendment."

- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is basically a Bill which came out of an audit by the Auditor General. It's the subject of a result of negotiations between the Governor's Office and the Comptroller's Office to try to improve the technology and the financial reporting standards in compliance with that audit. As I understand, this is an agreed Bill. I know of no objection to the Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, appears House Bill 5657, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 5657, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Bradley, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill which deals with project labor agreements for local bodies and whether or not funds can be used for public services if that local body outlaws project labor agreements. I'd ask that the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Bill be amended, moved to Third, and then if there's... either held on Third or if there's additional debate to do the debate on Third Reading."

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

Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Turning to page 13 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, the ones that have been approved, we will continue down the Calendar. House Bill 404, Mr. Mautino. Please proceed. Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker. House Bill 404, I would move to concur. And this is the DNR Bill and the changes that we had worked on throughout the course of the year. I worked on them with Representative Osmond. And in this Bill, as it comes back from the Senate, it will have the reductions of mandates. We met with about 50 groups, took a look at all the mandates at DNR. We reduced them. The Department of Natural Resources also reduced and achieved savings in their budgets of about \$10 million. This is part one of the whole program to make them sustainable. It passed unanimously out of this House, and I ask for Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 4 to House Bill 404. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 4 to House Bill 404. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1262, Mr. Farnham. This is a Nonconcurrence Motion, Mr. Farnham. Do you wish to proceed?"

Farnham: "I move that we Nonconcur."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House Nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 5 to House Bill 1262. Those in favor of the Motion say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does Nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 5 to House Bill 1262. House Bill 1717, Mr. Dunkin. I'm sorry, Durkin. Do you wish to proceed with your Motion to Nonconcur, Sir? Out of the record. House Bill 1883, Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill 3027, Representative Lilly. Representative Lilly. Out of the record. House Bill 4242, Mr. Phelps. Please proceed, Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4242. As you know, this is the Bill that we tried to help the tornado victims down in Harrisburg and Ridgway. And I want to thank Representative Harris, Bost, and Sullivan for helping this. And this just cleans up the Bill, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4242. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4242. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4531, Representative Hernandez. Please proceed."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with the Amendment #1. What it's really just doing is that it... it is actually just putting back the removal of the identification cards without photographs."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4531. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, how does Senate Amendment #1, that you're asking us to concur with, differ from the original Bill that we had sent over to the Senate?"

Hernandez: "I'm sorry. So, what I'm trying to... I'm just concurring with the removal... the removal of... what originally had had happened is that we had removed the identification cards without photographs. Senate did not agree, so we are looking to remove that."

Franks: "Okay. So we would not… they would not be able to give identification cards unless there was a photo ID?"

Hernandez: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. Is there any fees in this Bill?"

Hernandez: "No."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "Or the underlying? Was there any in the underlying Bill?"

Hernandez: "I have to look it up, Representative."

Franks: "I'm looking, too. We'll look together."

Hernandez: "There is no fee in the Amendment."

Franks: "Okay. In the underlying Bill..."

Hernandez: "Or the whole Bill, as a matter of fact."

Franks: "I think the underlying Bill had eliminated the provision for a disabled person to receive a standard Illinois identification card for no fee, but you'd still allow a disabled person to receive an Illinois person with a disability identification card. I'd agree..."

Hernandez: "That is..."

Franks: "Okay."

Hernandez: "Yeah."

Franks: "All right. Well, thank you then."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4531. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. Excuse me... well, too late. I'm sorry. On this question, there are 85 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4596, Mr. Durkin. Please proceed."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Concurrence Motion on a Bill that passed out of this chamber unanimously. It was amended in the Senate. And what this Bill does is it provides clarity to law enforcement. When a shared

