147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Good Morning, Illinois. Your House of Representatives will come to order. Members are asked to please be at your desks. We shall be led in prayer today by Reverend Edward Martin, Jr., who is with the St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church in Joliet, Illinois. Reverend Martin is the guest of Representative Larry Walsh. 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 Edward Martin."

Reverend Martin: "Let us bow our heads. All wise and merciful God, our heavenly Father, it's again that we come now with our head bowed and hearts lifted up to Thee. We come, first of all, thanking You for this time and the privilege that You've allowed a few of Your handmade servants to assemble together and discuss the affairs and the business of this country and this state. We thank You, Lord, for the appointment that You have challenged us with and we come now to ask Your divine blessings on us as we prepare ourselves to discuss the business of the hour. We ask Your blessings upon each and every Representative that is represented here as well as those that are absent. Pray that whatever we do here be pleasing and pleasant in Your sight. It's in the mighty name of our Savior, Amen."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Joe Sosnowski, would you please lead us in the Pledge."

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lyons: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie,

 Democrats."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative D'Amico."
- Speaker Lyons: "Leader Bost, the Republicans."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let all... let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today and that David Reis is wearing a tie today, too, which was very important for yesterday."
- Speaker Lyons: "Okay. Thank you, Leader. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There's 117 Members responding to the Roll Call, a quorum is present. We're prepared to do the work for the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted, referred to the Floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1064, Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1673, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2643, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3592; recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 5914."
- Speaker Lyons: "Members, I'm going to be starting with Concurrences on page 5 and... on page 12 and 13 of the Calendar. So, if you want to follow with me on Concurrences, we will be skipping around somewhat, but for the most part, we'll try to get them in numerical order.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Representative Walsh on Concurrence 1151. Out of the record. Representative Farnham, on House Bill 1261, on the Order of Concurrences. Representative Keith Farnham."

Farnham: "One moment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1261, Senate Committee Amendment #2 for Concurrence is a gut and replace Amendment. This Amendment seeks to reduce a release of mercury into the environment during the manufacture and disposal of zinc air button cell batteries. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on House Bill 1261, Amendment 2 from the Senate. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 1261 signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Barickman, Cole, Dunkin, Ford, Jerry Mitchell, Jill Tracy, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Amendment... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1261. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences, Sara Feigenholtz, on the top of page 13, Sara, you have Senate Bill... House Bill 1645 on the Order of Concurrence. Out of the record. Representative Camille Lilly. Representative Lilly, on page 13 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 3027. Representative Lilly, on the Order of Concurrences, 3027. Out of the record. Leader Barbara Flynn Currie, on the Order of

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Concurrences, on page 14 of the Calendar is House Bill 3329. Leader Currie on Concurrence with House Bill 3329."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 3329. There is a grocery store, Mariano's Fresh Foods, which plans to open a store on 22nd Street and also one in the 10th Ward. They would like to be able to sell packaged liquor, and... it's my understanding... well, I know, that both of the aldermen whose wards these brand new, apparently high-end stores are coming to, both Aldermen Sandi Jackson of the 7th Ward and Pat Dowell of the 2nd Ward support this opportunity. Each of these establishments will be close to a school. The principals of those schools, one each... one in the 10th Ward and one in the 2nd Ward also support the opportunity for the packaged sales to happen. So, there is no opposition, but in order for this high-end grocery store to come to these two parts of Chicago, that desperately need fresh food, we would have to adopt the Concurrence Motion to... to the... Concurrence Motion on House Bill 3329. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I need your support."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation on the Amendments. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendments #3 and 4 to House Bill 3329 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 65 Members voting 'yes', 47 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

House does concur with Senate Amendments #3 and #4 to House Bill 3329. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Beiser, on the Order of Concurrences, on page 14 of the Calendar, Dan, you have House Bill 3340."

- Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate

 Amendments 1 and 2. This is a Secretary of State Bill

 dealing with auto recyclers."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation on Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3340. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of those Amendments signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Durkin, Bost, Bellock, Nybo, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 75 Members voting 'yes', 42 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3340. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ann Williams, on page 13 of the Calendar, you have, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 1883.
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I took this out of the rec... oh wait. I'm sorry. Please take it out of the record."
- Speaker Lyons: "Take this Bill out of the record. Representative Reboletti, on the Order of Concurrences, Dennis, you have House Bill 3801. Out of the record. Representative Mike Unes, on the Order of Concurrences, on page 14 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 3825."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. This is the Copper Theft Bill that we have heard previously. This deletes some of the criminal provisions and adds some of the requirements for recyclable dealers."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3825 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3825. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Marcus you have, on Representative Evans, the Order Concurrences, House Bill 3881. We don't need to read it, Representative, you just have to run the... the Amendments. Want it. 011t. of the record? Out of the record. Representative Feigenholtz, on page 15 of the Calendar, Sara, you have House Bill 4028. Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is merely a technical matter that was brought to us by the Bar Association. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."
- Sullivan: "Representative, I realize that this is a technical, as you said, Amendment. Can you explain that further so the Body can get a further understanding of what the technical nature is?"
- Feigenholtz: "Hi, there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate Amendment substantively is the same as it left the House, Representative Sullivan. It contains the same three initiatives; it just changes the effective date. And also, retools the Adoption Advisory Council. It was not balanced because it is in-between Public Health and DCFS. Those clarifications were made in the Amendment that came back from the Senate. And now the Adoption Advisory Council is intact."
- Sullivan: "There was some opposition to the underlying Bill as it left the House, has any of that opposition been changed to your knowledge?"
- Feigenholtz: "I'm not aware..."
- Sullivan: "I mean, does... does the Senate Amendment change the underlying opposition, I guess, is the..."
- Feigenholtz: "I don't believe that there was. I think you may be confusing this with another Bill."
- Sullivan: "I believe there was 18 'no' votes as it left the House? There's 18 'no' votes and 1 'present' as it left the House."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Feigenholtz: "I knew of no opposition to this, Representative.

This is merely the reformation of an Advisory Council between the Departments of Public Health and the Department of Children and Family Services."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4028. This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Biss, Brauer, Evans, Rita, Jerry Mitchell, Paul Evans. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 93 Members voting 'yes', 23 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4028. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Renée Kosel, under Concurrences, on page 15, Renée, you have House Bill 4076. Leader Renée Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur on Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 4076. Very good addition to the Bill, will add the barber school to cosmetology. There is a distinct lack of places to get an education as a barber. And this is an agreed Amendment that will help fill that void. And I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of House... Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4076 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Have all voted who wish? Keith Farnham. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4076. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mike Zalewski. Michael, you have, on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 4526. 4526."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4526. We... we passed a very simple best practices Bill in the House with the help of Representatives Mell and Cassidy. There was an agreement in the Senate to do some best practices on the back end at the suggestion of Representative Tryon. This is an agreed Bill among the industry and the agency. There are no opponents to this Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4526 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mike Unes, like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 102 Members voting 'yes', 15 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to having received Bill 4526. This Bill, Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lou Lang, on the Order of Concurrences, Lou, you have House Bill 4569."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Move concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. All this did was take out a disciplinary committee that was in the original Bill. I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 4569 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hammond, Mayfield, Thapedi and Tracy, would you like to be recorded? André. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4569. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Emily McAsey, on the bottom of page 15, you have House Bill 4636."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4636. It's a simple drafting change. It changes language that read substantially similar to the words 'could be charged in Illinois'. This was bringing parity between domestic battery and violation of order of protection prior cases. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4636 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

voted who wish? Representative Coladipietro, Connelly, Paul Evans, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4636. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lisa Dugan, on the bottom of page 16, Lisa, you have House Bill 5142 on the Order of Concurrences. Representative Dugan on House Bill 5142."

Dugan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #1. And all it really does from the original Bill is change the date from January 1, 2014, which passed the House to January 1, 2015, to give everyone a chance that if they need that for medical access. So, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5142 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, Keith Farnham, Jack Franks, Al Riley, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5142. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Riley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Riley: "I'd just like the record to show that I would have voted 'yes' on House Bill 5142."
- Speaker Lyons: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative. Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My... I couldn't get my button to work there and I really would have like to have voted 'no' on that previous Bill, 5142. But I did want to point out that that's hopefully Representative Dugan's last Bill for the Health Facilities Planning Board. And I want to congratulate her on her stewardship."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will reflect your request. Representative Saviano, on page 16 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 5033. Representative Skip Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1... Senate Amendment #1 represents the agreed language between the department and the Illinois Currency Exchange Association. And now the department is in favor, I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5033."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5033 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Coladipietro, Connelly, Paul Evans, Schmitz, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 81 Members voting 'yes', 34 Members voting 'no'.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5033. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And Representative Saviano, you also have, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 5104. Representative Saviano on the Amendment."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 5104. This is again a... Amendment that makes this an agreed Bill and it addresses the issue of ratio of physician's assistants under a doctor's supervision. It's a good... it's a good Amendment. And I'd ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5104."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5104 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Representative Schmitz, would you like to be recorded? Dan. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 1 Member voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5104. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Karen May, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 4986. Representative Karen May."

May: "Thank you, Speaker. I ask leave to present from the Majority Leader's Chair, she's given me permission?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lyons: "Mr. Clerk, for whatever reason I guess she'll be using Representative Barbara Flynn Currie's chair."

May: "Okay. Yes, thank you. This is probably my last Concurrence, so I hope to have the eloquence and the pizzazz that our Majority Leader has because there were a few votes against this Bill. House Bill 4986, the... I move Concurrence with Senate Amendment 1. It only... it takes out any reimbursement for members of the task force."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "You remember when we had this Bill on the floor there were many descending votes. Can you tell us what was done in the Senate that might change our position on that now?"

May: "Yes. It took out reimbursement for any members of the task force."

Bost: "Okay. So, there is no cost to the state the way this legislation is right now?"

May: "That is true."

Bost: "Okay. That's what we needed to know. Thank you very much."

May: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "No one seeking further discussion on the issue, the question becomes, 'Should the House adopt Amendment #1 to Senate... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4986?' 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? Dunkin, Kosel,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Mautino. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 67 Members voting 'yes', 48 Members voting 'no', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4986. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kelly Burke, on the bottom of page 16, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 5211. Representative Kelly Burke."

- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5211. The original House version banned third party charges on telephone... landline telephone bills to prevent a practice known as cramming. The Bill we passed included some exceptions and the Senate version added one additional exception for 900 and 976 numbers. And I ask that we concur."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the...

 Representative Jack Franks."
- Franks: "Sorry... sorry, Speaker. I just can't read fast enough."

 Speaker Lyons: "You're getting a bad habit, Representative

 Franks, in the last few days here of a late switch."
- Franks: "I know. But I apologize. I'm... I'm trying to read it to see if I want to ask a question and I see that I do. Yeah, I think we're all too efficient today. But I appreciate and I apologize. But I... I'd like to know about the exemption, if I may, if the Sponsor will yield? I'm not sure I understand what the exemption is 'cause it... it'll cover charges for the 900 and 976 services. Why would those be exempted?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Burke, K.: "Because the people who are... you agreed to it.

There's not the... the risk of the fraudulent charges being put on your phone bill because the person using the service agrees to it."

Franks: "Agrees to what? I'm not sure I understand?"

Burke, K.: "If you call the 900 or 976 number and purchase whatever the service is, you've agreed to it and it can go on your phone bill."

Franks: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "You're authorizing the charge as the user... as the owner of the landline phone line."

Franks: "Is there anything... I'm just wondering if it's like a... someone who's not 18, you know a minor who would get on the 900 number and use the parent's home line and make a phone call? Is there anything there that could... with built-in protections for something to that affect?"

Burke, K.: "Not in this Bill. But there is a separate Bill regarding... or separate law regarding... that regulates 900 and 976 numbers and I believe there's some safeguards within that law."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5211. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Jones, Jerry Mitchell. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5211. This

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Costello, on the top of page 17... Before we get to you, Representative Brady, you're seeking recognition, Leader?"
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect on House Bill 4986, that we did previously, I intended to vote 'no'."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative, the Journal will reflect your request. And Representative Costello, on the top of page 17, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 5233.

 Representative Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for Concurrence to Senate Amendment 2 for House Bill 5233, which is the synthetic drugs Bill. In this Amendment, language is added that retailers who falsely advertise synthetic drugs are guilty of a Class III Felony. Also, synthetic drug paraphernalia is added to the Drug Paraphernalia Controlled Act. It also has an immediate effective date and it adds a substance to the Schedule I Controlled Substance Act. Thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Chair recognizes Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I had a little bit of trouble listening to your testimony. If you could... this is

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

regarding synthetic... synthetic products like synthetic cannabis, the bath salts, things like that?"

Costello: "K2 and bath salts, Representative, mainly."

Reboletti: "And those products are sold legally right now across the state?"

Costello: "Some of them are technically sold legally, some of them are technically illegal according to the… obviously, the intent and the substances in the products."

Reboletti: "And this tries to keep up with the new derivatives, the changes in the chemistry that would make products that are currently legal, illegal? Is that fair to say?"

Costello: "Absolutely, Representative."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I am... I'm reading the Amendment #2 and it says, 'House Bill 5233 provides that whoever falsely advertises synthetic drug product or drug is misbranded is guilty of a Class III Felony and may be fined an amount up to not to exceed \$100 thousand'. Is there a sentencing... would one be sentenced or merely fined?"

Costello: "I... I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question. I got through everything but the sentencing at the end."

Dunkin: "Yeah."

Speaker Lyons: "Hold on a second. Ladies and Gentlemen, shhh.

Discussion going on, it's hard to hear. Let's bring the noise level down, please. Thank you."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Dunkin: "What I'm trying to understand in Senate Amendment #2, will this Class III Felony... is there a... just a fine or is there jail... possible jail time as well?"
- Costello: "Fine and possible jail time. What you've got to realize is the amount of money that these retailers are making on these products. One of the examples I used when I presented the Bill the first time was a town of 700 people, there was one establishment in that town making \$8 thousand a week just off of selling synthetic drugs."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So, what's in place right now? Is it... you're saying it's the marketing aspect of the synthetic drug?"
- Costello: "Correct. The first language was just misbranded drugs, this adds falsely advertised and misbranded drugs."
- "Okay. What I like to do... for Members of the General Dunkin: Assembly to consider... Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I certainly see the Sponsor's intention, but I think what we should all know is that we're looking towards reforming our criminal justice system in short order here. Hopefully by next year, this time, we'll have a different criminal justice system whereas we are not putting those individuals who are nonviolent offenders in jail because it's costing the state a lot of money. Certainly, the Sponsor's intentions are great and I sponsored a Bill last year, as a matter of fact, Representative, regarding synthetic drugs. But it... it's critical for us to really start measuring some of the jail sentencing time as compared to fines with some of these or snatching their licenses in some respect. I support the Bill. I just want to make sure that we're conscious of some of the excess

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

penalties and there's in... and the cost of incarceration for nonviolent offenses. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Costello moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5233. 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 Jones and Soto, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5233. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bob Rita, on the Order of Concurrences, you have House Bill 5359. Representative Rita on Concurrences."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 5359. It makes a technical change in how court orders are... for the recovery fund."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5359 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cavaletto, Representative Flowers, Representative Jones, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 115 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5359. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

passed. Representative Ann Williams, you have, on the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 5434. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 2 and Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 5434. You may recall the discussion on this Bill yesterday. This is the Attorney General's initiative regarding debtor's rights. Senate Amendment 2 is purely technical in nature. And I think part of the confusion the other day was that the Amendment was a gut and replace so it included language from the original Bill also. But what we added in the Senate is purely technical and clarifies simply that the new requirements for the citation to discover proceedings only apply to the debtor, not a third party. Senate Amendment 3 was at the... negotiated at the request of the Illinois Municipal League and exempts cities and municipalities from complying with the new rules when it comes to quasi-criminal ordinance violations. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I want to thank you for pulling this Bill out of the record a few days ago and we had a chance to meet with you and staff. And I think there's... the confusion on Amendment #2 has been taken care of. My questions really are going to be focused then on Senate

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Amendment #3. That was not in the original Bill and that was not negotiated in the House, correct?"

Williams: "Yes. That was added in the Senate at the request of the Municipal League. They wanted to for ordinance violations such as underage drinking, housing code violations, they wanted to be able to utilize the procedure they currently use in terms of collecting fines associated with those violations. And the majority of the issue that we deal with and we've seen it... seen happening throughout the State of Illinois has not been pertaining to municipal ordinance violations. So, we agreed to the Amendment to move forward because we didn't want to throw the baby out with the bath water."

Franks: "I think that's a good way of saying it 'cause what...
what we're allowing here would be allowing municipalities
to throw people in jail for not paying an ordinance
violation basically. And they'd be able to do that
directly."

Williams: "Well, that's the current practice. As we can... as we've noted before in this discussion, we are going after abuses that don't occur in all counties. For example, due to court rule, this does not occur in Cook County. There is other counties we've seen this practice happening and the majority of the abuses that we've seen have been with regard to private collection agencies and over aggressive attempts to collect a debt by utilizing the body attachment procedure. So the brunt of our concern was related to that. In terms of the municipal issue, it's something I'm happy to look at in the future and really make an assessment as

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

to whether it's necessary to kind of complete the picture in terms of debtor's rights and go there in a separate piece of legislation."

Franks: "Thank you. And I... I appreciate that and I agree with that. To the Bill. I... I appreciate the Lady's work on this Bill, I know it's very important. And I do rise in support of it; however, I do think that Amendment #3 is not in the best interest, but I hate to lose everything else because of Amendment #3. So, I'd be happy to work with Representative Williams to file a trailer Bill to correct any... any unintended consequences of that Amendment. Thank you."

"Representative moves for the adoption Speaker Lyons: Amendments #2 and #3... Senate Amendments #2 and #3 to House Bill 5434. All those in favor should signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Beiser, Dan Burke, would you like to Leader be recorded? Representative Dugan, Poe, Chapa LaVia. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 5434. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Beiser... Dan, we can come back. We'll come back. Representative Feigenholtz, Sara, you have House Bill 5592. Representative Feigenholtz on House Bill 5592."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is also some technical language that was left out of the Bill when it left the House that Senator Koehler very kindly inserted about making sure that post permanent sibling contact agreements are not enforceable. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5592 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative David Harris. Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5592. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Carol Sente, on page 17 of the Calendar, under House Bill Concurrences, you have House Bill 5602. Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2, which adds three improvements to the Bill. I worked closely with Senator Millner on the Senate changes and I'd especially like to thank Representative Reboletti for his help and guidance on narrowing the list of appropriate crimes and the opponents for assisting me in crafting a stronger Bill. This Bill makes three changes: 1) the communication between police and a school can only be shared with the school official if the official believes

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

there is an imminent threat of physical harm to students. Number 2) if it is deemed in the best interest of the minor, the student may be referred to in-school or community-based social services if available. And third, we defined 'investigation' to mean an official system... official systematic inquiry by a law enforcement agency into an actual or suspected criminal activity. I've worked with the opponents for three months on these improvements and I think we have a stronger Bill. I heartily ask for an 'aye' vote. This passed overwhelmingly out of the House and the Senate."