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

electronic record management system is a recipient of a law enforcement record, it maintains the exemption for that law enforcement under FOIA. This is agreed upon by all parties. There was neutral position by the Attorney General in the House. They are now supportive, as is the Secretary of State and all their individuals who are part of this Bill. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4596. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Pritchard. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill... and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4596. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4757, Mr. Moffitt. Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With the Amendment, House Bill 4757 is now an agreed Bill. This is an initiative of the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities. It gives... changes the guideline on when they have to have their plans and then actually comply with the dormitory sprinklers, but it's an agreed Bill now with the Fire Marshal and with the State Board of Higher Education. I think it's the right thing to do. And I'd move to concur."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4757. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kosel. Please take the record. There are 87 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4757. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4761, Mr. Sullivan. Please proceed."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has to do with Sullivan: agri... electrical aggregation. As it went over to the Senate, I promised you that it would come back with a better Amendment on it, and it has come back. And I move to concur. What this Amendment does is, most of communities or many communities are dealing with electrical aggregation programs, and they're seeking vendors to help them with this program. What we're asking a potential vendor to do, whether they're with one municipality, a county or multiple counties or municipalities, is to disclose whether they have any other interests from different companies. So, we're trying to get to the meat of the matter. If you're going to push us to a specific electrical producer, we want to know about relationships. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4761. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sacia. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4761. And

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5021, Representative Sente. Please proceed."

Sente: "I move to concur with Senate Committee Amendment 1, which returns to the original language for the Illinois State Police's use of DUI funds for only DUI equipment. Due to the size of the ISP workforce, there was no need to expand their use of the DUI funds for equipment. I would like to clarify the Bill's intent regarding the use of DUI funds for officer salaries. It is strictly for allowing currently employed officers to be called back in from offduty to perform additional DUI related duties. It is not to hire back laid off employees. I move for Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5021. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ramey."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Ramey: "Representative, as you brought this forth, 'cause I did this six years ago... seven years ago, and due to language changes that's why you had to do it again. I thought you just said it would not be used for further other than DUI.

Can you explain again what you just said?"

Sente: "Okay. The original Bill is for local law enforcement to be able to expand their use of DUI funds beyond equipment."

Ramey: "The original Bill seven years ago or yours?"

Sente: "Mine."

Ramey: "Okay. Beyond... continue. I'm sorry."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Sente: "So, I don't know what happened in-between your Bill and my Bill. I'm sorry. But so..."

Ramey: "That's unnecessary. We already talked about that, but..."

Sente: "Okay. So, this allows local law enforcement because there might be a three person department up to 100-plus sworn department. Sometimes they have bought all the breathalyzers they need, so..."

Ramey: "Right."

Sente: "...they can... this expands their use beyond DUI equipment, but it does... well, I clarified that they couldn't use it to hire a new employee but expand and call back in a current employee for additional DUI related duties as well as officer training for DUI items."

Ramey: "Can they use it to purchase vehicles?"

Sente: "No."

Ramey: "Are not vehicles used in DUI enforcement?"

Sente: "It specifically names what they can use, and vehicles are not in there."

Ramey: "Well, that's why I'm asking 'cause originally we allowed it. So, now we're not in your legislation?"

Sente: "In the Bill, it is equipment what the local law enforcement request is... what it... that it was equipment. It would expand to training, as well as the hire back of salaries for DUI related activities. That's all they wanted."

Ramey: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Leitch. Mr. Leitch. Please take the record. On

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5021. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5025, Leader Lyons. Please proceed, Sir.

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5025 was a personal initiative that I sent over to the Senate. I know it needed some work to be done on it. They put two Amendments. One takes the time for the utility to notify the credit rating agencies. It gives them more time for 48 hours to 5 days. The second Amendment... the second Amendment basically says the Bill has to be paid in full before they're obligated to do that, rather than just have a working agreement. Well, maybe I sold my soul off by letting the utilities off the hook, but I'll take a half a loaf if I can't get a full loaf. It still makes... it gives some consumer protection. I'd appreciate your support on this Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5025. There being no debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Coladipietro. Connelly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5025. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5099, Mr. Costello. Please proceed."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The change for Concurrence in House Bill 5099 literally is just changing from voice activated to voice operated. And I believe that this is happening with all cell phone legislation that has gone through both chambers. Thank you and I ask for Concurrence."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5099. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Leader Lyons. Mr. Sullivan. Please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes' and 30 voting 'no'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5099. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5111, Mr. Mautino. Please proceed, Sir."
- Mautino: "I'd move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1. And this... this Amendment, as it comes back, deals with the... it's a page and line Amendment. And it provides that professional employer organization does not include the day and temporary labor services. So, we sent this over, and basically, it says that for those temporary services, who are putting people to work in... on a permanent basis, that they can apply for the same credits as permanent employers. There was a problem with the language. It was fixed in the Senate. I know of no opposition and would ask for Concurrence on Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5111. Those in favor of

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Biss. Jones. Rita. Smith. Mr. Biss. Mr. Rita. Somebody get the back row. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5111. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5114, Representative Dan Burke. Please proceed, Sir."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is on Concurrence. I would move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Give us a brief explanation, Sir."