Speaker Lyons: "Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook,

Representative Monique Davis."

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

Davis, M.: "Representative, according to, I think one of your Amendments, records are only to be shared orally, is that correct?"

Sente: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "So, there could be no written documentation of what this dangerous child might be or do?"

Sente: "There would be no written documentation; that is correct."

Davis, M.: "Well, suppose the person that you told is no longer there at the school?"

Sente: "How would that be a problem?"

Davis, M.: "Suppose that person is no longer there and it's only an oral record being transferred?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Sente: "There is no desire to hang on to the record. What we're trying to do is diffuse an immediate occurrence that we think might… might erupt into some danger for students and teachers. Once that is diffused, there is no need to hang on to this piece of information."
- Davis, M.: "Why is the Juvenile Justice Authority still opposed to your legislation?"
- Sente: "I cannot imagine. I've worked with them for four months."
- Davis, M.: "So, the Juvenile Justice Authority who work with children and only children are still opposed to this legislation?"
- Sente: "Correct. And 20 special interest state agencies and Members I've worked with for the last four months have all moved to proponents. We can't have everyone always as a proponent. This is a very good Bill."
- Davis, M.: "Tell us exactly what you expect the result to be."
- Sente: "I expect this Bill to prevent future... to make schools safe again, to prevent some... some of the items like what happened in the Elgin teacher stabbing. I also expect kids who need it to get some social services and assistance and keep them on the path towards success."
- Davis, M.: "So... so you admit this would be a better Bill if it stated that children who need social assistance would be getting that?"
- Sente: "It would be a better Bill and that's why I put that in the Amendment. And it's in the Bill now for Concurrence."
- Davis, M.: "What does it state, exactly?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Sente: "It states that if deemed in the best interest of the minor that they will... they may be referred to in-school social services as well as community social services. And it was written by an opponent. And I included it in the Bill."

Davis, M.: "Well, I do believe, Representative, that you had an incident in Elgin and I think a teacher was stabbed by a student. The student had had two prior incidents, and there some feeling that if the school had known about the two prior incidents, perhaps this would not have happened, is that correct?"

Sente: "Absolutely."

Davis, M.: "So, you know students that don't have any incidents also commit atrocious sometimes an egregious behavior. Sometimes they do, even when there is no report. I want to support your Bill. I know you have excellent intentions, but when we look at all of those organizations that are in support of your Bill are not necessarily those who work for children, who work in the best interests of children."

Sente: "Representative..."

Davis, M.: "Some of them merely have schools... pardon?"

Sente: "Representative, I want to say, I don't know that I agree with that. The chief of police who brought this Bill to my attention from the Village of Mundelein has given his career to starting an after-school coalition that actively works to keep children out of trouble and on the right path."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Davis, M.: "So, are we only dealing with children who deal with deadly weapons? Is this the only thing that will be reported orally?"

Sente: "Any of the crimes listed in the Senate Concurrence, in Amendment 1 and 2..."

Davis, M.: "I see we..."

Sente: "...are the crimes that could be..."

Davis, M.: "We have harassment..."

Sente: "...orally discussed."

Davis, M.: "...we have harassment through electronic communications."

Sente: "That is one of the crimes."

Davis, M.: "Is part of the curriculum in any school, the teaching of children about harassment through electronic communication?"

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

Davis, M.: "Well, to my knowledge, at this time, it is not a requirement that schools teach children that if you bully or harassed on a computer or on a telephone that you could be guilty of a crime. There's... is there... there's nothing in their curriculum that guarantees they should be taught this. And yet, we're willing to give them some kind of record because they... say violated, what's in your law here. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Sente: "It will not be on their record."

Davis, M.: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I know this young Lady has a very wonderful intentions and we all want our children safe and we want our teachers safe, but I just think we have to have more legislation that gives some kind

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

of support to children. For example, if a child has committed an act, don't wait until it's #3, provide social services for him immediately. And I'm really concerned when the only reporting mechanism is oral. People leave schools all the time. If the principal leaves who has that confidential information, the school doesn't have it because it's an oral... it's oral information. And I'm sure that her intentions are excellent, but I have to support the Juvenile Justice's position that this is not quite what we need to solve the problem of juvenile violence in our schools with teachers and other children. And I do urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Have numerous speakers. I'm not using the timer, but I'd appreciate it if you'd keep your comments to two or three minutes in respect for everybody who wishes to speak to the issue. Representative Dennis Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, when this Bill started out it... it would be fair to say that it was pretty broad in... in looking at a lot of different crimes that could be reviewed by school officials and law enforcement. Would that be fair to say?"

Sente: "That's correct. It was originally all Class A and B misdemeanors. It's quite extensively narrowed from that starting Bill."

Reboletti: "And... and the focus has changed now. And I know it's somewhat loud in here, but the... the focus is now on violent crimes on the bullying aspect and being able to look at

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

records based off of those types of crimes than somebody who might be trespassing or a theft case, right?"

Sente: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "And this Amendment... your second Amendment or Senator Millner's second Amendment was able to address the concerns of almost all of the advocates, right?"

Sente: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "And then the juv... Juvenile Justice Initiative, was there anything that they wanted that could be reasonably added into the Bill or... or were... they were generically against the whole idea?"

Sente: "They wrote a letter that has four additional points including doing this as a study. I... I think at this point for me it was going beyond the intent of this Bill. I thought I'd reach out to all of the opponents and moved everyone that could be moved off of it. And I'm very comfortable that this is an excellent piece of legislation."

Reboletti: "And... and you also changed... and I appreciate the work that... when we were talking about the Bill, you talked about what an investigation is and who can be part of the investigation. Could you explain that to the Body?"

Sente: "Well, as I said in my opening, they... the word 'investigation' is specifically defined. So, we're being very clear here and it does mean, again, an official systematic inquiry by a law enforcement agency into an actual or suspected criminal activity."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. As I take a look at some of the objections by the Juvenile Justice Initiative and the ACLU,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

I think that they've been addressed in the Amendments. It's simply not too broad, insensitive to victims or disproportionate on its face. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dunkin. Two minutes, Ken."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am one of the individuals here who really like give juveniles the benefit of the doubt juveniles are what, juveniles. They're young, they make certain mistakes and I've actually talked with my seatmate here in committee and insisted that she work with various organizations to really make... take some corrective measures. And Ladies and Gentlemen, she actually did that. And I want to say thank you for doing that, Representative Sente. My biggest concern was the records. This Bill will not... it will not go on the kid's record. It simply allows a police officer to give certain school officials a heads-up on certain individuals who may have gotten into some problems that may impact their behavior in school. And so, is it a perfect Bill? No. Does it provide rehabilitative services, counseling, et cetera? Yes. So, from where it was before compared to where it is now is a commendable approach. And I want to thank the... thank the Sponsor and ask Members to vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Two final speakers will be Mulligan and Jerry Mitchell. Representative Mulligan. Two minutes, Rosemary."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields. But before you start, Rosemary. Shhh. Let's bring the noise level down, please. We're

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

having a discussion on a Concurrence. Thank you. Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Representative, I'd still like an explanation of why the ACLU is opposed to your Bill for overly broad language?"

Sente: "I don't know that I can answer that, Representative. We started with Class A... and all Class A and B misdemeanors. They are... have concern... some concern about the assault and battery and their letter just states the broad nature of the crimes included. But as was stated earlier we worked with... I worked with Representative Reboletti to tighten that so only the ones we felt would erupt into some type of a dangerous situation within the school grounds."

Mulligan: "Well, I think it's hard to tell particularly with a juvenile and sometimes when you label a juvenile, that label becomes fact as opposed to treating them without the label. So, I think that the ACLU has a very valid point. And that the Bill is overly broad and that what happens then is you label too many children with a bad label. I tend to agree with Representative Davis that I think your Bill is overly broad and it should have been tightened up and I don't think that you should report everything for every child. I, too, have had unfortunate instances where juveniles murdered my father and I'm very interested in how that happens in the school district. My... the men that ... the young men that murdered my father were all out of school, they had left school. And we've tried to change that by raising the age now when you can actually leave school and truancy. And I know Representative Davis has worked very

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

hard on this over the years that I've been in committee with her. So, I think there's a problem with this Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The final speaker will be Representative Jerry Mitchell. I clearly announced there'd be two final speakers. Representative Mitchell."

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

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Sente, I understand that in the beginning with this Bill your... your main concern was to make sure that school officials knew when there was the reasonable intent of disruption in the school from a student who was being investigated by the police department for something very serious, is that correct?"

Sente: "Yes, it is."

Mitchell, J.: "And that hasn't changed, correct?"

Sente: "Correct."

Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill allows the local police to share information with school officials in case there's a very, very serious offense perpetrated by a minor. It could cause harm in the school. As you well know, our schools today are not as safe as they were back when I was in school, but then the wheel hadn't been invented yet. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. The intent of this Bill is... has been worked on by many, many people. I certainly agree with the Sponsor of the Bill and we should give this a very strong 'yes' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lyons: "So, let me guess, Representative Davis, that you want... your name was used in debate and you're going to yield your time to Mary Flowers?"
- Davis, M.: "I will yield my time to Mary Flowers."
- Speaker Lyons: "How could I have guessed that? How could I have possibly guessed that?"
- Davis, M.: "I will yield my time to Mary Flowers as important as this issue is to certain communities."
- Speaker Lyons: "All right. Mary Flowers has the microphone, Representative, thank you."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Davis. And thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, is the… the ACLU is against the Bill and who else is against this Bill, please?"
- Sente: "The Juvenile Justice Initiative."
- Flowers: "And so what is it that the Juvenile Justice know that you don't know that this is a bad Bill?"
- Sente: "You'd have to ask them, Representative."
- Flowers: "Well, I'm asking you because according to one of the previous speakers, you supposed to have... and I was in the committee that day, and you were supposed to have been working with them as well. So, what was their objections to the Bill?"
- Sente: "Representative, I did work with both the remaining opponents and when they stopped showing up, I didn't drag them there. I reached out to them every meeting I had. I explained why they were still opponents and I just have nothing left to add."
- Flowers: "Well, Repres... to the Bill. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the problem with what's going

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

on in this Legislative Body is that we are creating jobs off the backs of children. And unfortunately, we have not done a very good job as far as educating children, as far as creating opportunities for children, but we are very good at creating prisons for children. And this is not fair. One thing about being a child, if you keep on living, if you have a good opportunity, if you're given the guidance by the right type of adults, you can be successful in life. But if you are charged with the least little crime... yesterday, if you push and shove the State Police had to be called and today the least little thing... what happened to talking to children? It hasn't been that long ago for some of us, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we were all children and we all did childlike things. And thank God these types of legislation was not in place when we were children. Let's give these children a chance, let's not put a... a scar on them for the rest of their lives because they did something as a child. They are supposed to be forgiven. Please allow these children to be children and to be forgiven without having some type of job created or records created because they did something childlike or when they were children. Thank you very much. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Sente to close."

Sente: "I would like to be clear one last time; it does not create a written record. In closing, this Body can talk about school safety and our desire to keep young adults on a productive life path or we can do something about it.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

This Bill does something about it and I heartily urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5602?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Will Davis, Ramey, Keith Sommer, want to be recorded? Randy Ramey. Bottom... back row, GOP? Mr. Clerk, take the record. 98 Members voting 'yes', 19 Members voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 5602. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Poe, I think you have one of those announcements that we wait for all year long. Representative Poe."

Poe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. At this time, in the backroom we have chicken today that we fried and it's provided by Mike Horstman and Illinois Optometrist. So, thank... thank them when you see them and they paid for the food. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Let's have a round of applause for Representative Poe for doing this annual event. God Bless you, Raymond. Thank you very much. Now, for something completely different, a Nonconcurrence. Representative Pritchard, on page 16 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 4692."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment, which changed the nature of the Bill that passed out of this chamber unanimously dealing with the driver's license. This Bill adds a designated license

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

plate, which in and of itself is probably an acceptable idea, but our chamber has taken an attitude of not passing those plates now. So, I would move and ask for your support in Nonconcurrence."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any explanation... any questions? The question is, 'Should the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4692?' All those in favor of Nonconcurrence vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting... all those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. And the Motion carries. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4692. On the Order of Concurrences, Representative Chapin Rose, on page 18, you have House Bill 5914. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill sailed out of here previously, and in the Senate we were able to work out an agreement with the universities. This was the Bill regarding the use of higher ed search firms and the... and the... and there was a series of newspaper articles that discussed abuses by various universities of Illinois the use of GRF funds and/or student tuition dollars to hire outside search firms. In the Senate, we were able to achieve agreement with them that narrows it slightly. There were 91 'yes' votes previously. And so I would urge favorable adoption."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Reboletti: "Representative, not to debate this Bill again, how much had the U of I spent in search firms over the last decade?"
- Rose: "Representative, I can't tell you over the last decade but over the last several years it was \$5 million. And it was widely publicized. There were numerous newspaper articles that they were using student dollars for everything from associate directors of parking all the way up to the presidential searches. Now, one can argue, as the universities did in this Amendment, that it is appropriate for a board of trustees to seek outside guys when they're selecting a president, but certainly not an associate director of parking or an assistant director of housing. I mean, that's just ridiculous. You know this is student's money, it's the taxpayer's money and this needs to be dealt with."
- Reboletti: "I'm actually somewhat baffled that somebody would have to do a national search and spend millions of dollars to find people who are in charge of parking arrangements at the U of I. And..."
- Rose: "As am I, Representative. My constituents were outraged by... by that information."
- Reboletti: "I can imagine that are my constituents as they pay tax dollars and send students down to Champaign. And when we have a lack of dollars for higher education and we're making cuts, the last thing we should be doing is spending millions of dollars to find people that we can find here in the State of Illinois. So, I do support your legislation, Representative."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Rose: "Thank you, Representative Reboletti."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Rose to close."

Rose: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this previously got 91 votes. It is now agreed, so I would hope that we could at least do 91 on this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "The question is, 'Should the House agree with Amendments #2 and #3 to House Bill 5914?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bost, Will Davis, Marcus Evans, Lilly, would like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 5914. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back on page 17, Representative 5650 on McAsey, you have House Bill the Order of Concurrences. Representative Emily McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5650. What this Bill does is create the State Vehicle Use Act to increase transparency, make sure that we're using state resources more effectively. The Senate added a couple of additional requirements regarding data reporting and new vehicle purchases. So, I ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5650 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Scott Penny, Saviano, Smith, Sullivan, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 116 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5650. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAsey on House Bill 5653."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5653. This is legislation having to do with financial exploitation of the elderly. When the Bill was here in the House, I promised to work with the Representative from Western Springs to make an Amendment in the Senate. It returns to us with that amended language to address the restitution issue. And I ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We had a very spirited debate a few months ago about this Bill and I think it was just a matter of a clerical error rather than intellectual error which caused the problem which we noticed on the floor. I... I agree with the language which the Senate has sent over and I encourage all our Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative McAsey and Representative Durkin move for the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5653. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Krezwick, Reboletti, would you like to be recorded? Chuck? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5653. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Camille Lilly, on the Order of Concurrences, Camille, you have House Bill 5689 on the bottom of page 17. Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. House Bill 5689 creates a task force to develop a statewide high school course on domestic violence in accordance to the Step Back program from Oak Park-River Forest High School. Senate Amendment #1 keeps the majority of the Bill intact, it just adds and requires that the Clerk of the Circuit Court in the First Judicial District to provide administrative staff and support to the task force. It removes the requirements that the task force propose course content that should be mandatory versus voluntary. And it adds seven representatives to the task force from various organizations. I thank you for your attention and I'll ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Lady's explanation. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Leader Renée Kosel."

Kosel: "Is this a new mandate for the school districts?"

Speaker Lyons: "Are you asking a question of the Sponsor?"

Kosel: "Yes, I am. I'm sorry..."

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Kosel: "...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Lilly: "Thank you for your question. No, it's not. It's just an exploratory program and activity."

Kosel: "But I thought I heard you say that the Amendment said that it would now be a mandatory class?"

Lilly: "The Amendment addresses that it is voluntary."

Kosel: "Then it will be voluntarily administered in the schools that they don't have to have this class?"

Lilly: "The task force will not discuss whether it's mandatory or voluntary."

Kosel: "But does the Bill discuss it?"

Lilly: "No, it does not."

Kosel: "Thank you very much."

Lilly: "You are welcome."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Lilly moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by say... by voting 'yes'; those opposed say... vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, Will Davis, Kay Hatcher, Rich Morthland, Chris Nybo, Skip Saviano, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 117 Members voting 'yes' and 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5689. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Jim Durkin, on the Order of Concurrences, Jim, on

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

page 13 of the Calendar, you have House Bill 2582. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The... I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 2582. This is a culmination of the CLEAR Commission, which has been in place for the past seven years. They've done some outstanding work of reorganizing and making sense out of the Criminal Code and also the Criminal Procedure Act under our revised statutes. We know it's been a mess over the years. So, this has been basically a reorganization. There's no penalty enhancements and no adding of new crimes or offenses. This is a way to ensure that practitioners have some sanity when they go into a court and have to refer back to the Criminal Code. So, this has been agreed upon by chambers. A lot of research has gone into this and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2582 vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative du Buclet, Representative Hatcher, Rich Brauer. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there's 118... 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2582. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dan Beiser, we'll take you

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

back to your Concurrence Motion, on page 17, House Bill 5493. Representative Dan Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask… I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. This is an agreed Bill now. It passed 109… or 57-0 in the Senate. And basically it takes all of the opposition away."

Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5493 should vote 'yes'; those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Kay Hatcher, Representative Hays, Representative Morrison, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5493. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kelly Burke, on page 10 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Second Reading, you have Senate Bill 3597. What's the status on that Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3597, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kelly Burke on Floor Amendment #3."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to adopt Floor Amendment #3. Yes."
- Speaker Lyons: "Excuse us, Representative? I couldn't hear you."
- Burke, K.: "I... I move to adopt Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3597."
- Speaker Lyons: "Is there a brief overview of what that..."
- Burke, K.: "There is... Yeah."
- Speaker Lyons: "...or do you just want to move it and discuss it on Third?"
- Burke, K.: "Yes, that's what I'd like to do."
- Speaker Lyons: "We'll just move it? All those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3597, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kelly Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3597 is an initiative of the Chicago Teachers Pension Fund and is an agreed Bill with the Chicago Public Schools. It seeks to codify a rule of the pension fund regarding return to work for retired teachers and principals. The Bill would specify that retired teachers may return to work 100 days a year and earn up to a maximum of \$30 thousand. The retired

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

teachers would be able to return to work to earn a maximum of a specified daily rate times 100 days. It is a good Bill that mimics the provisions of suburban and downstate teachers in TRS. I welcome any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "The Chair recognizes Representative...

Representative Ed Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, my understanding is these are very similar provisions that are currently in statute for TRS systems?"

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "To further explain what the ramifications are that's... these teachers are not coming back at a specific salary like regular teachers. They would be put into the temporary teacher type program or how... how will they be paid?"

Burke, K.: "So, currently there was some confusion within the CPS system about how often teachers could work. And some teachers were coming back to work just short of a full year and thereby circumventing the intention of the retirement fund that they return on a temporary basis. And so, this seeks to put in specific limits on how many days they can work and the maximum amount that they can earn in order to be... keep... keep receiving their pension."

Sullivan: "So, obviously, it's... on the maximum amount it doesn't really necessarily matter where there... I'm... I'm

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

asking the question more of, they would go in and be what would be considered a substitute teacher?"

Burke, K.: "Correct."

Sullivan: "Okay. That... that was the clarification I just wanted to make."

Burke, K.: "Yes, that's correct."

Sullivan: "And so, no matter what they are paid from district to district..."

Burke, K.: "It's only CPS."

Sullivan: "...or school to school, they're capped at \$30 thousand?"

Burke, K.: "Correct."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Question is, 'Should Senate Bill 3597 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, Chapa LaVia, Crespo, Golar, Kay Hatcher. Chapa. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 117 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Ed Acevedo."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Leader."

Acevedo: "I apologize. I wanted to say this in the beginning when we started, but I was stuck in a meeting. You know,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

folks, I've been down here starting 17 years and we've all had our disagreements. And you know we could beg to differ with one another, but yesterday was outrageous and very disappointing. Yesterday decorum was lost in this esteemed Body as the pressure of the end of Session got the better of some Members. Question... questions were raised about the Leadership on my side of the aisle, questions about my friend, my Leader, our Speaker. Questioning his integrity and his ability to move us forward to solve the very good ... very difficult problems we face here in Illinois. I rise today to say enough. Folks, enough is enough. I speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I say we stand with our Leader, Speaker Madigan, and fully support and trust his plan. Yesterday's actions reminded me of a quote from a famous man, Jackie Robinson, a hero of many here, the fairest African American in Major League Baseball and a truly great American who led by example and turned the other cheek when attacked. He said, 'I'm not concerned with your liking or disliking me, all I ask that you respect me as a human being'. Words we should all remember during these tense days, folks. We all got a job to solve and some problems to solve here in the State of Illinois. So, let's do it together but let's have respect for one another. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the speaker from...
that just spoke, I would say that I agree that a person of
Christian faith should turn the other cheek, but I also
agree... I agree and I hope that you do, my job is to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

represent my people. And I don't turn the cheek of my people. The people I represent of the 115th District have been slapped long enough. And I do not regret what I said yesterday and I will not apologize for what I said yesterday. We have been under a very strict iron hand control and if you cannot admit that, I'm sorry. I'm sorry that you can't admit it. I'm not sorry I said it. I say it with respect and if I raise my voice and that offends you, I apologize that it offends you, but I do not apologize for saying it or raising my voice. My job is Representative of the 115th District and I will represent them as such."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, while I respect the opinions of Leader Acevedo, yesterday I watched as we all work in bipartisan fashions until we don't work in bipartisan fashions because the Speaker chooses not to do so. And then we're no longer needed. But then can we help out somewhere else where we are needed? Bipartisanship is not that you write the Bill and we get to vote on it. That's not the spirit of what we've been talking about in this House for the entire year. For two years at least we have tried to come to agreement on budgets, on pensions, on Medicaid reform and we're on the brink of some historic changes in the way we do business in the State of Illinois, but yesterday that all fell apart. And each one of us is entitled to represent our districts the way we best think that is the case. I represent the same 108 thousand people that all of you do. We all represent the State of Illinois. But when I try to discharge a Motion so that the people of my district can be

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

heard, I deserve the opportunity to be heard as I would if I were in a court of law outside with a microphone or with a sign. I have rights of speech that are denied. And the Speaker indicated that we should have deliberative debate on the issue, when would that be? Is that Amendment going to come out of Rules? Has Rules met? Do they have any idea of when this might happen? That's what we're talking about, Ladies and Gentlemen."

- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo, on page 4 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 1064. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. I've been advised by the Clerk, Leader, that there is a Floor Amendment to put on there. So, we'll take that back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, take that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. What's the status on the Bill?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1064, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Acevedo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Acevedo on Floor Amendment #1."
- Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, can we take it out of the record for a few minutes, please?"
- Speaker Lyons: "Take that Bill out of the record on Second Reading. Representative Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that House Bill 6153 can be heard in Environmental Health, Senate Bill 1853 in Housing, Senate Bill 2915 in Healthcare Licenses, House Resolutions 1040,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

1043, 1053, 1072, 1079 and 1088 in State Government, House Resolution 1098 in Armed Forces and Military Affairs, House Resolution 1107 to Insurance, House Resolution 1115 to State Government and House Joint Resolution 90 in the J-II Committee. I know of no opposition and I'd appreciate leave for this Motion."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I concur."

Speaker Lyons: "Seeing no objection, the House suspends the issues... or the issue carries. Now, all those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' carry and the Motion carries. Representative Scott Penny, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Leader?"

Penny: "Moment of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Please proceed, Chief."

Penny: "I would like to announce the presence of a couple of local dignitaries from the City of Caseyville that my wife has brought here. It's my two nephews, Tyler and Daniel Foley who are very active politically in the Caseyville area. So, would you gentlemen stand up for us."

Speaker Lyons: "Welcome to your Capitol, enjoy the day.

Representative Currie, on the page 5 of the Calendar, under

Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 3397. Read

the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Leader, there's an Amendment. I'll

bring it back to the Order of Second Reading. And what's

the status on the Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3397, the Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

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

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

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the final piece of the Medicaid puzzle. This would change Section 25, which is the Section that we use in terms of delaying various debts of the state. This would limit the ability of the state to use Section 25 to pay Medicaid bills incurred in one year indefinitely in following years. And as I understand it, it would apply starting next fiscal year. It would say that only a limited number of bills, 700 million could be spent in Section 25... under Section 25 and the following years 100 million. And this would only apply to bills that are in hand at the end of the fiscal year, but as everybody knows, we've been using Section 25 to delay payments of our Medicaid bills, our Medicaid debts, and this would limit that practice. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate adoption of the Amendment and then the Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Reboletti, do you want to discuss the Amendment or do you want till it's on Third? What's your pleasure?"

Reboletti: "Just briefly on the Amendment."

Speaker Lyons: "Speak... the Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, what is Section 25? And what was the actual intent of Section 25? I know that it's changed over the years but what was the intent of Section 25?"

Currie: "Yeah, medical bills we've always considered somewhat differently from other bills that the state has

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

responsibility for. But this will rein in our ability to incur a lot of Medicaid liability in one year with the hope that we can pay for it in the out years."

- Reboletti: "And I guess my... my point, Leader, is that... I... I thought the original intent of Section 25 was to allow providers a window of time in which to be remunerated for their services if they didn't... you know, send the bills in right away. But Governor Blagojevich, at the time, decided that he would use that to push all Medicaid bills through to the next fiscal year. Is that..."
- Currie: "So, it made it... it is fair to say that Section 25 makes it possible for the Legislature to adopt budgets that, in fact, are not balanced because they're not taking into account the liabilities and the Medicaid program that would be incurred in the fiscal year for which that budget is... is offered."
- Reboletti: "And... and I think this is a huge step towards the Medicaid reform package. Thank you."
- Speaker Lyons: "Representative Kay, this is on the Amendment.

 Do you want to speak to the Amendment or you want to wait 'til it's on Third? Your pleasure, whatever you want to do. Wait 'til it's on Third. Thank you, Representative Kay. Seeing no further discussion, those in favor of the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 signify by saying 'yes'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #1 is adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed." Speaker Lyons: "Third Reading. And read the Bill."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3397, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Majority Leader Barbara Flynn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. The Amendment we just discussed becomes the Bill and I urge your support."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Bellock."

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

This was one of the major issues that we addressed in the Medicaid reform. And this, again, was to discipline ourselves to bring down pushing over that money into the next year. And this is... I would highly recommend voting for this because this will help us within the next couple of years bring down our bills and pay them in the year that we incur them. Thank you."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative Dwight Kay."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, quick question. I'm inclined to... to vote for your... your Amendment and your piece of legislation here, but I'm curious, would we not be better served if we just didn't eliminate Section 25?"

Currie: "I think you need some kind of safety valve. You can't always predict precisely how much you will be spending on the Medicaid program in any given year. As you know, today we spend close to \$14 billion a year on the Medicaid program and that number varies. In fact, the reason we were in the business of finding \$2.7 billion to cut is that the expectation was that Medicaid liability would soar through

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

the roof given the recessionary time that we are in, more people eligible for services and so forth and so on. So, I think..."

Kay: "Yeah. Representative, I don't..."

Currie: "...I think a bit of a... it's a pressure cooker and I think a little valve at the top to... to take care of circumstances where we're not altogether accurate in our prediction is a good idea."

Kay: "Let me... let me ask a separate question. Would... would Section 25 hold up to the scrutiny of general accounting practices or procedures?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, could you repeat?"

Kay: "Would Section 25 of the Finance Act meet the scrutiny of general accepted accounting procedures or practices?"

Currie: "I assume that it does because I think all of our spending does. And let me just say that... that in the first year we were saying 700 million could come out of Section 25, use Section 25 for those purposes, but after that, it would be 100 million which doesn't even count for as much as four days of our usual Medicaid spending. So, we've not left ourselves much of a valve, much of a... an opportunity if we turned out to guess wrong."

Kay: "Thank you, Leader. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Just... I... I think this is probably something we need to do frankly. I think most know that Section 25 has been used to proper a shell game over the years so that we really don't know how much we owe. We really don't know which year we spent money in for particular services rendered. This may be a step in the right direction, but frankly, I think we need to look

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

at our Finance Act. We need to get ourselves on the same schedule accounting wise that businesses do because this is a big business. We don't need to hide things any longer. Furthermore, one last point, without a posting requirement we really don't know what we owe in this state and we still don't have any particular posting requirements that really apply to Medicaid and that's really a shame. But I'm going to support your Bill, Representative, only because it may be a step in the right direction. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Jim Watson."

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

Speaker Lyons: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Leader Currie, will... I... I... first of all, I commend you on the legislation. I think it's a great idea and... and those that worked on it. My... my concern or my question to you would be, is... is this a commitment that will stand in the years to come as we go through budget processes?"

Currie: "It's my hope that it will."

Watson: "I mean, but... will you commit that you will personally work to try to maintain this policy as implemented and kept in?"

Currie: "Of course."

Watson: "My concern is this, is that we had a plan to fund the pensions once and then Legislators came up and said, oh, we will ignore it. We will pass legislation to exempt it."

Currie: "That would be..."

Watson: "What us..."

Currie: "...that would be my commitment, but we cannot bind a future General Assembly, Representative."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Watson: "Right. But this is a... I guess my point is this is a good policy."

Currie: "Yes."

Watson: "And I would hope that Members of both sides of the aisle do not stray from this good policy."

Currie: "Right."

Watson: "Thank you."

Currie: "Right."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. This is good legislation in and of itself, but it's also tied directly into the other... the other Bills that we have passed this Session having to do with the Medicaid program, the cuts, the Cook County waiver. None of those happen unless we adopt Senate Bill 3397. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lyons: "Leader Currie moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3397. 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 118 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bradley, on the top of page 6, under Senate Bills-Third Reading, you have Senate Bill 3794. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3794, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lyons: "Representative John Bradley."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Bradley: "I... yeah. This is a compromise Bill between the Governor's Office and the Comptroller's Office in response to an audit from the Auditor General involving technology and systems in State Government. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lyons: "You've heard the Gentleman's explanation. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor of the passage of Senate Bill 3794 signify by saying... 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? Marcus Evans, Camille Lilly, Deb Mell, would you like to be recorded? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there's 116 Members voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 11 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 3811, Representative May. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3811, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second... this Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3811, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative May."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- May: "Thank you, Speaker. 3811 is a... it's a trailer Bill to the Smart Grid Bill that passed last year. It has no opposition. In fact, the ComEd utility and the groups that worked on it, the National Resources Defense Council and the Environmental Law and Policy Center are just clarifying, not making any new change in the law, clarifying some points about energy efficiency and the net metering provision."
- 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? Leader Lyons. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 104 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 3722, Majority Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3722, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 4, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to adopt Amendment #4.

 So, we can withdraw 2 and 3."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendments 2 and 3 are withdrawn. Leader Currie on Amendment 4."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "And I'd appreciate it if we could just amend the Bill and then have our debate on Third Reading."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3722, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is... and Members of the House. This is the... the broad ranging Elections Bill, the catch all, the grab bag, and it contains numerous provisions, most of them are technical. It requires at the request of the business communities that if there are assessments or dues of individuals but \$500 or more comes from any individual, this would be for corporations, labor organizations and so forth, assessments of \$500 or more, that would have to be separately disclosed. There would be early voting at state universities except in Cook County. And in the event that there is a Super PAC operating in Illinois making expenditures for a particular candidate greater than 250 thousand for a statewide office or 100 thousand for all other elective offices, then campaign contribution caps would not apply to other candidates. This provision tracks entirely current provisions with respect to candidates who are self funded. We clarified that there's no limit on the amount of money a political Party committee and its affiliate at the federal level may

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

transfer back and forth. And we're making it easier when you have raffles, you only have to disclose the name of the person who bought a raffle ticket if the ... if the price was more than \$150. We were... we are requiring voters to cast provisional ballots if they received an absent ballot but didn't return it. We're permitting early voting and grace period voting until the Saturday before the Election Day. We will shorten then the beginning period for... for voting before the election. And we're also providing that in the event... in the event that there is a Super PAC and somebody... another candidate, Attorney General or the attorney believes that there is collusion, there coordination, this would provide them the opportunity to go to court for injunctive relief. We are also asking the campaign tax... task force, there's a Campaign Finance Task Force already in place. We are asking them to have a look at the... the issue of Super PACs and what they mean to Illinois. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for this important Bill."

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

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

Pritchard: "Leader, one of the provisions in here is that we have early voting at all of the university campuses. Has there been an estimate as what that might cost local units of government?"

Currie: "We don't know what it would cost, but we've not heard a lot of squawks from the county clerks."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Pritchard: "Maybe they're not aware of it."

Currie: "They have to do early voting anyway."

Pritchard: "They do, but there's a limit to how much they have to do."

Currie: "Well, we're only bring..."

Pritchard: "And this seems to be increasing in the amount of obligation and time that they need to have election judges at all of those locations."

Currie: "Well, on the other hand, since they have to provide early voting, this would seem to me to give them the opportunity to choose the public university as one of those early voting sites."

Pritchard: "And I think usually they are..."

Currie: "Good."

Pritchard: "...because of the concentration."

Currie: "Yeah, so..."

Pritchard: "But it's just a matter of how many polling places and if there's additional ones. There's also a provision in here about allowing early voting up to the Saturday before the election. Isn't there concern that there might be a problem recording who voted and passing that back to avoid double voting?"

Currie: "We... the clerk's office did not... and none of the clerks' offices indicated that that would be a problem.

They did complain that sometimes they have to pay overtime on Saturdays, but that was the only complaint they made."

Pritchard: "Well, and there again..."

Currie: "And so, to take care of that we took out the first week of what today is the early voting period."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Pritchard: "Well, I'm just concerned that we not have voting abuse. And sometimes you do find people so energetic to vote that they'll vote several times if given the opportunity. And that's why I'm concerned that if we have Saturday before the election that the county clerk would really be in communication with all of the polling places to be able to... to stop that kind of action."
- Currie: "Yeah. And you... you can still absentee vote up to the day before the election, so I think your fears are misplaced."
- Pritchard: "There's also a major provision in here of rolling back the cap on expenditures if an Independent exceeds a certain level. Aren't we really headed..."

Currie: "Contributions."

- Pritchard: "...in the wrong direction by doing that? Aren't we spending too much on elections now?"
- Currie: "I would say this, I would say that as the Supreme Court and now the Federal Court has said that in Illinois contribution caps cannot be imposed on a Super PAC, an independent political expenditure committee that is not connected to a candidate. I think it would be an outrage not to help the other candidates not so benefited by the Super PAC, not to give them the opportunity to try to level the playing field. Let me tell you this. We already provide an end to caps when somebody running against you is spending \$100 thousand of his or her own money to defeat you. We give you the opportunity to avoid the contribution cap. This new provision is totally analogous to the circumstance where a self-funder is spending huge sums of

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

money. And let me say this too. Yes, there may be too much money in politics and if I were on the Supreme Court, I would not have voted for the Citizens United decision, but the fact is that if we don't help these candidates who are not benefited by the deepest pocket across the country, if we don't help them level the playing field, we are ceding our democracy; ceding our democracy to the highest bidder. And that to me is a disservice to all the democratic values I thought each and every one of us held dear."

Pritchard: "So, I would be happy to work with you to try to have campaign limits because it just seems like we keep going the wrong direction and voters are tired of all the campaign ads and aren't paying attention to them."

Currie: "Representative, we cannot control that the... the ability of these Super PACs. We... to ... to take unlimited contributions the Federal Court said in a lawsuit brought before the Primary Elections, the Federal Court said you may not impose your contribution caps. And all this says is when that outside group, uncoordinated with the candidate, is spending as much as 250 thousand in a statewide race, \$100 thousand in any other, just as we say for a self funded candidate, the other candidates in the race do not have to abide by contribution caps either. And we do that in my view because otherwise we would essentially be selling seats in this Legislature and in the Governor's Office to the highest bidder, to the deepest pockets, to the big money. And I don't see how that is a... is a conclusion... a result that would suit anybody in this chamber."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Pritchard: "I noticed there are some very reputable groups in opposition to this legislation. Can you explain what their opposition is?"

"You know, they... they believe that the political Currie: landscape that we live in is not the political landscape that we have. They are... are idealists who would wish the Supreme Court had voted differently in Citizen United. The reality is the Supreme Court voted the way it did in Citizen United. These groups are fearful there might be collusion. As I said in my opening remarks, we've given other candidates, we've given the Attorney General and the state's attorney the opportunity to go to court if there is evidence of coordination, but I don't think we can... You've seen what's been happening at the national level, the number of Super PACs that have emerged supporting one or another of the Republican hopefuls for the nomination for President, these are very big money propositions, Representative, and we cannot tell them that they cannot do business in Illinois. We cannot say they have to abide by our contribution caps. And I would just say, that if we seed the field to them, then our democracy has a bigger problem than the fact that there is money in it."

Pritchard: "Well, I certainly applaud your theory on that, but I think this is taking us in the wrong direction. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Leader will yield."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Leader Currie, didn't we complete Campaign Finance Reform back in 2009?"

Currie: "We did our best."

Reboletti: "I might disagree with that, but did we not put together a Campaign Finance Task Force in that legislation?"

Currie: "We have, I'm a member."

Reboletti: "How many members are there besides yourself?"