Burke, D.: "The issue is the offering of a video that would train school-aged children between the sixth and eighth grade. The language is now permissive, previous to the House Bill suggested that they 'shall' provide this video for all children's consideration at this time. The Senate made a change and it 'may', so any public school in our state, if they are so interested, they may access this training video and provide, again, students between the ages sixth grade through eighth the opportunity to view a video to train them in CPR and the use of an AED. And I, again, would move for the Concurrence on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5114. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Leader yield?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, with the Senate Amendment, does that remove the opposition from the School Management Alliance? There were a couple other groups that were opposed."

Burke, D.: "Yes. Absolutely."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Smith. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5114. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5122, Mr. Beiser. Please proceed."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This adds another exemption under the Bill, which is for people that are engaged in the organ and tissue procurement process."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5122. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5122. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5278, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1. Senate Amendment 1 makes a

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

very simple, technical change cleaning up where we were changing language concerning the title of the offense, taking out 'trafficking persons for forced labor or service' in order to be consistent throughout the Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5278. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5278. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5280, Mr. Cunningham. Please proceed."

Cunningham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5280. The Amendment merely removes some modifications the initial Bill made to mandatory supervised release. The underlying Bill requires individuals convicted of luring a minor to register as sexual predators. Be happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cunningham moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5280. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5280.

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5289, Mr. Turner. Please proceed."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2, which is a gut and replacement.

House Bill 5289 creates the offense of sales tax evasion. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner, the Motion was Amendments 1 and 2.

Is that correct?"

Turner: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Your Motion was to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Is that correct, Sir?"

Turner: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5289. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reis: "Representative, you said this was a gut and replace.

Could you explain a little bit more about what the

Amendment actually does?"

Turner: "Right. So, Amendment #2 would create the offense of sales tax evasion, and it's for prosecuting offenders engaging in ongoing fraudulent activity. Sales tax evasion is defined in the Bill as when a retailer knowingly attempts in any manner to evade or defeat the tax imposed on him or on any other person, or the payment thereof and he commits an affirmative act in furtherance of the evasion. The... Amendment 2 also defines an affirmative act,

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

and it's defined as an act designed in whole or in part to conceal, misrepresent, falsify, or manipulate any material fact or tamper with or destroy documents or materials related to a person's tax liability under the Retailers' Occupation Tax Act."

Reis: "Representative, you passed a Bill that you amended here in the House earlier in the spring. How does this compare to what you passed that went over to the Senate?"

Turner: "It took out the penalty enhancements or failure to file sales tax returns and for fraudulent filing of sales tax returns."

Reis: "So..."

Turner: "And it added... I'm sorry. And it added the definition of an affirmative act."

Reis: "Does the Senate version remove… as I mentioned, you amended your Bill to take individuals out, so that if grandma or Aunt Matilda orders something over the Internet, she's not going to get hammered for not paying her sales tax."

Turner: "That's right."

Reis: "Does this Senate version only affect businesses, as well?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Reis: "No individuals?"

Turner: "Just realto... retailers, Representative."

Reis: "And it also took out the criminal penalties for this?"

Turner: "Of the current law with the penalty enhancements that were proposed before are taken out under this Amendment."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Reis: "Okay. I just wanted to get some clarification on that, when you said it was a gut and replace. I think there's some... still some additional questions that I'm going to listen to in the debate."

Turner: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Durkin: "Representative, could you explain to me what's the difference between evasion and filing a fraudulent sales tax return?"

Turner: "Right now, current law only allows us to do it with 30-day returns, and this has to do with those who have a pattern of fraud."