Currie: "I think there's a Member from each caucus and then there are people from I think... I think the Leaders... I think the Leaders each have two members and that the Governor may have three, I'm not sure."

Reboletti: "How... how many times have you met in the course of the last year or two?"

Currie: "Oh, four or five times."

Reboletti: "And you need additional time now to author a report?"

Currie: "Well, yeah we..."

Reboletti: "February 1."

Currie: "We are... we did a report I think at the end of December and one of the measures in this... in this omnibus Bill would be to require the Campaign Task Force... Finance Task Force to look at the issue of the Super PACs in Illinois politics."

Reboletti: "Leader, why can't we wait for the task force to put together some recommendations that we can all abide by?"

Currie: "We are going into a November election, it is just around the corner. We will not likely be here before the November election. I don't want any candidate, Republican

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

or Democrat, to have to have one hand behind his or her back, to be defenseless if we discover that there are Super PACs invading Illinois. I don't think we can afford to wait."

Reboletti: "Does this... does this Bill address cap limitations on the Leaders?"

Currie: "No."

Reboletti: "Why is that?"

Currie: "Because they're..."

Reboletti: "Isn't that... isn't that part of an issue as well?

We... that the Members are..."

Currie: "...there was a... there..."

Reboletti: "...are capped out but then the Leaders are not?"

Currie: "There is no consensus on that issue, Representative."

Reboletti: "Well, I think that's a large loophole within the system. And what about the voting at the universities, do we have any numbers of how many students avail themselves of this extra ability to... to vote?"

Currie: "I don't have numbers. And of course, not all the public universities outside Cook offer the opportunity today."

Reboletti: "Why are we worried about early voting sites and the ability for the students to do that? Why don't we open it up pretty much everywhere?"

Currie: "Well, I'd be happy to..."

Reboletti: "Why college campuses only?"

Currie: "I would be happy to, Representative, but I think the clerks would have something of a cow if we were to impose even more early voting opportunities on them."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Well, it's my understanding and I... I spoke with Representative Rose about the early voting at Eastern Illinois and he said it was very, very minimal, and that the costs far outweigh the benefits. And I'd have to argue that the reality is, is most students are probably voting out of their home county as I did when I went to Eastern Illinois. I didn't vote in Coles County. So, why would we need to do that then, Leader?"

Currie: "Staff and faculty, of course, can take advantage of the early voting opportunity, not only students. And... and... and I would imagine that most of these universities are fairly central... centrally located. And that because there are large numbers of students, faculty and staff they have the population density that might warrant an early voting opportunity."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we passed Campaign Finance Reform which I thought was filled with loopholes and gave the Leaders in this Body even more power, which I don't think anyone wanted to happen. This does not rectify that. All this does is expand the opportunity for money to become involved in election cycles and that people would be beholden to those interests. So, I would ask that we all vote 'no', and go back to the drawing board and wait for the Campaign Finance Task Force to submit their report next year. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader yields."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Sacia: "Leader Currie, Representative Reboletti kind of went around the… the edges of this, but we are giving an opportunity to young people to vote at college campuses. And if I understand the legislation correctly, they fill out an affidavit that says they did not vote in their home district or something to that effect, is that correct?"
- Currie: "No. I... I think this would mean if they are registered to vote at their college address."
- Sacia: "Okay. Thank you for that. Would you not agree that by creating this opportunity for students at college campuses, why aren't we doing something like at old folks homes or reaching out to them? It appears to me we are... we are seeking a select group here... go ahead, Leader."
- Currie: "First of all, I would say that remember there are many staff and faculty also on those university campuses. And let me tell you that many clerks do have special programs to go into nursing homes to make sure that the… that the… the elderly who are in-firm are able to cast a ballot."
- Sacia: "However, I heard you say when you were addressing the previous speaker that if we went any further I think your words are that they would have a cow or something to that effect if we... if we went that far?"
- Currie: "We already have those programs in place, Representative, in the... in the elder living facilities."
- Sacia: "Leader Currie, I... I really struggle with this. And we did have a good debate in committee, I do agree with that, but this just seems to be taking a bad piece of... a bad issue and I think Representative Reboletti alluded to it. We made an effort in 2009 and that was supposed to fix

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

a lot. This appears... it seemed like to me that we failed miserably then and this seems to be taking the misery a step further. I think this is a situation that is going way too far. It... it's a step beyond the pale. And with all due respect, Leader Currie, I will be voting 'no' and I hope as many here in the floor will join me with that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Majority Leader, a few years ago we debated this Bill and I think I was the only Democrat who voted 'no' on the… on the… in position to caps. I didn't think the caps work. I didn't think it was fair the way it was laid out where the leadership had the ability to pay whatever they… whatever they wanted. But I'm going to ask you now after… after that Bill has been around for three years, do you think the caps work?"

Currie: "I haven't seen any statistical backup, but my guess is by and large they do. But I don't know that whether the caps were a solution in search of a problem or whether there really was a problem that the caps have helped us curtail."

Franks: "Well, nonetheless, they have been found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, correct? There... they've taken..."

Currie: "No, no, only... only in the circumstance where there is uncoordinated activity between an independent political expenditure committee and a candidate."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Franks: "Correct."

Currie: "And that's what happened in Illinois. The Federal District Court in Illinois said, Illinois caps are unconstitutional if we try to apply them to a Super PAC..."

Franks: "Right."

Currie: "...that's not coordinated with the candidate."

Franks: "Right. And... so they have been found unconstitutional.

This Bill would deal with that issue I would think, it would make it constitutional?"

Currie: "Yes. It would give the defense to the person against whom the Super PAC is raising unlimited funds to defeat."

Franks: "Well, I... I want you to know I'm supporting your Bill this time. And I... I voted 'no' last time, but this time it's a much different Bill. In the sense... one of the previous speakers had talked about voter turnout. And you know, the last Primary in my district, in my county, we had less than 20 percent people turnout, we had 19 percent turnout in McHenry County, which I find terribly embarrassing."

Currie: "Right."

Franks: "And it may be because they don't like us, but that's okay. But the fact is, anything that we can do to encourage voter turnout I think is very important. So, I think your solution to have early voting extended to the Saturday before the election I think will bring more people to the polls, don't you?"

Currie: "I agree. I agree."

Franks: "And I think that ought to be our goal to engage people in democracy instead of trying to keep the voters down."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "Absolutely."

Franks: "So, I think that's important. But I want to tell you I... to the Bill now. And... and I rise in support I've heard some of our previous speakers talk against it, but I can you that this is necessary. I was personally threatened last week by a person of large means indicating that they would throw in whatever it took to start a new Super PAC if I wouldn't do something that they would like me to do. And this person said I'm worth \$100 million and I'll spend whatever it takes. Now, that's really not democracy when I've got to fight with both hands tied behind my back and while this guy can throw in a million dollars if he wants. And I don't think that's what democracy is all about. So, I think this Bill will help level the playing field. I think this is nowhere near a solution, we have a lot more that we need to do, but we certainly need to support this Bill and to be able to level the playing field, do what's right constitutionally and hopefully, ultimately, get more people engaged and more people voting. So please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sullivan: "So, three years ago we passed legislation that some people supported and some people did not, but embodied in that legislation we created a task force to study the affects of campaign finance laws to see what happened, where they went, should there be any recommendations and so

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

forth. I believe that was one of your ideas. Can you tell me has this met... this task force met and discussed this specific provision in regard to the caps? Did they make any recommendations?"

Currie: "Yeah, we... but we did... we did begin a discussion, but we did not finish the discussion and the task force is not going to meet until after the scheduled end of this Legislative Session. And whatever the recommendation of the task force it seems to be clear that we ought not to go into November elections with people with their hands tied behind their backs, defenseless in case a political expenditure committee, a Super PAC, uncoordinated with the candidate, nevertheless, throws a \$1 million into a race and leaves the... the unbenefited candidates no way to defend themselves."

Sullivan: "The other point that I wanted to bring up, you have this provision in regard to having associations, unions and so forth document \$500..."

Currie: "Right. And that came from..."

Sullivan: "...of contributions or above."

Currie: "...the business community."

Sullivan: "Certainly."

Currie: "They were concerned that..."

Sullivan: "Why... why would... so how would this affect teacher unions so... or nurses associations? You have a nurse that takes \$30 out of their paycheck, so in a quarter there might be, you know, \$180. That's not going to affect them so we're not going to look at that."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Currie: "Not going to affect them, and in fact, I think it won't affect most associations, most dues payments are well below the \$500 cap."
- Sullivan: "If... if the idea is to have more reporting and have more transparency, why would we not include those and just say all of those types of contributions?"
- Currie: "Well, since people are joining these organizations for reasons other than contributing to a political action committee I think that there was a general view that we don't need to... we don't need to make labor groups or corporate groups disclose their individual members."

Sullivan: "Okay."

- Currie: "Disclose the names of their individual members. But if they're contributing significant sums and that entity is making campaign contributions, then this will increase the accountability and the transparency of the system."
- Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've brought up a couple of different issues. One is, some of my colleagues talked about statistics on how many people vote. Four years ago in Western Illinois University, 800 people voted. Two years ago, less than 125 voted. What is the return on investment of those votes? This is a tremendously burdensome idea to pass this on and especially if we're going to do it statewide, but not the City of Chicago. Secondly, we have a group... a task force that is supposed to recommend ideas. This idea has not even gone through that task force; they haven't recommended anything. So, why are we backing away from what we wanted to do three years ago and all of the sudden say, well we'll just change

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

election law willy-nilly without being well-thought-out, without being vetted. So, my question to you on that side of the aisle is, what's next? What changes in election law are you willing to vote for next? Because there will be more when it doesn't help with what you want to do. So, before you vote just ask that question, what do you want to vote for next? And Ladies and Gentlemen... or Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify this vote."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Mathias."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie yields."

Mathias: "Leader Currie, hello."

Currie: "Hi."

Mathias: "I... I listened with interest to some of your remarks regarding fairness and level playing fields and as somebody mentioned, I wasn't sure if it was you or another speaker, about a million dollars by one person and how do you defend that. Does this Bill in any way affect the amounts that political Parties can give to candidates?"

Currie: "Political Parties are already limited in Primary Elections, it does not deal... there's nothing in this Bill that deals with political Parties and limits in General Elections."

Mathias: "So... but this Bill does apply to General Elections also, right?"

Currie: "Yeah, it does."

Mathias: "So..."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "But... but specifically what this Bill does is to say that if there is a Super PAC backing a candidate to the tune of 100 thousand in a local or state race, 250 thousand in a statewide race then for the candidates in that contest there will be no contributions caps because we cannot... we thought we had, we'd said, in the Bill that we adopted three years ago, we said these independent political expenditure campaign committees, these Super PACs, they must abide by our contribution limits. That's what we thought the law was. And then the courts came along and they said, no, you may not apply your contribution limits to them."

Mathias: "So... so, do you think it's fair if you have on one hand a political Party that gives a candidate \$100 thousand and then you have on the other hand a Super PAC that gives another candidate \$100 thousand that, because of what the Super PAC did, we are now going to say you don't have limits. But what the political Party did we'll say, well, you still will have the same limits. So, if a political Party gave the million dollars and the Super PAC wanted to match that now the bets are off. But yet it... to me it seems unfair..."

Currie: "Well, except..."

Mathias: "...that if one Party can do it that not everybody should have their limits taken off."

Currie: "It... it may be unfair to a Libertarian Party or some other not mainstream political organization, but the Republican Party can give a million dollars in that contest to the Republican nominee and the Democratic Party can give

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

a million dollars to the Democratic nominee in that same contest. So, I don't think that there is a discrepancy at all. What you can't do is when there is a... a Super PAC, we can't control what they give and I think it would be wrong to say that the candidates that are not benefiting from the Super PAC have to run with arms tied behind their backs, have to be defenseless in the face of major money. I'm... I'm not a great fan of major money in politics, but I cannot control the contributions that are given to Super PACs. The courts said we cannot. I think we have to respond to make sure that they don't run roughshod over our democracy. But they're not the ones that are calling the tunes and determining the outcomes in race after race across the State of Illinois."

Mathias: "I appreciate your comments; however, I would apply those same poli... same comments to political Parties. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, are you trying to codify the personal PAC court decision?"

Currie: "I'm trying to respond to the result of the personal PAC decision, yes. I'm saying if personal PAC or any other Super PAC can spend without contribution limits, as long as they're not coordinating with the candidate, then the other people in that race if it... if they're spending as much as 100 thousand for state and local, as much as 250 thousand

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

at statewide then contribution caps would not apply in that contest."

Mulligan: "So, what would you consider Super PACs, personal PAC, women's campaign fund..."

Currie: "Personal PAC..."

Mulligan: "...Brady PAC?"

Currie: "And... well, the question always is, is there coordination between the Super PAC and the candidate they are helping? And the law is that they can only avoid the caps if they do not coordinate. And it may be difficult to prove whether or not there is coordination, but in this Bill we give any candidate or the state's attorney or the Attorney General the chance to go to court if there is evidence of collusion. Because as soon as there's evidence of collusion then it isn't a Super PAC that is exempt from the campaign contribution limit."

Mulligan: "So, what about IEA and IFT? Where do you... where do they fit into this plan?"

Currie: "Well, unless they wanted to define themselves as... as independent political expenditure committees, then they would be bound by the same caps that apply to all of us."

Mulligan: "Well, not under..."

Currie: "So, as far as I know they have not tried to take that stand."

Mulligan: "Because if they're not under IEA and IFT they go under their campaign fund name?"

Currie: "And they generally make contributions to candidates rather than setting up their own apparatus."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Mulligan: "What about someone like Gingrich, Newt Gingrich, who has a fund..."

Currie: "He had a... right."

Mulligan: "...that he has contributed to and now he's not running for President. He could make contributions, could he not?"

Currie: "He... he had a Super PAC working hard for him, so did Mr. Romney, so, I believe, did Mr. Santorum. And those were all... they... they ran their own committees to help these individual candidates. So, IEA and IFT contribute to candidate campaigns, they would apply... the contribution limits would apply to them."

Mulligan: "What about PACs or individual groups? We've had it where teachers... I belonged to a group, when Mary Jo Arndt was alive, where we bundled checks. So, we all wrote a check to her particular campaign group and then that campaign group put money out. What happens when you bundle checks? Are those people..."

Currie: "They would be subject to contribution limits unless they were contributing to a Super PAC."

Mulligan: "All right. So, that would not be considered a Super PAC because they're just bundling?"

Currie: "Right."

Mulligan: "What if... doesn't this... isn't this law a big hindrance to Independents and challengers because they're not, as Representative Reboletti mentioned, they're not the... they do not get the largess of the Democrat or Republican Leadership. They're on their own. And challengers sometimes are preferable, particularly in times like this, to the voters. So, they're on their own without

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

the backing of that. How does that impact or don't you think it impacts negatively on Independents?"

Currie: "Well, I would say an Independent challenger would desperately need the provision in this Bill that would lift the contribution cap in the event that a Super PAC is supporting an opponent. That individual's already going to have trouble raising money, but if you apply the contribution caps, that individual could not go to some particularly wealthy friends and ask them to fill in the blank."

Mulligan: "What about a philanthropist who gives a huge sum of money to one of the large PACs?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, say again?"

Mulligan: "What about a philanthropist who makes individual..."

Currie: "Yeah."

Mulligan: "...contributions to a wealthy PAC?"

Currie: "Under... well, if they're... they can make unlimited contributions to those Super PACs that are not coordinated with candidates. They can give as much as they like. If they are giving to individual candidates or to a political Party, they are subject to the contribution caps. And so they can't spend their fortune on Representative Mulligan's contest for State Rep in Des Plaines."

Mulligan: "So, wouldn't that be a way to get around it if you say, such and such PAC is a big supporter of mine, instead of giving the money to me, why don't you give them half a million dollars that they can divide up?"

Currie: "And if you... if you do that, then you are coordinating with them and then they no longer will be defined as an

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

independent political expenditure committee. The whole basis of the Supreme Court rulings has been that there is not coordination between the candidate and the Super PAC. So, as soon as you say to people give money to the Super PAC that is evidence of collusion and coordination and if the state's attorney or the Attorney General or another candidate in that campaign has access to that information, this Bill will give them the tools they need to go to court and stop that phony Super PAC in action."

Mulligan: "What happens..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan, your time has expired.

Will you bring your comments to a close?"

Mulligan: I have one last question. What happens to an individual such as myself if I'm not running and I choose to be a board member of say the Brady PAC and go out then and solicit funds for the Brady PAC to back candidates? Am I then absolved of anything because I'm no longer a candidate and I'm not running, I'm an individual?"

Currie: "Yes."

Mulligan: "So, I would be able to do that if I wanted to."

Currie: "Yes you would."

Mulligan: "All right. Thank you."

Currie: "And I hope you will."

Mulligan: "I am. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Rose: "Representative, we tried the student voting piece a few years ago at Eastern Illinois University. Do you have any

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

idea how many students there are at Eastern Illinois University, Leader Currie?"

Currie: "No, I don't. And I don't know how many faculty and staff are there either."

Rose: "Well, we're going to talk about that too. But do you have any idea how many students there are at Eastern Illinois University?"

Currie: "I don't, but I'm sure you'll tell me."

Rose: "There are 11,000... there are 11,000... yeah, I am. There's 11,200. Do you know how many them availed themselves of this ability?"

Currie: "Yeah, you guys fell to the bottom of the pack. Eastern was the lowest in terms of response. Yeah."

Rose: "It was 25, Representative."

Currie: "Yeah. Yeah."

Rose: "Twenty-five out of 11,000 students voted, seventy-five total, the other 50 were faculty and staff. Let's put that in perspective. For the faculty and staff, that's less than one-tenth of one percent or one one-thousandth of the citizens of Coles County. For the student population, it's less than two-tenths of one percent or two-thousandths of the student population. Do you know how much that cost the citizens of Coles County to do that, Leader Currie?"

Currie: "No."

Rose: "It cost them \$205 per citizen to vote or \$615 per a student to vote. Does that seem a little silly?"

Currie: "I'm not sure why Eastern had such a very sad experience compared..."

Rose: "Well, let me tell you... let me suggest why."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "...to other... other public universities."

Rose: "I'm glad you asked that, here's why. Because on Election Day the voting place is in the dorm. They can get out of bed, not even take a shower and go vote in the dorm. Or if there's student housing, then they can go to the courthouse which by the way... Representative Currie, let me ask you this question. Do you know how far the current early voting station is from Old Main at Eastern Illinois University?"

Currie: "I do not."

Rose: "It's less than a mile."

Currie: "Well, maybe... maybe they should..."

Rose: "And student housing..."

Currie: "...close that one and open the one at the university if it's only less than a mile."

Rose: "...it's open. It's open. The courthouse is open. It's always been open, Leader Currie. And all the way between Old Main on campus and the courthouse is student housing. In many respects, it's actually shorter for a student to walk to the courthouse to vote than it is for the student to walk to campus. There's a big... 4th and Polk in my district, I grew up not too far away. Fourth and Polk is equal distant from the courthouse so they can vote and a student campus where they can vote. But here's my question and this is a simple question. Why should the taxpayers of Coles County pay for something that we're telling them they have to do so that only 25 people, students, 75 total avail themselves of that, Representative?"