Durkin: "Okay. I guess the question I have is that right now, to charge someone under this provision of the Code, you can either charge them with failing to file or filing a fraudulent tax return, sales tax return. We're now adding the offense of evading. I guess I need to know, and I think it's... I'm going to vote for your Bill, but I think we just need to understand the distinction between evasion and the failure to file and also those who file fraudulently."

Turner: "Evasion requires an affirmative act in furtherance of the evasion."

Durkin: "Isn't that also the same for filing a fraudulent tax return?"

Turner: "I think that... I'm being told that the fraud, itself,
 it's all that's required for."

Durkin: "All right."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Turner: "I can get back to you."

Durkin: "I understand. This... I'm not criticizing the Bill, but again, it would be helpful just to get a better understanding of the distinctions that we currently have in the law for failing to file, fraudulently filing, and also someone who is now evading the sales tax return."

Turner: "Well, this would allow us to aggregate months and months of returns."

Durkin: "Well, true. But again, you have to be able to meet certain elements to be able to be evasive, and it seems to me the evasiveness is somewhat the same as someone who is either intentionally fraudulent, who is intentionally failed to file, or someone who is fraudulently filing. I'm not going to ask anymore questions, but I've been telling you that there's just a little... some confusion. I mean, we're moving close to the end of Session. There probably is another reason. I know you've got a great counsel over there to your left informing you of this, but there is still a question out there; the distinction between the elements required to prove evasion versus those elements that are required to prove a fraudulent filing. So, I'll leave it at that. Thank you."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose. Mr. Rose."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Rose: "Representative, I have one question, and that is, with respect to the dollar amounts referenced here that become like Class IV, Class III Felonies, et cetera, this is in

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

essence a theft, a theft from the taxpayers, but why are we treating it with any higher criminal penalty than a theft from anyone else? Put more simply, misdemeanor theft; if I were to steal the same amount of money from my next door neighbor, it would be misdemeanor theft. So, why is the theft from the government being treated differently than from ordinary citizens or a regular business?"

Turner: "One second, Representative. This is considered theft from people of the State of Illinois, as opposed to theft from one particular person. So, I guess for policy reasons."

Rose: "So, the government's better than everyone else, so they...
it's a higher penalty?"

Turner: "No, Sir, Representative, that's not what I'm getting at."

Rose: "Yeah. I didn't think you were, Representative."

Turner: "Thank you."

Rose: "So, I guess my question is, were this to pass, would you be amenable to a trailer Bill to equalize the penalties, so that we're not saying that the Governor is... the government is better than, say, Wal-Mart or my next door neighbor that would have a theft committed against them?"

Turner: "That's something I'd be willing to discuss, Representative."

Rose: "Very good. Thank you, Representative Turner."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner to close."

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

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 89 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5289. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5330, Representative Greg Harris. Please proceed, Sir."

- Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to concur with the Senate in Concurrence Amendment #1. The underlying Bill, if you remember, was an initiative of the Attorney General dealing with sexually violent persons. It passed unanimously through both chambers. The Amendment simply makes the effective date immediate."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5330. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received... and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5330. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5434, Representative Williams. Please proceed."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 2 and Senate Amendment 3. Senate Amendment 2 is... this deals with the Debtors Rights Bill that we passed over to the Senate. The first Amendment, Senate Amendment 2, is

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

technical in nature and just clarifies that new requirements for citation to discover asset proceedings don't apply to third parties. The third Amendment was adopted as part of a request by the Municipal League to exempt cities from having to comply with the new rules when collecting fines for violation of certain quasi-criminal city ordinances. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5434. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm sorry. We're going so fast. I'm having trouble reading what the Bill actually does; the Amendments, and I don't mean to be rude, but I'm going to have to ask you to go through Senate Amendment #2..."

Williams: "Sure."

Franks: "...and then Senate Amendment #3. I can't read fast enough."

Williams: "Well, if you recall, you and I discussed in detail, that when this Bill was first called, how the new proposal for the citation to discover assets would proceed. Basically, the Amendment just provides, and this was the intent the whole time, that these do not apply to actions involving, say like, the debtors' bank. So, the protections that we put in place for debtors does not apply to regular court proceedings. So, it would not adopt the sort of protections we had to regular litigation."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "What's the definition... I'm not sure what you mean by a regular litigation?"

Williams: "Okay. This just means against the debtors' bank, say, would be a good example of that. Specifically, supplementary proceedings may proceed, notwithstanding the debtors' failure to complete the income and asset form. So, you can still proceed against the bank or with the bank. It has nothing to do with the protections we put in place. Those were merely for the notice requirements, everything else, the new procedure for this citation to discover assets. It was all about protecting the debtor, making sure the debtor had accurate notice. We're just clarifying that it doesn't apply to litigation involving perhaps the same topic, same subject, but that doesn't have a debtor as a party."

Franks: "Well, now, for instance, when a debtor is picked up on a body attachment, the plaintiff can ask that the moneys be turned over to the plaintiff's attorney on behalf of the plaintiff. Would this substantively change that requirement?"

Williams: "Well, in Amendment #2 we clarify that a court may not order that the funds used to post bond be turned over to the judgment creditor, unless the court specifically finds the bond money does belong to the debtor, as opposed to the third party, so..."

Franks: "Well, let me ask you this."

Williams: "...maybe that's your example."

Franks: "Let's assume a third party posted the bond. Would anything in this Bill preclude the moneys being turned over

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- to the plaintiff, or is this just something that 'may' instead of a 'shall'?"
- Williams: "It would go back to the third party in that case."
- Franks: "Are you sure that it... Are you sure it's an absolute...

 So, if any... why would any debtor then ever post their own bond? Wouldn't they always ask that a spouse or someone to post it, so that way they would never have to turn it over?"
- Williams: "Well, in the example of a spouse, that would probably be also applied to property of the debtor, as well, so I don't know if that's the best example."
- Franks: "Can we... can you show me that in the text of the Bill, where it indicates that it has to be..."
- Williams: "In the Bill or the Amendment?"
- Franks: "In the Amendment 'cause it seems to me to be that may not be the best public policy if a third party turns it over to then indicate that if it's simply because the third party turned it over then that bond can't be turned over to the plaintiff."
- Williams: "I think you may be getting a little bit into the weeds. Again, this is just a clarification that the protections that we put in the original Bill would not apply to third parties. I think that's a little bit different than what you're asking about."
- Franks: "But that's different than what our analysis shows.

 That's why I want to... I want to look at Amendment #2 with you because our analysis indicates that if it's a third party then bonds would not be turned over the plaintiff."
- Williams: "What page and line are you referring to?"

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "I'm looking it up right now..."

Williams: "Okay."

Franks: "...but I'm looking at our analysis that indicates that."

Williams: "Well, I'm looking at the language, so if you could refer me to the appropriate language, I'll be happy to go through it."

Franks: "Can we take it out of the record for a few minutes and you and I can discuss it."

Williams: "I think we can work through this. It's just... it's a very simple clarification. Amendment #2 simply, as I mentioned before, addresses the issue of third parties."

Franks: "Okay. I'm looking at it. I'm just... I'm whipping through it right now so hold on."

Williams: "Are you waiting for me or ... "

Franks: "I'm look... I don't know if you could tell me where this might be. I'm looking... I'm looking it up and I'm hoping you can as well."

Williams: "Well, why don't you repeat your question 'cause I think I'm getting a little confused of what your last question was?"

Franks: "Hold on. I'm looking at page 19. My question... hold on.

Let's go to the body attachment orders. That's what I want
to see."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, do you have a question?"

Franks: "Yeah. I do, but I'd like her to take it out of the record, so I could ask her... I can do this. I'll be happy to answer... ask the questions, but I'm not getting the answers, specifically. So, let's go to page 18, then, of the second Amendment, and let's go through the body attachment issue

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

because that's what I want to know about. So, what I'd like to know is if a third party posts the bond, does that preclude the court from turning over those moneys to the plaintiff?"

Williams: "Repeat that one more time? I couldn't hear."

Franks: "I'm sorry. I couldn't hear you."