Currie: "As one of my colleagues just reminded me, you cannot put a price tag on liberty and democracy."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Rose: "And Leader Currie... Leader Currie... so talk about that price tag. They've already got the voting booth open in the courthouse. It's faster for a student to walk to the courthouse than it is the campus. Why are you doing it twice? Okay. So, let's say that, you just made a very good point... cheaper, right? So, let me ask you this Leader Currie. My constituents in Oakland, Illinois, that are half an hour from this polling place, you didn't put a polling place in their district, in their area, did you? Oakland, it's a little town along Route 133. It's still in Illinois."
- Currie: "They don't happen to have a public university, so this provision would not apply to them."
- Rose: "Exactly. So, why are we treating the university campus differently than the citizens of Oakland? Because as you just said, you can't put a price on democracy. So, why should my constituents in Oakland not be treated... I believe you're a constitutional scholar, someone told me once, Leader Currie. Under the Equal Protection Clause, United States Constitution, why are you saying that students are more important than the citizens of Oakland, Illinois?"
- Currie: "Well, I would encourage you to work with your county clerk to see if the county clerk..."
- Rose: "My county clerk hates this Bill."
- Currie: "...will not... will not offer early voting in Oakland.

 That would be the solution."
- Rose: "My county... because Leader, she has an early voting center for everyone... everyone. It's at the courthouse. The students... if you live at Fourth and Polk, it's just as easy

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

to walk to the courthouse than it is to walk to campus. But again, why should the citizens of Coles County pay \$615.94 for this when they've already got one down the street? Less than a mile, MapQuest, .94 mile, 94 hundredths of a mile. Why should they do that?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose, your time has expired. Can you complete your remarks?"

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, again, the University of Illinois campus hasn't done this and it makes some degree of sense they work cooperatively with the county clerk on the University of Illinois campus. The Coles County Clerk, which is Eastern... and listen, you all took me out of Eastern, my hometown. So, hey, that's okay, that's life. Took me out of Charleston, but I grew up there. I can walk just as easily to vote at the courthouse than I can at EIU and not waste the property taxpayer's money."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "I yield my time to Mr. Rose."

Speaker Lang: "I believe Mr. Rose has completed his remarks.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want to read a statement from a group called, Change Illinois, the coalition for honest and new government ethics. They're the ones who... were the major force... by the... with the 2009 Campaign Finance Reform. Keep limits on campaign contributions. Have you forgotten about the crimes of Rod Blagojevich and George Ryan? Have you forgotten how large campaign contributions to politicians made Illinois a national laughing stock? Have you forgotten that the quest

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

for big contributions resulted in corruption that raised the cost of government? It costs... you're paying in higher taxes and lost services. No, of course, you have not forgotten. But some Legislators are hoping that you won't notice if the last moment they pass a Bill to put a big gaping hole in the state's new Campaign Contributions Limits Law. Yes, the very law that you and other members of Change Illinois worked so hard to pass in 2009. If Senate Bill 3722 becomes law, there'll be no limits in some of the most highly contested elections. And yes, that includes campaigns for Governor. Remember what happened when Rod Blagojevich and George Ryan solicited massive contributions? Of course you do. That's Change Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, the ink is barely dry on the 2009 law from the last... with that last campaign finance relaw ... campaign finance law. Do not vote blindly on this. This is a bad law and a bad idea. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, I just have one question before I make a few remarks. Does this broad reaching education or... excuse me... election reform Bill include photo IDs for voters when they go into vote?"

Currie: "No."

Reis: "I specifically heard you just say, we cannot put a price on liberty and democracy. Don't we want to make sure that the person that's showing up to vote is actually that person?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "Representative, you're welcome to introduce that legislation. That..."

Reis: "I have a hundred times."

Currie: "...that is not in this Bill."

Reis: "We would love to have that part of your Bill. But to my question, don't we want to know that the person that votes... that shows up to vote is that person?"

Currie: "Evidence... evidence of that kind of voter fraud is... is minimal, if there is any at all. And I know in the Indiana lawsuit... in the Indiana lawsuit there was virtually no evidence of fraud based on... on the person not being the person who was registered to vote."

Reis: "And all we would do if we had that provision is to make sure that truly was the case. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a hastily brought forth... part of this Bill is a hastily brought forth Amendment that comes on the heels of the personal PAC court case. But this only applied to individual contributions. This goes way beyond that and includes the Super PACs. We all know what's going on here, we saw this Bill get jammed through on a partisan basis in committee. Everyone on that side of the aisle is going to blindly vote for this Bill. We don't benefit from Super PACs as a Democratic Caucus, so let's... let's try to limit them. The Majority Leader said we don't want to go into the election with our hands tied behind our back. When she said we, she means the Democratic Party. We know that college towns tend to vote Democratic. As Representative Rose said, only a few people voted at Eastern. How do we make it better? Well, let's have voting on Saturdays where they can

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

walk in and register a vote on Saturday, vote on Saturday, not even get verified if they voted back home. Let's try to drive those numbers up in our college towns. Let's make this narrowly focused so that we can only get those people that tend to vote Democratic out to vote. Doesn't include photo IDs. I've sat on the Election Committee several years and I've watched Bill after Bill after Bill go through. We should call this the Democratic Incumbency Protection Bill; we should call it what it is. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "The last speaker will be Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie yields."

Zalewski: "Leader, between the discussions of Newt Gingrich and EIU shower habits I must have missed a couple of things.

Don't we already have an exemption in the law for millionaires who parachute into races?"

Currie: "We have. And it's identical to the provision here with respect to Super PACs."

Zalewski: "What's... compare what we're doing in this particular piece of legislation to the exemption that we did a couple of years ago that I believe got bipartisan support when it comes to removing the caps on contributions?"

Currie: "It did, Representative. And what that provision says is that if a self-funded candidate, a millionaire type candidate, spends as much as 250 thousand on his or her race for a statewide office or 100 thousand dollars for his or her race for a state or local office, then caps are off. Contribution caps do not apply to the other candidates in those races. And that's all that this Bill says with

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

respect to a Super PAC. If a Super PAC, uncoordinated with the candidate, is spending as much as 250 thousand dollars in a statewide race, 100 thousand in a state or a local race, then the candidates in that race cannot be subject to contribution caps."

Zalewski: "And is it... am I mistaken or didn't the... the <u>Chicago</u>

<u>Tribune</u> editorial, no fewer than a few days ago, state that
the caps, given the current circumstances and the ability
for an independent Super PAC to parachute into a race, it
might make sense for the Body to act and do this exemption,
maybe I'm wrong?"

Currie: "I think that's accurate."

Zalewski: "So, to the Bill, Representative... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I've heard we need a task force, I've heard we need to study the issue more and I've heard about Newt Gingrich. A Federal Court has ruled that an independent Super PAC can parachute into our elections undisclosed with unfettered access to the ability to persuade voters. And when we put a Bill on the board that allows us to fight fire with fire, the answer's no. It's ridiculous and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan, you spoke in debate. For what reason do you rise, Sir? Mr. Reboletti, you spoke in debate. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Reboletti: "My name was used in debate. Mr. Speaker, my name and my university was used in debate. I'd like to respond."

Speaker Lang: "Wait... wait... wait... Who mentioned your name in debate, Sir?"

Reboletti: "Representative Sacia did."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed. Good work, Sir."

"Mr. Speaker, I'm looking here at some newspapers Reboletti: within the last couple of weeks as to what they have to say. The Moline Dispatch and the Rock Island Argus say that this measure should be vetted for the very purpose of what we're trying to do, to slow this issue down and do it right. The State Journal-Register, just a few days ago, we agree with the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform that entry of the Super PAC in the state election need not signal an automatic forfeiture of a contribution limit that barely has been tested. And the Sun-Times, not of the most conservative of newspapers, said we join several good government groups who say a proposal to lift donation limits in some campaigns is hasty and premature, should be tabled now. And with respect to the previous speaker talking about Newt Gingrich or the Supreme Court case, the Supreme Court talked about independent expenditures of when people could jump into a campaign. This Bill does not deal with that issue. So, the Supreme Court case is inapplicable in this legislation. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. In this measure there are several provisions that will let us know who those Super PACs are and where they're getting their money from. Without passage of Senate Bill 3722 we won't even have a clue, we will have no idea who hit us. There are disclosure and reporting requirements in this Bill. Without this Bill, Super PACs could come to Illinois and wreak real havoc on the countryside. Let me say this, there

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

are people that would prefer a different political landscape, I would count myself among them. But ideal in the political reality and the political reality in Illinois today is that a Super PAC, an independent campaign expenditure committee uncoordinated with a candidate is not subject to contribution caps. I like the phrase, 'fight fire with fire'. I do not believe that any candidate should be defenseless against the Super PAC that comes along and wants to destroy him or her in an electoral campaign. I do not want to turn our democracy over to the big money. And the only way we can avoid that, the only way we can stop it is to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 3722."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the passage of Senate Bill 3722. There is a request for a verification by Mr. Sullivan. Accordingly, Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis? Please take the record. On this question there are 63 voting 'yes', and 55 voting 'no'. And Mr. Sullivan has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative."

Clerk Bolin: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
Acevedo; Arroyo; Beiser; Berrios; Biss; Bradley; Burke, D.;
Burke, K.; Carli; Cassidy; Chapa LaVia; Costello; Crespo;
Cunningham; Currie; D'Amico; Davis, M.; Davis, W.; du
Buclet; Dugan; Dunkin; Evans, M.; Farnham; Feigenholtz;
Flowers; Ford; Franks; Gabel; Golar; Gordon; Harris, G.;
Hernandez; Howard; Jackson; Jakobsson; Jefferson; Jones;
Krezwick; Lang; Lilly; Lyons; Mautino; May; Mayfield;

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

McAsey; Mell; Mussman; Nekritz; Penny; Phelps; Riley; Rita; Sente; Smith; Soto; Thapedi; Turner; Verschoore; Walsh; Williams; Yarbrough; Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Costello"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello in the chamber? He's in his chair."

Sullivan: "Bradley."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley's in his chair."

Sullivan: "Sente."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente's in her chair. Do you want pictures of the Members, Sir?"

Sullivan: "Just reading off a list here. Franks."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks is in his chair on the telephone."

Sullivan: "Mussman."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mussman is in her chair waving."

Sullivan: "Mautino."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino's in the front of the chamber also waving. Everybody wave to Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Feigenholtz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz is in the front of the chamber."

Sullivan: "Thank you. That's all."

Speaker Lang: "On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes' and 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We request an immediate Republican Caucus, please."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "And do I understand it will be limited to one hour, Sir?"
- Bost: "Yeah, about that... something like that."
- Speaker Lang: "House will stand in recess 'til the hour of 2 p.m. Ladies and Gentlemen... Ladies and Gentlemen, before we recess there is an announcement... a committee announcement by the Clerk. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, the House will stand in recess 'til the hour of 2 p.m. The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: approved for consideration, referred to the Order of Concurrence is House Bill 1577."
- Speaker Lang: "Returning to the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, on page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 2761, Mr. Jackson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2761, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson."
- Jackson: "Senate Bill 2761 makes two changes concerning public-private venture leasings. Number 1, it continues a special value... valuation procedures for the Great Lakes Naval Base in Chicago. And number 2, it expands the application of the special valuation procedures to rental housing units to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

include Scott Air Force Base and they're retroactive to 206. I would entertain any questions and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

There being no debate, those in favor vote 'yes'... just for the record, Mr. Sullivan, I was into my comments before you hit your button, but I'll allow you to speak. Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Representative... or I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, we just got on the floor. And this is a Bill that is highly controversial as everybody in this floor knows it is. And so, for us to run this through so quickly before we get anybody... I was here trying to look around on this... people that we know that are speaking on this. So, it doesn't, you know... I guess I understand what the last two days is all about and that's what it is. And thank you for taking my time to speak."

Speaker Lang: "That's it? Nothing on the Bill? Mr. Evans."

Evans, P.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Evans, P.: "I rise in support of this Bill. This is of great local importance to our local school district. This is a housing situation on a military base identical to that at Great Lakes Naval Station. Although we have radically different tax treatment, it will be devastating to our local school districts. In the interest of fairness, I encourage all to vote 'aye' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Reboletti: "Representative, I'm not familiar with what a PPV lease is. Could you explain that?"
- Jackson: "A PPV lease is a public-private venture lease. This is something that was done in Senate Bill 702 where a public property... or public land is leased to a private person and because of that, they've come up with this PPV lease where they can be taxed."
- Reboletti: "How does this benefit... I see the Mascoutah schools are for it. How does that benefit them directly?"
- Jackson: "They... they... it benefits the Mascoutah School District as well as St. Clair County taxing bodies because now those taxing bodies can tax the leaseholder."
- Reboletti: "And I see, according to our analysis, says the Scott Air Force Base properties are opposed? Does... does this take care of their opposition? Is it... are they still opposed?"
- Jackson: "The property... the one you see that is opposed to it is the property owner of the business. It's not Scott Air Force Base."
- Reboletti: "And... and why is he opposed?"
- Jackson: "Because they're going to be paying taxes. But let me add though, they'll be paying taxes, but when they picked up the Request For Proposal to do the proposal, in the proposal it was stated that they should assume taxes will be paid and their proposal should reflect the numbers."
- Reboletti: "What is the amount that the property tax... property taxes will be for those properties, do you know?"
- Jackson: "I don't ... I don't have that information."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Rosenthal: "Do you know how many students are impacted by this, Representative?"

Jackson: "It would be all of the students in the Scott Air

Force Base as well as that district itself."

Rosenthal: "Do you know how many?"

Jackson: "I don't know... I don't have the exact number."

Rosenthal: "Do you... do you know what the impact fee is that the Federal Government gives Mascoutah schools?"

Jackson: "No."

Rosenthal: "Well, let me... let me give you a couple of numbers.

There's 424 students that are impacted that... on Scott Air

Force Base. And the impact fee that the Federal Government

pays is \$10,491,946, which is \$24,208 per student. Is that

true?"

Jackson: "I don't... I think you're looking into the individual students to stay on the property that... that would develop that, not all of these students of the Scott Air Force Base."

Rosenthal: "I think that's all the students. The other question I have is, would these taxes be just strictly for schools?"

Jackson: "Go right ahead, I'm listening."

Rosenthal: "I said, would these taxes be strictly for the schools?"

Jackson: "Yeah. Yes."

Rosenthal: "How about..."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Jackson: "The taxes themself..."

Rosenthal: "...the property taxes?"

Jackson: "No, it would not. It would be those taxing bodies within St. Clair County."

Rosenthal: "Well how about the... the property that you're talking about, being in concern, if I'm not mistaken is on federal land, part of it and part of it's private land and they pay taxes on the private land. But what's on federal land the police, the fire, the EMS, the water and the sanitary sewer all those services are provided by Scott Air Force Base and the military. Is that correct?"

Jackson: "That's correct."

Rosenthal: "And we'd be paying additional taxes on those to the local bodies?"

Jackson: "Well, no, you would not be paying for additional taxes. Let me add now that, yes, they do pay an impact aid to the district as well, but that impact aid does not take into consideration capital development. Mascoutah has built a brand new school. That impact aid cannot be used for capital development."

Rosenthal: "Yeah. Well, they... they also have more students now...

more impact fee and less students than what they had

previously. Thank you. That's all I have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Sullivan."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe you're truly the war time councilary and you missed me a little too quick, I

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

did have something to say, but thank you. Will the Speaker yield? Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, we're here today because there was a ruling before the Illinois Department of Revenue, was there not?"

Jackson: "Yes, that's been a ruling."

Sullivan: "What was that ruling before the Department of Revenue?"

Jackson: "That the company did not have to pay taxes."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, the company did not have to pay taxes for what reason?"

Jackson: "They... they... they did not have to pay taxes because they were not a part... they was ruled... they were ruled that there was a license as opposed to a leaseholder."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, the Department of Revenue... our Department of Revenue has already ruled that this is a license therefore not subject to property taxation. Are there ever... any other licenses similar to this on the Air Force base that you're speaking of?"

Jackson: "No."

Sullivan: "There are actually two more. There is a credit union that has a license to operate on the Air Force base that does not pay property taxes. There is also a commissary that operates on this Navy base that is also a license and does not pay property taxes. Do you know how many other states have this similar language throughout the country?

Or I mean, how many other projects throughout the country?"

Jackson: "I'm not for sure about the number of..."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Sullivan: "Okay."

Jackson: "...around the country, but I know..."

Sullivan: "Well..."

Jackson: "...that we do have one at Great Lakes Naval Base."

Sullivan: "Certainly. The Great Lakes Naval Base up near me, where they agreed going into the project that they would come up with a way to pay property taxes. Currently, there are 50 of these type of arrangements throughout the states, 37 are not taxed, 5 have pilot programs and 3 are under litigation. So, the overwhelming majority of these projects do not pay property taxes as it is. There is a management fee that's... takes place, so the payment that goes on. Can you explain that or do you have an idea how that works?"

Jackson: "The management fee, there's a lockbox and in that lockbox I think they're supposed to be placing dollars in there for maintenance of the facility as well as other things in terms about a lockbox. I'll have to go and read them to you."

Sullivan: "So, it's my understanding that 20 percent of the...
the overall money that's generated by the project goes to
the company for their licensing... their license, so it's a
management fee. And then 80 percent covers roads, all the
other maintenance type things, upkeep of the buildings,
renovation of new buildings. Is that correct?"

Jackson: "I can't dispute what you're saying."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, here we go once again interjecting the General Assembly into a court case. The Department of Revenue has already ruled that this is a license, not subject to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

taxation, although the county has already decided they're going to tax it anyways. Our own Attorney General is going to have to sit and defend the Department of Revenue in a Circuit Court case that the county has already brought up. So, why do we want to do that once again? This is also going beyond taxation. They're... they're taxing at a certain level, this increases the property taxes. So, by doing that, right now, this company, their 20 percent management fee is being eaten up because they have to pay the property taxes. And you might not care about a company and their profit level and that's fine, but by increasing the amount of property taxes under this new legislation you now cut into that other 80 percent. And as we just heard, what does that other 80 percent do? It's for the airmen on the base. It's for their services that are provided under the dollars that are generated by this project. It's for the upkeep of the buildings that these airmen are staying in. It's for the building of new buildings to house more of our airmen. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you want to hurt the airmen by taxing more of these properties go ahead and vote for this Bill. If you want to interject the General Assembly in another court case, go right ahead, but that's what this Bill does. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Penny."