Williams: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that? I didn't hear that."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Mr. Franks, please ask your... please ask your question."

Franks: "If a third party posts a bond in response to a body attachment order, does the posting of that bond by a third body preclude the court from turning the moneys over to the plaintiff?"

Williams: "The answer is yes. If you look at line 16 and 17, subsection (e), the term is 'shall', not a 'may'. So, it would be a mandate. I can read it, if you'd like. Upon discharge of any bond secured by the posting of funds, the funds shall be returned to the respondent or other party posting the bond..."

Franks: "I'm looking on line..."

Williams: "...unless the court after inquiry determines... and that's where we go into the issue from the original Bill.

The judgment debtor has willfully refused to comply with the payment order or any part of the funds constitute nonexempt funds..."

Franks: "Okay."

Williams: "...which we've already discussed herein the Bill."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Franks: "So, why would we change the law to that effect? Why would we change and say if someone posted a bond, that then it could not be turned over because in every other instance, when a bond is posted, it can be turned over? So, why would we change the law now to preclude a plaintiff from being able to collect on the bond?"

Williams: "Well, I think this kind of goes to the root of the whole issue of debtors' rights. What, unfortunately, some creditors had been doing they would post... and working with judges, unfortunately, in some counties... to post the bond in the exact amount of the judgment that was due, whether it's \$99, \$125. That was an incentive for them to utilize the body attachment procedure because then, out of threat of going to jail, the person would be forced to pay the debt back and that is..."

Franks: "No. I agree..."

Williams: "I guess that's a way of collecting a debt, but that's not..."

Franks: "Oh, I agree. We should change that, and we did, but this is different. Let's assume there is a judgment creditor, who has a \$15 thousand judgment, and the court gives the body attachment for \$100 because this person continuously fails to show to court. So, the only way to get the person to court is to give them a body attachment. So, they get served with the body attachment. It's a hundred bucks, even though they owe 15 grand. But they didn't put the money up under this Senate Amendment #2, so you're saying they get all that money back instead of the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

judgment creditor who has to have paid the sheriff to go and get that body attachment served."

Williams: "But Repre..."

Franks: "No. What we're doing here under this is we are punishing the plaintiff for being the one who shows up every time and the person who doesn't is getting their money back."

Williams: "Yeah. I'm going to disagree with that. We just read the language that says it 'shall' be returned to the respondent or other party posting the bond. So, I don't think that that would be the case."

Franks: "That means they get their money back. What that means..."

Williams: "Whoever put it up gets the money back."

Franks: "Right. But that's not how it works now because oftentimes the only way to get people to court is to do the body attachment. And I think it's ridiculous that they do the higher levels, which we've already fixed in the underlying Bill. But with this Amendment, it would preclude a plaintiff from receiving those funds even though they had to pay the sheriff to serve the body attachment. They're out the money."

Williams: "Sure."

Franks: "Shouldn't they get their money back?"

Williams: "Well, I think, again, with the basic principle. The body attachment mechanism is not where we should be looking to collect the debt. The debt should be... and that could be in a separate proceeding, a subsequent proceeding where the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

judge could look at the assets of the person and proceed from there. But again..."

Franks: "But that's... no, that's a preclusion; that's before.

See this is... that's not... you're missing two steps. After
the judgment..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, time to bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Franks: "Well, I'm not sure I can because we haven't even got to #3 yet."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks..."

Franks: "That's why..."

Williams: "But I think that was..."

Franks: "...if she'd take it out of the record, I could talk to her and not waste the Body's time."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, it's time to bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Franks: "I... I don't have enough information at this point."

Williams: "I don't know how to answer your question, Representative, because I think we're talking about what was already done in the original Amendment. I can pull up some documents and we can go over what we already passed unanimously out of this chamber."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "To reiterate and I apologize, Representative. Okay.

We... you know what, we're going to take it out of the record. And we'll be right back. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. House Bill 5450, Representative Golar. Please proceed."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this Assembly. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5450."

Speaker Lang: "Can you tell us what the Amendment does, Representative?"

Golar: "Yes. The Amendment actually expands the legislative findings and purpose to include how housing contributes to an overall decline in real estate values. In the current law states that instability and inadequacy in housing limits the employability and the productivity of many citizens. It adversely affects family health, stress levels impedes children's ability to learn and corresponding drains on public resources. Senate Amendment #1 adds language that provides grant funding to be used to develop housing opportunities for persons with disabilities but not housing restricted to a certain disability type. Current law requires that Illinois IHDA to adopt a rule restricting local administrative agencies and developers from using funding under the grant to develop or support housing that requires that a tenant has a particular diagnosis, type or presence of disability. Senate Amendment #1 finally, in conclusion, includes a severability clause that allows a provision or clause to be invalidated without effecting any other provision or application of that act that can be given effect without the invalid provision clause or its application. This allows IHDA to designate special housing for disabilities; however, they cannot hold a unit for specific disabilities which would create preference for a specific disability. I'll be happy to take any questions and I urge an 'aye' vote."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5450. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Franks, Harris, Jones, Mussman. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Harris, Mr. Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5450. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5547, Mr. Zalewski. Please proceed."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5547. It's... it's a request of the National Retailer's Association to ensure that private entities' parking lots are not subject to tax. We had a robust debate on this Bill back in the spring. This... this Amendment that the Senate placed on the Bill makes it stronger and more protective of... of private interests. IRMA is a strong supporter of the Bill as a result of this Amendment. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5547. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how does this tax structure work or this fee structure work? However you want to couch it."

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

- Zalewski: "So, we're not... it's important to remember, Representative, we are not incorp... we are not creating any sort of tax structure with the passage of this Bill. All we are doing is enabling a local municipality to say if they want to adopt a percentages basis tax for parking garages, they are allowed to do so."
- Reboletti: "And how many local municipalities does this impact?"
- Zalewski: "Any Home Rule municipality. I can tell you the City of Chicago would be the prime suspect for adoption of such an ordinance."
- Reboletti: "Then, with respect to that then, they would be able to set it based on the amount of the actual parking amount.

 Is that what the…"
- Zalewski: "Well, what they would is say... right now, the way a parking tax works is very, very anticonsumer, antitaxpayer. We simply add the tax on the top. So, if you pay \$2 to park for a half an hour, you'd pay twenty-six and a half to pay for eight hours; you pay the same tax, which is completely inequitable. This Bill allows the parking garages and the municipalities to come sort of an... to come to sort of an agreement about a percentage basis of the... of the amount coming into the parking garage to create a more equitable tax structure."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Motion. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Concurrence Motion to remind the Body the original underlying Bill, which this is just a minor

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

change to, really makes a much clearer system that matches what we are typically used to in seeing how tax structures go. We expect that there is a tax imposed as a percentage of the use. What we have currently in statute requires a set of different flat fees for different hourly usage which can amount to huge differences in percentage depending on which minute you happen to check in and check out of a parking garage. Passing this will create a uniform system. It doesn't effect whether or not Chicago will choose to raise parking rates or not. That is their prerogative as a Home Rule municipality. Nothing this does enables that or disables that in anyway. I would urge this Concurrence."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Do... do you have a Motion to make, Sir?"

Zalewski: "Yes. I wish to move to Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman asks for Postponed Consideration. Mr. Lyons in the Chair."

Speaker Lyons: "I'm back by necessity here, kids. Mr. Clerk, that Bill having failed to get the required number of votes, fails. The Motion fails... the Concurrence Motion fails. Leader Lang, on page 13 of the Calendar, you have, under the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 735."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. When this Bill left the House it was the Bill that would allow a municipality to elect a mayor who owns a liquor license as

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

long as the municipality chooses somebody else to be the liquor commissioner. The Senate made a change that... that narrowed down the person who could be that liquor commissioner. It would have to be an attorney; it would have to be someone who had no conflict of interest or any liquor clients within that village or an adjacent village. So, all this does is narrow down the Bill that we passed quite easily in the House. And I know of no opposition."

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation for the Concurrence on Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 735?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 68 Members voting 'yes', 44 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 735. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Renée Kosel, on page 15 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3982. Leader Renée Kosel."
- Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with House...