Penny: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill. When this project was proposed I was a member of the St. Clair County Zoning Board of Appeals and we heard the testimony of this very issue. This issue was partly on the military base; it's partly on private property. Our board

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

was given the task of considering the case of rezoning the agricultural property for a special use permit. When we heard this case, the applicants testified under oath before our committee. They testified that they needed the county rezoning to make this economically viable, to make it large enough in scale to work. I was a municipal official at the time, so I inquired at several different points whether or not this whole project would become tax-exempt property taking our tax assessable farm field and making nontaxable. We were repeatedly assured by the applicants that this entire project would be taxable and included in the county's EAV. The board that I was on was a bipartisan board made up of Republicans and Democrats. All of us were very sensitive to this issue because this project affected local school district, our local junior district, traffic patterns in the area would be increased. Also, in my area and Representative Jackson's area storm water drainage and flash flooding going into our local tributaries was also an issue. We would never have approved this project if we would have thought for a moment that it would be a few years later that we would be arguing for us to get our fair share of property taxes. The construction company and the management company knew going into this taxes would be due because he had agreed to that as part of the RFP. So, any taxes abated by this Body right now is going to go into the pocket of the management company. They were aware of this going in and they budgeted for it. I would like to thank Representative Paul Evans and also Representative Jackson for bringing this Bill to us on

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

behalf of the people of St. Clair County. And I would ask you to do the right thing, which is to make the developer uphold his original agreement and vote 'yes' for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I wanted to underscore a comment by the previous speaker. He tells us that in the Request For Proposals from the government to the developers of this project there was language that made it absolutely clear that the winning bidder would expect to have to pay property taxes. It said so right in the Request For Proposal. We have another example of legislation like this in a situation very similar in the Great Lakes area. And the developer there has not fought the idea that property taxes would be due and in fact, this legislation is modeled on legislation we put into effect for that Great Lakes housing development. So, for the developer Representative Jackson's area suddenly to come forward and begin fighting the idea that they owe property taxes doesn't make any sense at all. And I think it's incumbent upon us to correct the record, to fix the problem and to vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 2761."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Watson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, my only question is, when the original project was started it was my understanding that the company decided or said that they would pay property tax on the 30 percent in the private... that was privately owned

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

and... and that it was the assumption, given assumption, that they wouldn't pay on the other 70 percent. Do you have a comment on that?"

Jackson: "I couldn't speak clearly and say that you're incorrect, but I know that when they picked up the Request For Proposal, it stated that they were going to pay taxes on the project itself."

Watson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson to close."

Jackson: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 2761 is identical to Senate Bill 702, which... which started the Great Lakes Naval Base PPV. The only difference is that in this legislation instead of being naval, I'm mentioning... change it to military. Instead... and it also is making it permanent and making the fees retroactive to include the dollars that HUD have already paid St. Clair County and Mascoutah school district to the tune of 10 million. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Cross. Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar, under... under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2443, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2443, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

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

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2443, I move that we adopt Amendment #2."

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

Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. And no Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2443, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Illinois House of Representatives Higher Ed Appropriations Committee meet all throughout this Session and we had a very interesting and harmonious, sometimes debate of discussion, and yet we came up with a budget that speaks to House Joint Resolution 69. It's a responsible budget. And I would ask my colleagues, all of my colleagues, for an 'aye' vote."

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

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Pritchard: "Mr. Dunkin, I know the committee dealt with a lot of tough issues like most of the appropriation committees.

 Can you highlight some of the reductions in this Bill?"
- Dunkin: "Sure. There are a number of reductions, if you look at the analysis. In the General Revenue Fund, we reduced the base operating grant for the Illinois Board of Higher Education, we reduced some of the equalization grants. The equalization grant was at \$1.5 million, the base operating grant was \$7.539 million in general revenue. We also reduced the City Colleges of Chicago grant by \$921 thousand. We reduced the Illinois Veterans Grant by \$6.511 million as well, to name a few."
- Pritchard: "The Monetary Assistance Program was also reduced. I know we had a Bill on this yesterday that dealt with communication with recipients, but can you highlight how much this was reduced?"
- Dunkin: "We reduced the Monetary Award moneys by roughly \$15 million."
- Pritchard: "And that was a very tough call. I know in the debate on the committee that we understand we're making higher ed less cost effective and that's one of our public agendas, is to try to make higher education more affordable for families. So, this really is headed in the wrong direction. I hope that in some of the action we take and other proposals that had been put forward before this Legislative Body, that we can make some changes to improve the business climate in this state that would help increase economic activity, create jobs and generate normal tax

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

revenue that can be used for important things like higher education. I would ask for your support in this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm looking at this performance based measures and I was wondering why the University of Illinois is at -6.03 percent while the rest of the universities are at -6.14 percent?"

Dunkin: "Representative, the Illinois Board of Higher Education came up with a formula and every single university was impacted. The University of Illinois as you know has three major campuses: one in Chicago, one in Champaign and here in Springfield. And so, it was across the board reduction or performance based review that we had been talking about both in the House and the Senate on the Republican end... the House side for the last three years. And we used the 2009 data to come up with a number, which is where we are right now."

Reboletti: "Was there some type of transfer of funds regarding some geological surveys? Is that... does that explain some of the difference?"

Dunkin: "It... it's in the Bill as a... as a distinct line item."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Thank you. Mr. Dunkin, with respect to the Grow Your Own Program what is the status at this point?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Dunkin: "The status is, it's in the budget."

Thapedi: "At what dollar amount?"

Dunkin: "At roughly \$500 thousand."

Thapedi: "What was the initial dollar amount?"

Dunkin: "Well, the previous dollar amounts were from 3 million to... 2 thou... 2 million .5."

Thapedi: "And... and was it necessary to cure it out those extra dollars or..."

Dunkin: "That's what the committee came up with and agreed on."

Thapedi: "Do you know why? What the theory was?"

Dunkin: "Yeah. There was... there were a number of reasons from both Members on our side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle as relates to some of the return on investment outcomes."

Thapedi: "I know, but what do you mean by that, return on investment and outcomes?"

Dunkin: "Well, since 2006 we gave them roughly over \$19 million and at the time of our discussion on this budget there was roughly 50-some odd voters... excuse me, graduates of college."

Thapedi: "Okay. And... and where did you get that information from?"

Dunkin: "Received that from the organization, Grow Your Own."

Thapedi: "Okay. So, Grow Your Own actually gave you data that delineated how successful the program was, and as a result of your findings, you found it necessary because of the financial strengths that the State of Illinois is in that you... it was appropriate for you to make the corresponding cuts. Is that correct?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Dunkin: "Well, the Illinois Board of Higher Education gave us the data on most of everything that I'm talking about with some of the ancillary programs such as this program. And we had Members on our side of the aisle, Democrats, Members on the Republican side of the aisle who felt stronger than I did. I advocated for them last year as I did this year as well. And every university, every agency, every program, special program or not, was impacted."

Thapedi: "Understood. Thank you."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a bipartisan Bill that we worked on since January. It was ... there was a very strong and active cooperative spirit. I have the utmost respect for my Republican counterpart, Minority Spokesperson Chapin Rose. I'd like to take my hat off to him with his cooperation. With us working together, we were very straightforward with one another as it relates to the reality of our fiscal conditions. We're not proud of cutting anyone as us politicians love to... to try to be as supportive as we possibly can. So, I would encourage all of my colleagues for an 'aye' vote. And again, I'd like to thank my Republican colleagues as well as my Democratic colleagues and particularly, the staff person who really held my hand and many others, Mr. Mark Jarmer. Thank you, thank you, thank you, Sir. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Arroyo. Mr. Arroyo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes' and 55 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Rose: "I want to take a moment to thank Chairman Dunkin for the comments he just made and also return them in-kind. Up and to the last 24 hours for events above everyone's... above everyone's level, the chairman worked very well. And I want to compliment him on that and... and the time he's put in as well as Mr. Jarmer and Mr. Tietz from our staff, a phenomenal job. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Ladies and Gentlemen, please pay attention to the Clerk. There's no handout for the afternoon committees. So, please pay attention to the Clerk. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting at 3:00: Appropriations-General Services meeting in Room D-1, Appropriations-Public Safety in Room C-1, Appropriations-Human Services in Room 413 and the Executive Committee in Room 114. Once again, Approp-General Services in D-1, Approp-Public Safety in C-1, Approp-Human Services in 413 and the Executive in Room 114."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Walsh: "Today I'd like to introduce for the first time down in Springfield, my family, my wife Theresa and my two sons, Joshua and Caleb."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Happy you're here. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now proceed to our 3:00 committees immediately. The House will be in recess 'til the hour of 4 p.m. The House shall be in order. Page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading appears... Withdraw my comments. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2409 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2971. Representative Feigenholtz, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Service reports the following committee action taken on May 30, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 and Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2454. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 2 2378. Representative to Senate Bill and Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2474."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, on page 3 of the Calendar, House Bill 4278. Representative Gordon. Please read the Bill."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4278, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gordon."

- Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4278 provides that the penalty fees paid to the State Board of Education for reinstatement of a lapsed certificate shall be paid to the Teachers Certificate Revolving Fund. This is an initiative of the Regional Office of Education and there is no opposition to this Bill. And I am open for any questions at this moment."
- 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? Record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Berrios, Carli, Evans, Schmitz. Mr. Evans. Please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes, 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2958, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment... no Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes the Majority Leader."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the… the procurement Bill that changes some of the provisions in current law. And this was the product of a work effort among all four caucuses. And except for one item, I think it has the support of the Governor's Office as well. It includes things for example, like exempting artistic and musical performances held at places…"

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, we're going to take this out of the record for a moment."

Currie: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "This hasn't been read into the record. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 38, Senate Bill 3766; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 5078; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 2348, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2958, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2971, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3146 and Floor Amendments #3 and 4 to Senate Bill 3802."

Speaker Lang: "All right. Senate Bill 2958, Mr. Clerk, we'll move back to the Order of Second Reading. Now, on Senate Bill 2958, please read the Bill for a second time."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted in

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. May we adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Lang: "Without objection, those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the measure that was part of the work effort by all four caucuses and the Governor's Office. I think that office objects to one provision in the Bill. But it makes a lot of changes, many of them technical, to the Procurement Code, some are substantive. For example, the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy actually is part of the Board of Higher Education and we would provide them with the same exemption for artistic programs and others that we gave to higher education last year. In addition, the artistic performances at state places, for example, the fairgrounds would also be exempt from the bidding requirements. There are many technical items in the Bill and perhaps it would be best if I were to stop with this short introduction and be available to answer your questions. The State Chamber of Commerce is very happy with the Bill as we did respond to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

some of their concerns about contractors and reporting requirements."

Speaker Lang: "Leader moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the chamber. I had the opportunity to sit in on these negotiation sessions and would just like you to know, as the Leader mentioned, this is a fairly complex Bill of corrections to the Procurement Bill and clarifications; it's some 106 pages long. It... the important thing I think is that there was good give and take in those negotiations and I believe this is a agreed Bill with all four caucuses. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, I'm looking at... it says, it places the IMSA into the definition of higher education. What... what is that?"

Currie: "The Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy is funded through the auspices of the Board of Higher Education rather than elementary and secondary rather than the State Board of Education. And they have many of the same issues that the state universities had. The state universities came to us last year and they said, for example, they do performances in the Krannert Center at the University of Illinois and they did not want to have to bid those performances. They obviously wanted to be in a position to hire somebody to come and make a performance that was

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

relevant to the student body. The Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy had similar issues involving grants that were given to them by corporations or foundations. They didn't want to be subject to the complex bidding requirements when they were being offered a present from an external source. So, by virtue of this language any exemption that we gave to higher education would now apply to ISMA as well."

- Reboletti: "And you spoke about an exemption for higher ed and then the..."
- Currie: "Last year... last year we did that. And that is, as I say included some exemptions for artistic and other performances and again, the oppor... for example, they had to bid out the... if they wanted to subscribe to journals, they had to bid that opportunity. Well, that didn't make a lot of sense for them because what they... they knew what journals they wanted they should just be able to go ahead and subscribe."
- Reboletti: "And I'm looking also at the issue of the written explanation that must be addressed with respect to the Illinois Procurement Bulletin with the state purchasing officer. And it outlines what written explanation must appear if we don't choose the lowest bidder."

Currie: "Right."

- Reboletti: "What... what... if you could just highlight a couple of things that would be included in that explanation?"
- Currie: "Well, I... I should think that the explanation would have to say why they thought that the slightly higher bid actually would be more likely to do the job they requested,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

either they would have more experience or they would have seen them in operation. That the lowest bid, they could argue, really wasn't a responsible bid, that the bidder would not be in a position to perform the contract, so it would be that kind of thing. But the important point here is that giving them the opportunity to avoid the lowest bidder, but at the same time requiring that they tell us why, that there is transparency and accountability in that process seems to me to be a... a good balance between the lowest bidder and getting the job done most efficiently and... and at... at a good price."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you, Sir. Representative Currie, I'm looking in here and I see that there is a mention made of workers' compensation and it appears to be a procurement issue with respect to that. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Just... just a moment. Yeah. Okay, sorry. Would you repeat the question, please?"

Kay: "Yeah. I... I'm looking here and it's talking about workers' compensation procurement of vendors and it has a Bill reference on here. But apparently, we intend to outsource workers' compensation. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Yes. I think this is an initiative of the Speaker and is a direct response to the audit findings that showed that we have both structural and operational problems with the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

current way we organize workers' compensation claims and adjudications."

Kay: "My..."

Currie: "But... but this would only... only cover state employees, it would not cover people in the private sector."

Kay: "No, I understand. Thank you. My question has to do with the actual procurement. I'm curious about the criteria that we're going to develop to use in the actual hiring of a third party administrator or administrators?"

Currie: "So, what we do in the Bill is establish minimal criteria but our hope is that the chief procurement officer in conjunction with Central Management Services would flesh out the minimum requirements and make sure we get a strong proposal that we can... that we can get people to respond to."

Kay: "Not... not to be overly critical, but do you have confidence that Central Management can do that?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, say again?"

Kay: "Do... I don't mean to be overly critical, but do you believe that Central Management has the ability to actually lay out the critical framework we need for the hiring of these third party administrators?"

Currie: "Not only do I hope so, but I'd remind you that the Bill requires them to report to us by the middle of September on the progress they have made."

Kay: "Well..."

Currie: "And if they aren't making the progress that we think they should, we will find ways to… to encourage a better… a better result."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Kay: "Why... why wouldn't we have... we've got an advisory commission now... an advisory... workers' comp advisory commission in place, why wouldn't we use them as the resource with respect to the criteria, if you will, a job description?"

Currie: "Well, I would think that that advisory committee would work closely with the chief procurement officer to see to it that the fleshing out of the criteria that are already in the Bill is appropriate."

Kay: "Okay. To the Bill. I think... I haven't read the entire Bill, but I think that this is a marvelous step in the right direction with respect to procurement to remove this responsibility of the handling of workers' compensation, the processing and maybe even the payment of claims from CMS and move it on to a third party administrator. I applaud this initiative and I... I hope this moves forward. I would certainly support this with my recommendation that we get this done today. Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Leitch: "I, too, am glad to see progress being made on this. We've heard repeated concerns expressed by Healthcare and Family Services and the Department of Human Services specifically about their inability to work with the procurement rules in order to get the technology the state requires. Is there anything in this Bill that would enhance the opportunity of us to get into the 20th century with our technology?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "No. Yeah, unfortunately, we're not able to incorporate that in this Bill."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Franks: "Representative, I'm happy to see the issue with the workers' comp. I'd actually had that hearing in our committee and I met with the director of CMS as well and I think he thinks it's a good idea as well. I think he does. My question though is, I was carrying two Bills for Senator Garrett, Senate Bills 3296 and 3297, which are procurement Bills. And I was hoping that they were included in here because that deals with the identity of ownership for leases?"

Currie: "They were not included in this package."

Franks: "Is there any chance that we could perhaps... we still have a day and a half to move that back and... and get... and get that done? Or on the other hand, let those two Bills out of Rules so we can get those done as well and they're, I think... it was my understanding that this was going to be part of the procurement package and I don't think it's in here."

Currie: "Yeah. We'll... we'll talk to you later. But it's not part of this package but there's always another day and another package for us to consider."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I didn't realize we finally got back to me. First, I would like to thank all the staffs who worked very hard on this measure. It is indeed a very thick Bill and it has many complicated provisions. I especially appreciate Representative Pritchard who managed to be at every single working group meeting. I applaud him for his diligence and I'm certainly grateful to have his support as I hope I will have support from all the Members of this chamber for passage of Senate Bill 2958."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this issue, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2621, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2621, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. A pension state debt, state mandates, balanced budget, Home Rule and other notes have been requested but not filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold the Bill on the Order of Second Reading. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 3881, Representative Marcus Evans. Please proceed, Sir. Mr. Evans."
- Evans, M.: "Sorry about that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Please explain what the Senate Amendment does, Sir."

Evans, M.: "House Bill 3881 places a moratorium on new and expanding landfills. I know you've... we've all heard a lot about this Bill. The opponents have said it's not necessary; they've said it's against local control and it should be placed in the county to solve. I want to tell you what this Bill is really about. I grew up in close proximity to this landfill that's in question. I remember seeing landfills everywhere in my neighborhood growing up on the far south side of Chicago. I played at a park near this landfill and the smells were horrific. I'm here today because I want to do something better for the children in my community. The state has invested millions and millions of dollars in the Lake Calumet region to make the southeast side a better place and this is public funds invested to improve my community. Unfortunately, we're only here because my constituents and investments made by the state require our protection. The City of Chicago, started in 1983, had a moratorium in place to prevent what this company is attempting to do today. That moratorium was local control and is local control. And instead of respecting it, there's an effort on the way to skirt it; it's simply not right. I'm asking for you to support this Bill. We need this Bill now, not in November, not four months from now, to ensure that my community is improved. Thank you. Take any questions."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3881. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, as I understand the Concurrence Motion, these Senate Amendments... this is not just seeking to limit the expansion of the landfill that you've described in your area, but it would, in fact, affect all of the county of Cook, isn't that correct?"

Evans, M.: "Representative, there's one landfill in Cook County."

Fortner: "There is one landfill today. There is nothing that would prevent someone from applying through the regular state process to have a landfill somewhere else. I'm not saying it would be a good idea, but we have a process in the State of Illinois whereby other people could apply for other locations in Cook County. That would be blocked by this. I understand that currently the City of Chicago has a moratorium, but this would extend that moratorium to all of Cook County."

Evans, M.: "We've had a lot of groups speak out about this issue, groups from all over the southeast side of Chicago.

The moratorium is placed in Chicago as it stands."

Fortner: "Well, that's right, but this is not just a moratorium for the southeast side; this is a moratorium for all of Cook County, for further... other parts of south Cook, parts of north Cook, northwest Cook. This would extend to every other area where people would otherwise have a perfectly

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

legitimate ability to use the current state process if... if that was their desire. We have a process and the locals in those areas could then make the determination whether it was in the unincorporated county or in any other municipality as to whether or not that siting would be appropriate for that area."

Evans, M.: "And again, they are landfills. This Bill focuses on expansion and new landfills."

"That's right. But it focuses it ... it puts it to the entire county. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This... if the Representative had wanted to do something for this, I think that there are far better ways in our statutes. If the concern is about this landfill, we could have had something more narrowly crafted that dealt with a particular environmental issue, if that's the issue. There already, in the 172 process that we use for siting landfills, other types of setbacks and restrictions so that people understand what's going to cause a concern. This is a major change from what we have done before. This would say, it's banned everywhere in the county of Cook. That is... I... in my opinion overkill to deal with a single landfill. But more to the point of what we should be very aware of is this sets a precedent that rather than go through the normal 172 process that is used for determining whether or not a landfill should either be expanded or sited at a location of which we have a lot of experience, personally, I've been involved both as a proponent and an opponent in these processes, so I have an idea of how they go and they work. But this would basically take this process completely

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

off the table and it would make this Body now a Body that every group is going to be looking towards if we want to... if they want to either block or see a landfill succeed. The whole purpose of the state process was to recognize this is a decision that, guided by state principles, the locals could sort out. I think this takes that a step in a direction that is not helpful. I strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, in committee you described this area as being an industrial site, is that correct?"

Evans, M.: "I didn't describe as being an industrial site. The Calumet area is an industrial area. There's a lot of factories in the area."

Pritchard: "Well, if there's a lot of factories, that suggests it's an industrial area. And it was also brought up in committee that the underlaying soils are clay, which tend to be good for landfills, isn't that correct?"

Evans, M.: "That's correct. It was mentioned."

Pritchard: "And the battle here is really between two cities, where a part of the landfill is in the City of Chicago and part of the landfill is in the City of Dolton, and the expansion is intended for the City of Dolton, is that correct?"

Evans, M.: "The battle… the battle is about circumventing the moratorium…"

Pritchard: "Which the City of Chicago have."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Evans, M.: "Which the City of Chicago has is 30 years old. This moratorium is..."

Pritchard: "Right. But we're talking about the City of Dolton."

Evans, M.: "The moratorium was set in place specifically to stop the landfills from doing exactly what they're trying to do. So, that's what the fight is about, a company looking to circumvent the city moratorium."

"But they would only circumvent it if they were Pritchard: trying to do it within the city limits, and they're not trying to do it within the city limits. They're actually trying to expand the landfill between the landfill in the City of Chicago and the City of Dolton. And it's in the City of Dolton where this expansion would occur, so there would appear to be no going back on the moratorium. What is even more troubling though is that as Mr... as the previous Representative mentioned, there is a process for hearing and having local input into the expansion and the siting of landfills. And what we're doing today is overriding that 30-some year old policy that has worked very well. And that's why I'm troubled that we're making it a countywide moratorium without having input from the Cook County Board and without dealing with the process that we have. I understand what you're trying to do for the City of Chicago, but I think this issue goes beyond the city and we need to consider what's best for the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is not just an environmental Bill, this Bill is not just an

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

electrolysis Bill as it was two weeks ago, this is a Bill about local control. If you carefully look at the wording in this Bill, it mentions inhabitants under 2 million that gets around Home Rule authority. So, Mr. Speaker, if I can ask the Sponsor of this Bill questions... ask him to yield for questioning, please?"

- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Jones: "Representative, there are Members who thought this Bill was an environmental Bill. Is this an environmental Bill or a landfill closure Bill?"
- Evans, M.: "It's not a landfill closure Bill. It's partially an environmental Bill. It's partially a Bill to protect local control. Local control was set in 30 years ago; local control was reinforced in 1995. Local control was again reinforced in 2005. And now, local control is attempted to being averted."
- Jones: "Representative, where is this... this is located in which village, Representative?"
- Evans, M.: "I can't hear you. Repeat the question."
- Jones: "What's the name of the village this... the landfill that you're seeking to... this Bill will affect? Where is it located at?"
- Evans, M.: "It's partially in Dolton, it's partially in the City of Chicago."
- Jones: "Which... which Representative District is that in, Representative?"
- Evans, M.: "The 29th Representative District, the district directly west of my district and the district that has a

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- landfill that affects my community and affects the environmental community of my community."
- Jones: "Representative, there was testimony yesterday from the EPA that there are no known sanctions or IEPA sanctions against this landfill that will be affected by in Dalton. Are you aware of any sanctions on this property that the IEPA has provided you record with?"
- Evans, M.: "That may or may not be correct. But what I do know is that this company is attempting to avert Home Rule. And I want to protect Home Rule and I ask my colleagues to do the same."
- Jones: "Well, Representative, I repeat my question. Are you aware of any IEPA sanctions against this company in the Village of Dolton in the 29th District?"
- Evans, M.: "May or may not be, I'm not aware."
- Jones: "Okay. So, Representative, are you aware of how many
 Home Rule communities there are in the south suburbs? Home
 rule communities versus non-Home Rule communities?"
- Evans, M.: "I'm sorry, Representative, I can't understand you.

 Can you speak louder?"
- Jones: "Let me repeat my question. Are you aware..."
- Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Jones... Mr. Jones, wait one second, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we please hold it down in the chamber so these Gentlemen can have their debate. Please proceed, Sir."
- Jones: "Representative, are you aware of how many Home Rule communities versus non-Home Rule communities are in the south suburbs?"
- Evans, M.: "No."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Jones: "Okay. There are 238, Representative. This Bill would actually take Home Rule authority away from the municipality in making this decision, if this Bill passes. Representative, yesterday or around yesterday there was a meeting that you scheduled with the opposition with myself, Representative Davis and Senator Trotter. And there was some language drafted for a trailer Bill that would change the effective date. Representative, are you aware of that agreement that was made between the opposition and the proponents?"
- Evans, M.: "Again, I'm... I'm not aware of any agreement. We were both in the meeting, Representative. There was talks. Please feel free to pursue any trailer Bill language. And ob... we're willing to support it, if it makes sense for my community."
- Jones: "So, Representative, then why not take this Bill out of the record and wait for the trailer Bill so we can address the concerns of the residents of the 29th District in the Village of Dolton?"
- Evans, M.: "Representative, I'm looking forward to moving forward with the Bill, support my community. This Bill does not affect Home Rule. I just want everybody to be aware of that. And I'm looking forward to moving forward with this Bill, Representative."
- Jones: "Representative, how were you given this Bill? Who gave you this Bill and drafted this language? How were you given this Bill?"
- Evans, M.: "Once the Bill left the Senate, the Bill was initially picked up, as you can see in the record, by

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Representative Saviano. I requested the Bill because I'm familiar with this landfill, I grew up five minutes away from this landfill. And I played in the park and I smelled this landfill my entire life. So, it was an issue that I was passionate about. I support my environmental community and I'm looking forward to limiting the expansion, not closing... not even a moratorium but limiting the expansion or the creation of a new landfill in this area. And that's what the Bill states."

Jones: "So, you drafted the language to this Bill,
Representative, this Amendment... the Senate Amendment that
becomes the Bill? The electrolysis Bill, you drafted the
language?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Jones: "Okay. Well..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr... Mr. Jones, could you bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Jones: "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. This is a huge colossal issue in my district. This Bill will impact the residents and elected officials in the Village of Dalton and take away the right of the village to make a decision on this issue. We had this exact issue in the City of Calumet City where the elected officials in Calumet City voted 'no' on this type of issue. If this Bill passes today, we take the elected officials and the residents who I... you... they sent me down to Springfield, along as the Representative 'cause we both share the Village of Dolton, it takes their voice out of this process. I'm asking the Representative that we hold this Bill; we come back in

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

November. If it's a good Bill now, it will be a great Bill in November. I'm asking you to stand with me and vote 'no' on this Bill and let's make it a better Bill. And I'm asking the Representative to pull it out of the record. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are still eight people who wish to speak on this Bill on Concurrence. The Chair is going take the prerogative to give each speaker two minutes. Mr. Mautino for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition today to the Bill that is before us. The 172 siting process has been longstanding, a true test and an opportunity for local people to impact and decide what happens in their local area. Thirty years ago this came out of statewide hearings and in Bureau County in the little town of Sheffield is the state's only low level nuclear waste site. I don't know what you know about the low level nuclear waste, but it's got about a half million year half-life and you either got to eat it or smoke it, you cannot get rid of it. We do not produce these things in Bureau County, they come from siting process somewhere else. The has protected communities. For 20 years, there has been a battle in LaSalle County about not allowing landfills to come in from Cook County, and not knowing what the components would be, it's been a very, very contentious issue for 20 years. Sidestepping a process that gives local control is not in the best interest of the people of the State of Illinois. It is certainly not in the best interest of downstate if

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

you are going to put a ban and a moratorium on an area that produces a lot of the waste. So, I would ask for a 'no' vote. And I appreciate your consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in strong support of this measure. The people of the southeast side of Chicago, the Lake Calumet region, have been the subjects of significant environmental damage over years. You heard from Representative Evans what it was like growing up in that area. The Southeast Environmental Task Force has been working hard to try to clean up the Lake Calumet and the southeast side area. They worked extremely hard to do so and they were the group that I think was perhaps the most effective in establishing a city moratorium on the development of new landfills back in 1994, I believe it was, re... reenacted in 2005. The problem with saying, oh, let the locals control, let the locals decide is that the locals who are going to be breathing the air and dealing with the pollutants that come from this new landfill are not part of the decision. The citizens of Chicago, the way the winds move, are the people who are going to be catching the problems, but they will not be part of a local siting decision that would happen if we did not pass this Bill. And let me tell you, it is environmental Bill and groups like the Sierra Club and the Environmental Law and Policy Center strongly support this Bill. And let me tell you that the company that opposes this Bill is a company that closed its landfill at one point rather than meeting strong requirements set upon it

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

by the City of Chicago to clean up its act. It closed the landfill and it did not do environmental remediation at that site. In fact, the city fined them some \$500 thousand sometime in the '90s because they refused to obey environmental regulations. I would say that without passage of this Bill we would create a situation which is bad for the health and the safety of the people of the Lake Calumet and southeast side of Chicago. I urge your 'yes' vote."

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

Rita: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Rita: "Representative, what... you... you were talking about how this protects Home Rule. Can you explain to me the language in this Bill? How it protects Home Rule in the locals?"

Evans, M.: "I didn't mention, Representative, that it protected Home Rule. It does not affect Home Rule."

Rita: "Could you explain to me how it does not affect Home Rule?"

Evans, M.: "We're not talking about a power delegated to a municipality. We're targeting a permit, so it doesn't affect Home Rule, Sir."

Rita: "Are... are you... and it's been mentioned about these 172 hearings that take place, that have been in place for over 30 years in the sitings of creating a new landfill or an expansion of a landfill and how them sitings take place, are you aware of that?"

Evans, M.: "No."

Rita: "Well, there's a series of... of... of events that need to take place which puts the power into the local communities,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

the municipality or the county in which that expansion would take place and/or a new site would be sited. It would start with the local government. Does your Bill allow for that process to take place?"

- Evans, M.: "My Bill targets the permit process. So it's... it's unrelated."
- Rita: "So, would the… the… the 172 hearings still take place under the language presented in your Bill?"
- Evans, M.: "No."
- Rita: "So, in... in essence what you're saying is that you're taking the power out of the local governments that... were... would first start this process? You're... you're just coming in and wanting to pass a Bill to say this is how it's going to be and then put that power in them?"
- Evans, M.: "What I'm doing, Representative, is reinforcing the local control, the 30 year local control that was put in place to stop specifically what was attempting to be happening."
- Rita: "And... and you stated that this... this particular site is in the 29th District. What Repre... what district do you represent?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita, will you bring your remarks to a close after the Gentleman answers this question, please."
- Evans, M.: "The 33rd District is directly east of this district. And any resident in my district that opens their windows, particularly in the summertime in the month of July and August, will be encouraged to support this issue."
- Rita: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I represent the south side of Chicago in my district. This site is not in my

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

district, but it's in proximity right... right up to the boundaries of my district. Therefore, I also live within a few miles of this site. I'm in strong opposition to this because they're taking the ability for our local authority, the local governments to go through them 172 site hearings first. So, I'm urging a 'no' vote."

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

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

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

Reis: "How many votes will it take for passage of this Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "This Bill does not preempt Home Rule and requires 60 votes, Sir."

Reis: "Has that already been... that question already been asked?"

Speaker Lang: "I've... I asked that question of the counsel for the Speaker about 20 minutes ago and that was the answer I got anticipating your question, Sir."

Reis: "We'd like to hear it on the record, as well. I don't understand when we want to... we want to let people carry guns it takes 71 votes, if we want to ban trash bags it takes 71 votes, but landfills doesn't take 71 votes?"

Speaker Lang: "I will ask the House counsel to approach the podium, Sir, but as I understand it, the Bill has no language that preempts Home Rule. Do you have any questions of the Sponsor?"

Reis: "I have one more. Should this require... should this get the required number of votes, whether it's 60 or 71, I would ask for a verification."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Your request will be acknowledged. Representative Roth for two minutes."

Roth: "Will the Speaker yield? Or Sponsor yield? Sorry."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Roth: "Representative, can you tell me who put the moratorium in Chicago against landfills in Chicago?"

Evans, M.: "The City of Chicago City Council."

Roth: "So, we didn't do that as a General Assembly?"

Evans, M.: "The City Council put it in place."

Roth: "Okay. I guess I'm... I'm not clear why Cook County isn't putting this moratorium on since this is also in Cook County. Do you know why they're not... why they're neutral on the Bill?"

Evans, M.: "Even if they put it in place it could potentially be overruled. Cook County doesn't govern landfills."

Roth: "Do you know have the… has the landfill started the siting process?"

Evans, M.: "No, at the very beginning."

Roth: "So, we're just being preemptive in this and not even letting the process start and follow the process that's been in... intact for 30 years? The only reason I ask is because my... the city I live in just went through this process. And just as Representative Jones said, they denied the process as well and the landfill is not going to expand in my city. So, I'm... I don't understand why we wouldn't at least go through the siting process and find out what's going to happen from that? It seems a little horse before the cart or cart before the horse, sorry. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is a Bill that really

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

preempts Home Rule... or excuse me, it really takes away local control as to the essence of what it is to site a landfill. I think it's a bad Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams for two minutes."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I rise in strong support of this Bill. First, for the environmental considerations. Cook County is one of the most densely populated, if not the most densely populated counties in our state. And everybody can... can imagine what the serious environmental and health costs are by having landfill in such a densely populated community, Marcus has testified to that today. In terms of this not being a state issue, the Lake Calumet region has been the subject of a lot of... and significant state and federal dollars that have gone to improve the site. As the Majority Leader stated, the Lake Calumet region has been riddled with illegal dumpina, dozens of landfills and a legacy of pollution left by heavy industry years ago. We are finally starting to take some positive steps to make this a better place to live. In terms of the local control issue and the siting process, contrary to what one of the previous speakers asserted, the land in question is actually in the City of Chicago and is subject to the moratorium. However, it is the subject of a court action to disconnect the property from the city. And that is why we are here today. The issue of local control is important and it is relevant in this case, but we are... what we're doing here... what the City of Dolton attempting to do is to do an end run around the locally

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

supported ordinance in Chicago that provides for a moratorium. An earlier speaker also suggested that Cook County handle this issue. In a municipal law situation, a municipal ordinance would trump a county ordinance and we'd be right back right where we started, so that would be of no use. I would assert that the state does have an important role in this issue. The county, the city and the municipality are all players, but the state is a player too in terms of protecting the environment... environmental interest and the health of its citizens. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative, is Represent… is Senator Harmon your Senator? I see he's the Senator that has this Bill."

Evans, M.: "The Chief Sponsor of this Bill is Senator Donna Trotter, which is my Senator."

Sacia: "Then why does Senator Harmon have the Bill, Sir?"

Evans, M.: "I don't... the Chief Sponsor is Senator Trotter."

Sacia: "Okay. It shows on our... Thank you, Representative. I hope everybody here listened to Representative Thaddeus Jones. He explained exactly what is wrong with this Bill. I couldn't begin to compliment what he said, but this is bad, bad, bad legislation. It has been articulated why it is bad. I stand with my good friend Mr. Jones and others. This is legislation... we need to let the locals control what they've already voted to do and not put it in the hands of

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

the state... of the General Assembly because somebody back home doesn't get their way. Vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Tryon: "You know landfill space is a commodity. have a market-driven landfill that we commodity so community that keeps prices reasonable. Landfills have to be properly sited, they have to be sited where there are conditions that don't have a high risk contamination to the groundwater, 10-7 permeability rating has to be the initial soil. We heard testimony yesterday that the soil conditions in that area were ideal for the placement of a landfill, a landfill that already exists. We also heard testimony that the operation of the current fill that's there today has been operating its entire life with no environmental violations. So when you look at the fact that the environmental parameters to site a... a... a landfill are there, you look at the fact that Dolton deannexed, went through the court system to do that, did it properly and have that inside their boundaries now. Now they get to proceed, hopefully, to the Senate Bill 172 hearing. That hearing will cost the petitioners anywhere from 600 to a million dollars to go through the hearing process. During that time, all of these concerns can be addressed in the design of the ... of the fill. We heard from DNR, some concerns they had. When asked, yes, they said they could actually design the reclamation plan to actually be a part of their long-term plan. All of that can be done in the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

design and hearing criteria in a Senate Bill 172 problem. The issue that I have is we're not trying to solve an environmental problem, we're trying to solve a political problem. On some... when we're talking about bags, Home Rule nobody wants to vote against Home Rule. The environmental community says, no, we object because it's taking away Home Rule powers and you're forcing communities to participate in a statewide recycling program. Here we're trying to take away Home Rule powers because we don't want the expansion of a landfill. The expansion of the landfill and the concerns everybody have will be adequately addressed in the hearing process. And in fact, some enhancements to the older section of this landfill could occur to actually make it more compatible with the DNR's reclamation plan for the millennium reserve. And I don't see why we would put a moratorium on a landfill, especially in an area that has the right soils; that's hard enough to find. And I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, the parliamentarian has an answer to your question."

Parliamentarian Weir Vaught: "Representative Reis, on behalf of the Speaker and in response to your question, Amendment #1 to House Bill 3881 does not preempt Home Rule; therefore, only requires 60 votes."

Speaker Lang: "Just for the record. Was that a lot different than the answer I gave you, Sir? Representative Dugan for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Dugan: "Representative, we have talked back and forth on this Bill, I... I just have a couple of questions. One, I wasn't under the understanding that this actually puts a moratorium completely in Cook County, not just the City of Chicago has a moratorium on landfills but this Bill would actually not just address the issue we talked about with the expansion of this particular landfill but it actually puts a moratorium so there will be no landfill sitings at all in any of Cook County?"
- Evans, M.: "It was necessary to include all of Cook County. We would have needed some special legislation to specifically target a location, but there's no other landfill site in Cook County."
- Dugan: "Is... is Cook County... if I... and I just want to make sure I'm clear. Is Cook County... I understood Cook County was neutral on this Bill. If Cook County wants a moratorium for no landfills, then why is Cook County not taking that action themselves?"
- Evans, M.: "Cook County is neutral on this issue."
- Dugan: "Okay. Again, and my question was, Representative, I just want to make sure I understand. Why, if a county wants a moratorium on landfill sitings, why would the county not be in support of a moratorium on landfills in their county?"
- Evans, M.: "This landfill doesn't just affect Dolton. The landfill is located right on the edge of Dolton, but this landfill affects the southeast side of Chicago. This landfill had a moratorium put in place to prevent what we're dealing with now. And all I'm looking to do is

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

protect Home Rule. This is an issue of circumventing Dolton's Home Rule. The company has taken steps to circumvent the City of Chicago's Home Rule, which needs protection. And that's why I'm presenting this Bill."