 Senate Amendment #1 to 3982. This would allow use of
 Internet to access taxi records in the report that was in
 the original Bill. This hopefully will go a long way
 towards improving safety."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3982 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Franks and Riley, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate votina Amendment #1 to House Bill 3982. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Pat Verschoore, on the Representative Order Concurrences, on page 16, Pat, you have House Bill 4598. Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Pat Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this Bill left the House, there was some concerns about allowing golf carts, slow moving vehicles and they said that they'd work on it in the Senate. And that's what they did. They allowed those smaller units of... of the vehicles to be added to the... to the slow moving vehicles sign. I'd ask for Concurrence on it."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House adopt the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4598?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mathias, Watson, Jim, Leader. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 109 Members voting 'yes', 6 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

with Amendment #... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4598. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lou Lang, on page 17 of the Calendar, under House Concurrences, is House Bill 5016. Leader Lou Lang."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Senate

 Amendments are simply cleanup language defining the term

 'debt buyer'. I would ask your support."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5016?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr... Representative Krezwick, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 113 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 2 Members voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5016. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Resolutions, on page 19 of the Calendar, Representative Cavaletto, you have House Joint Resolution 86. House Joint Resolution 86. Just give a brief overview, Representative."
- Cavaletto: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What House Resolution does is joins a four-lane highway from Vincennes, Indiana to Route 64 basically."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. All those in favor of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 86

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 86 is hereby adopted. Leader Jim Watson, on the bottom of page 19, under the Order of Resolutions, you have House Joint Resolution 88. Leader Jim Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there is an Amendment to be adopted."

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Watson, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Representative Watson with House Joint Resolution 88 as adopted."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think it's fitting that today, on Memorial Day, this Joint Resolution would come up naming a stretch of highway in Jersey and Madison County after Russell Dunham, who was a Medal of Honor winner during World War II."

Speaker Lyons: "Heard the Gentleman's explanation on the Joint Resolution. All those in favor signify by voting... by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there are 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And House Joint Resolution 88 is hereby unanimously adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, there will be a little adaptation to the gray

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

schedule that was passed out. So, the Clerk is going to go through that. So, if you look at the schedule, make the notes as requested. Mr. Clerk."

"The following committees are meeting this Clerk Hollman: afternoon. Immediately following Session, the Business Occupational Licenses Committee is meeting in Room 413, Consumer Protection is meeting in C-1, Elementary & Secondary Education is meeting in Room 114, Transportation: Vehicles & Safety is meeting in Room D-1. committees are now meeting at 4:30. So, meeting at 4:30 is the Executive Committee in Room 114, the Revenue Committee in Room 115, Public Utilities in Room D-1, Judiciary II-Criminal 413 and Law in Room State Government Administration in C-1. Once again, those are at 4:30."

Speaker Lyons: "Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1114, offered by Representative Reis. House Resolution 1116, offered by Representative Pritchard. And House Joint Resolution 92, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Members, as an announcement, I'm asked to remind you to review the Concurrence Calendar and to file Motions on any House Bills on that Calendar. So, check the Concurrence Calendar and if there are any Motions to be filed, don't wait. And now, seeing no further business to come before the Illinois House of

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Representatives on Memorial Day, Leader Barbara Flynn Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday, May 29. 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 'til 12 noon tomorrow, Tuesday May 29. Happy Memorial Day, one and all. Enjoy what's left of it this evening."

"House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Clerk Hollman: Committee Reports. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 28, recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4076, and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5033. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5211. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5602 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 28, recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3340 and the Motion to #1 to House Bill Concur with Senate Amendment Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: recommends be adopted is the Motion Concur with Senate Amendments #3 and 4 correction... to House Bill 3329 and the Motions to Concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4569 and the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5689 and Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 34... correction... Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1034. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: do amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 549. as Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3811. Representative Howard, Chairperson from the Committee Judiciary II-Criminal Law reports the following committee actions taken on May 28, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2621; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with the Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 2582, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3366, the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5233. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee State Government on Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2012: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1151, Motion

145th Legislative Day

5/28/2012

to Concur with Senate Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4983 and House Resolution 1111. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 549, offered by Representative Jackson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2621, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. Senate Bill 3811, offered by Representative May, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."