- Dugan: "And... and I understand what you're trying to do,
 Representative, and I certainly commend you for trying to
 do what it is you're trying to do. I'm just saying, I'm
 just having some confusion in understanding why because of
 something that's happening in one area requires that we
 make a moratorium in an entire county as big as Cook
 County, and the county itself is not even in support of the
 Bill. So that's, I just wanted to make sure I understood
 that. Another question and it's just one more..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Dugan, please bring your remarks to a close."
- Dugan: "Thank you. Is... does the City of Chicago or Cook County bring in garbage from out of state into their landfills?"
- Evans, M.: "I can't hear you, Representative."
- Dugan: "I... I just have one more. Does the City of Chicago or Cook County bring out-of-state garbage into the landfills that exist now in their areas?"
- Evans, M.: "No. The landfill there takes... it's a very small landfill. So, we don't... I don't want to make this into a very large landfill, takes in probably 1 to 2 percent of the trash in the City of Chicago. The majority of the trash collected by the City of Chicago and Cook County, 80 percent of it goes to Indiana."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Dugan: "That wasn't my question. My question is, does the City of Chicago or Cook County import any out-of-state garbage into the landfills that are in the Cook County area?"

Evans, M.: "Not that I'm aware of."

Dugan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mell for two minutes."

Mell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. You know, I... when I first heard about this Bill it was the Representative telling me how he grew up around this area and this section of population has a very... they're having problems with odor and various things. And as it turns out and I'm sitting here and I'm listening a little bit more, this is... there's something else going on here. And you know what, this is what happens at the end of the Session, we're trying push things through. We have over 5 thousand Bills and it's hard to research each Bill. And it is the last hour, I will be voting for the Bill. But I just kind would like to speak on the process and how... you know, I just feel like I... I quite didn't get the full story. So with that, I'll... I guess I'll vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan for two minutes."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course you would. Mr. Tryon, for two more minutes."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and this is a long day for all of us, but you know I made... I thought it very clear that let the Senate Bill siting 172 process work. That is where

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

most of this can be addressed. I haven't heard one thing that can't be addressed in that hearing process. And in my close I said, vote 'aye'. But what I am telling you is I believe that 'no' vote is what... is what you need to make and I didn't get that out properly. But seriously, the 172 hearing process for anybody that sat through that on a county board or a city council, it's intense, it's long and all of these will be addressed. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans to close."

Evans, M.: "Colleagues, please be aware, the City of Chicago... see... we're talking about doing a process that's already happened. This is a 30 year process, started in 1983, continued in 1995, continued in 2005. With some legal maneuvering the company is looking to circumvent what's going on in my community. The environmental community's in supportive of me, the City of Chicago in support of me, and I ask you to stand in support of our community. I've dealt with this issue, unlike many of my colleagues, for my entire life. And when we leave this Body, I'll be at my friend's house in the City of Dolton on 142nd and University smelling this dump. So, I ask you to support me as we... in this Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3881. This is final action. Please be advised that Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. All Members will be in their chairs and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Feigenholtz, Penny. Feigenholtz, Penny. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. And Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. Do you persist in your verification, Sir? Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, please read House Joint Resolution 93."

- Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 93, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1034, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1034, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1034 is an agency initiative of the Illinois State Police to improve its FOID card system. Based upon the recommendations of the Illinois Auditor General and the mandates from the United States Department of Justice, the Bill is intended to meet applicable recommendations from the Auditor General to improve the FOID system. And it will also place Illinois firearm regulations in compliance with the Federal Law. The Bill has been negotiated among the Illinois State Police, the National Rifle Association and the Illinois State Rifle Association. And there is no

147th Legislative Day

- opposition to this Bill, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1034.

 And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want to compliment the Sponsor for all the hard work she did in getting an agreed Bill to this. So, gracias amiga."
- 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? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3450, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3450, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3450 simply clarifies police powers granted to the Gaming Board and their ability to carry out provisions of the Video Gaming Act. I will answer any questions."
- 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? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative May. Please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

147th Legislative Day

- received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading appears Senate Bill 38, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill. It's on Supplemental Calendar #1, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 38, a Bill for an Act concerning professional regulation. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #5 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the same order, Senate Bill 3766, Leader Lyons. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3766, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.

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

 No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, page 9 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 2971, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2971, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on Amendment 2."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This includes most of the provisions in the Budget Implementation Act that will accompany the fiscal '13 budget. Most of it is stuff that we've done before. For example, we are transferring a total of 8.3 million from various funds in the... in the Secretary of State's Office to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

his Identification, Security and Theft Prevention Fund, that we've been doing since 2008. We've also put money in from the General Revenue Fund so that we can give grant authority to the Illinois Violence Prevention Fund, it extends through the end of June 2013; the annual transfer from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the Vehicle Inspection Fund, and if we don't do that, then we may risk losing some federal highway dollars. I would be happy to answer questions. I could go on through each of the provisions, but I... since all of you have an analysis maybe it would make more sense for you to offer me your questions so that I can respond specifically if there are specific concerns that you have with the Bill."

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

Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "This... this provision would eliminate the... the fund shifts from the standardbred and thoroughbred breeders that was in Amendment 2. I think that the standardbred people and the thoroughbred people will be very happy with you if you vote 'yes' on Amendment 3."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will 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."

147th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2971, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "This includes all provisions and only the provisions of House Amendments 2 and 3. I explained portions of the Bill and I'm happy to answer questions on any of the specific provisions that the Bill includes."
- 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? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Crespo, Nekritz. Mr. Crespo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1064, Mr. Acevedo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1064, a Bill for an Act concerning corrections. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Acevedo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "All right. So, this is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Acevedo on the Amendment."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would grandfather out of this Bill the one detention in the state that is already privately run. The center currently employs 80 individuals and with this Amendment, those 80 workers will not lose their jobs

147th Legislative Day

- and Tri-County is required to not run privately. On the other hand, if this Bill fails and ICE opens up the Crete Center, ICE would likely stop sending detainees to Tri-County, forcing the jail to close and killing the... at the loss of 80 jobs. I'll be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments, but several notes have been requested on the Bill as amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Lang: "The Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading while Mr. Acevedo tries to find the notes. Mr. Acevedo."
- Acevedo: "I was... I was at the understanding that the Bill... the notes are inapplicable?"
- Speaker Lang: "Are you moving that the notes... We'll take this out of the record for now, Sir. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted and referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 93; recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2348, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2378, Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 2409, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2413, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2474, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2474, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3146 and Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 3802."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "On the Supplemental Calendar #2, under the Order of Resolutions, appears HJR93, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. As you know, when we propose a Constitutional Amendment we also have to give language to the Secretary of State to send to all registered voters making arguments for the proposed Constitutional Amendment and arguments against the proposed Constitutional Amendment. House Joint Resolution 93 does exactly that. We have to do that before we leave our job this spring Session because, of course, there will be a Constitutional Amendment on the November ballot. I would appreciate your support for adoption of HJR93."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what questions I wanted to ask. You've just been calling the Bills so fast that I turned my light on so that you couldn't do that this time. The last Bill that Representative Currie had and that you called before we could ask a question was a major budget Bill, but it had two subjects in it. It had one subject that was racehorse and the thing... and it had another subject that was budget would not make it not a single subject Bill. So, I think there's a problem. So, I turned my light on this time to give people on our side of the aisle time to take a look at it and get up and speak if they would like. On budget Bills, I've never been here when you've had a call like that so that no one could speak to it and it was a very dubious Bill, if you ask me. So, I think if there's other Members on our aisle or on the other

147th Legislative Day

- side of the aisle would like to ask a question, I'd like to give them the opportunity to do that."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, for the record, there were no lights on when I called for the vote. Mr. Franks is recognized."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our system does not have an analysis of the Bill at this time. I don't know if... can you tell us, maybe the parliamentarian knows, whether one will be coming so people may be asking questions based on an analysis. I don't know if the Republicans have an analysis on it, but the Democrats do not."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, it will be on the system... Leader Currie, we're going to take this out of the record for the moment.

 On page 6 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 549, Mr. Jackson. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 549, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 549, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jackson."
- Jackson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate
 Bill 549, as amended... as amended, creates a new Act; the
 Metro East Police District Act, which establishes a new
 special district to be known as the Metro East Police

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

District within St. Clair County, comprising the City of East St. Louis, the Village of Washington Park, the Village of Alorton and the Village of Brooklyn. The district will be governed by the established Metro East Police District Commission. To fund the district, St. Clair County will adopt by ordinance a mandatory \$100 fine to be charged to all criminal defendants who are either found quilty of or assigned court supervision for a felony or for a DUI when the offense was committed within the corporate limits of a municipality that is located within a special police district. And a municipality may use moneys from special tax allocation fund to hire police officers. If the corporate authorities of the municipality determines by ordinance or resolution that more police officers are needed to protect the public health and safety of residents, the amount may be no more than 10 percent of the funds available. All provisions of Senate Bill 549, as amended, would take effect January 1, 2013 and would be automatically repealed December 31, 2019, except the TIF related charges under the Municipality Code. I will entertain any questions and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Reboletti: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

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

Reboletti: "My analysis indicates this preempts Home Rule.

Would the... the vote total needed to acquire the constitutional requirement?"

147th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "It's your lucky day, Sir. The parliamentarian is here and she will check on it presently. Do you have any questions of the Sponsor?"
- Reboletti: "I do. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "He will."
- Reboletti: "Representative, this creates the ability to use TIF funds only if you join this TIF or this Police District Act. What would happen if one of the communities did not join this? Would they not have a police department then?"
- Jackson: "No, that's not... no, they would have a police department. They can use TIF funds even if they're not a part of the district. If... they cannot use or receive any of the \$100 fine for DUI or felonies."
- Reboletti: "One of... one of the concerns I have is a due process concern that there will be additional fines only in one county and in the other 101 counties every other person would be treated differently. Do you have any of those... do you have some of those concerns as well?"
- Jackson: "No, I do not. One of the things that we're attempting to do here is to try to provide additional dollars for a... a municipality... a police department that we're... we're trying to provide additional dollars for the police department and to do so, the fines are necessary."
- Reboletti: "It... it... what's the issue there that additional funds are needed?"
- Jackson: "The… all of the cities' incomes is extremely low and the EAV is extremely low, and it cannot afford… was not producing enough capital in those particular cities."

147th Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "How much would the TIF proposal raise for those communities and assuming that it does raise money, how many police officers would be able to be hired?"
- Jackson: "The TIF moneys is based upon a 10 percent of the amount of money that each of the cities receive. So, for instance, if East St. Louis is receiving 5 million, it would receive 500 thousand. Each of the individual cities will receive a different TIF amount."
- Reboletti: "Will this be a standard TIF then, would be 23 years with the opportunity to expand it out to, I think, I believe it's 35 years?"
- Jackson: "The... the TIFs are already developed, already established in whatever their establishments are, yes."
- Reboletti: "And... and who would appoint the members of this commission? I see there's 14 appointed members, 3 exofficio members. Who appoints them?"
- Jackson: "Seven members will be the mayor or by the Governor,
 I'm sorry, 4 by the mayor of East St. Louis, 1 from each of
 the other cities. There's Alorton, Washington Park and
 Brooklyn. And then there would be 3 ex officio members.
 There will be one from the state's attorney, U.S. Attorney
 and the Police Commission."
- Reboletti: "And does the Auditor General have any role in this particular TIF district or commission?"
- Jackson: "Yes. Yes, he would. The Auditor... he would be the Auditor. He would do the same... he would audit those funds to make sure that they are done correctly."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, in answer to your question, the Bill does preempt Home Rule; however, it preempts Home Rule under subsection (i) and accordingly requires 60 votes. Mr. Jackson to close."
- Jackson: "This is an opportunity to beef up a police area...
 police department, with several of the police departments
 within the St. Clair County. I think it's an excellent
 opportunity to add additional policemen and a way of having
 additional police protection. I would ask for an 'aye'
 vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Evans, Mathias, Watson. Please take the record. There are 64 voting 'yes', Bill, voting 'no'. And this having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1531, Representative Golar. Is Representative Golar in the chamber? Out of the record. Page 9 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3101, Mr. Mathias. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3101, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mathias."

Mathias: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse... excuse me. Let's move the Bill to the Order of Third Reading and read it a third time."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3101, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Mathias, now you may proceed."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3101 is an Mathias: initiative of the Illinois County Treasurers. It basically allows county treasurers to get copies of change of addresses from the post office, which are readily available every six months from the post office. And they are able to send the tax bills to the new address rather than waiting for the taxpayer to do it. This way the taxpayer will get their bill quicker. And even, I think even a better part of the Bill or just as good but maybe better, is to allow the tax bills to be sent by e-mail if the treasurer decides to set up that type of system and if a taxpayer requests that he would want his bill sent directly by e-mail. I think it's a taxpayer friendly Bill. It will save the counties money. It will get the bill out quicker rather than waiting for the post office to reroute, it if there's a change of address. So, I ask for your '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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Biss, Mr Rita. Please take the record.

On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of personal privilege."

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

147th Legislative Day

- Jones: "I meant to vote on some of the Bills, but unfortunately
 I was stuck in the elevator, as things would happen in
 Springfield. So, I apologize to the Assembly."
- Speaker Lang: "Is that your whole story, Sir? Okay. On page 9 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 3262, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3262, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3262, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 3262 addresses two liquor license... license exemptions, one in my district and one in the district of Representative Greg Harris. In my district, the Raven Theatre, is a not for profit theatre and arts organization, an ensemble organization that has sought a... an exemption in order to have a liquor license for sale of alcohol during their... their intermissions. They would not be... they're not open during school hours so they would not be providing liquor during school hours. The school and the school council as well as the aldermen have submitted a letter stating that they have no objection. In addition, the So Gong Dong Tofu House passed the Senate in March, narrowly written to allow the city to issue a liquor license to the So Gong Dong Tofu House. It's within 100 feet of the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Assyrian Christian Church. There is also no objection there. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I won't try to say those names of the restaurants again, but is there any... have you heard any complaints from any of your constituents if this Bill were to pass with respect to changing these sitings?"

Cassidy: "No, Sir, I have not."

Reboletti: "And what... for some of these, what is the change in distance from the church?"

Cassidy: "The Raven Theatre is... I'm looking for the exact proximity. They are within 100 feet of the Hayt School and the So Gong Dong Tofu House, which I challenge you to join me in saying So Gong Dong as often as possible, they are with 100 feet... within 100 feet of the Assyrian Christian Church. In addition, there is already a restaurant that does serve liquor within 100 feet in the other direction and there have been no issues with the neighborhood."

Reboletti: "I'll stick to saying Raven Theatre, but..."

Cassidy: "Oh, come on."

Reboletti: "...and this will be... is this a seasonal or is this a permanent change then to the... to the license?"

Cassidy: "The Raven Theatre is a... is a permanent change.

However, because it is a theatre they do have a season and
they're not open every night. They are not open during
regular school hours."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Are they open all year though?"

Cassidy: "I believe they have a... they have season, I don't believe it's the year round."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative May."

May: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

May: "The So Gong Dong Tofu House, it's 6:00 and I'm starting to get hungry. Could they send carryout down to us?"

Cassidy: "I think that's probably a pretty good idea."

May: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Because of the ethics laws you may want to do it after we vote, Representative. 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. Smith. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes' and 56 voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #5 for Senate Bill 2454."
- Speaker Lang: "Returning to Supplemental Calendar #2, on the Order of Resolutions, House Joint Resolution 93, Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We are required to give the Secretary of State language so that he

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

can... explaining the Constitutional Amendment... a proposed Constitutional Amendment, arguments for and arguments against that Amendment. And the Secretary of State then mails that pamphlet to all registered voters across the State of Illinois. House Joint Resolution 93 includes the arguments for and against the Constitutional Amendment that was approved this spring and will appear on the November ballot. I'd be grateful for your 'yes' vote."

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

 The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Would the Majority Leader yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "She will."
- Reboletti: "Leader, I'm... I'm... just had a chance to start looking at the language. I think you indicated in your testimony earlier that all of the four Leaders of the caucuses were able to discuss the language before this was put together or who... who drafted this language?"
- Currie: "I believe it was all four caucuses, Representative. If one of our staffers can clarify, I would be glad to know that. But that generally is the way we do it."
- Reboletti: "And this pamphlet is distributed by the Secretary of State's Office?"
- Currie: "It's required to be distributed by the Secretary of State. So, it includes the actual language of the proposed Amendment and it includes arguments for and against adoption of the Amendment."
- Reboletti: "And my understanding is that with the election in November and with early voting when would this notification

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

be sent out to our constituents regarding the question and the arguments for and against?"

Currie: "Before they'd start voting, but it could... they won't get any notification unless we act to adopt HJR93 now."

Reboletti: "And I... and I appreciate that. Do you... do you know the timeframe in which that piece would be in my constituents mailbox for them to review prior to early voting?"

Currie: "I don't know. But certainly it's the… the Secretary's responsibility to get it to them before early voting starts."

Reboletti: "And it has to be there before early voting starts, that's... that's correct?"

Currie: "That's my understanding."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, if this were to become part of our Constitution, if this passes and submitted to the voters and becomes part of the Constitution, I think a question that... that... the question I have and I think should consider. This would raise the threshold on what it would take to increase pension benefits, is that right?"

Currie: "That's right. It would do so at the level at which those pension benefits are being approved. So if it's a city council and the State Legislature as well."

Moffitt: "Okay."

Currie: "So, it would be a two-thirds vote."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Moffitt: "Instead of a simple Majority?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Moffitt: "Instead of a simple Majority?"

Currie: "That's right."

Moffitt: "Okay. So, if it became law or became the Constitution and there was a time when we're going to look at anybody who was looking at diminishing pension benefits, would that also take a supermajority to diminish or reduce?"

Currie: "No. No. Only... only an enhancement."

Moffitt: "Only an enhancement, not a simple Majority for reducing?"

Currie: "There is an issue about diminishing benefits with respect to the Constitution."

Moffitt: "Right. And that's part of why I was..."

Currie: "Right."

Moffitt: "...so this would not change that. That would still be..."

Currie: "Would not change that."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Durkin: "Representative, who is going to be the benefit increase czar in the Illinois House to make the decision of whether or not there is an actual increase in the benefit and a certain piece of legislation?"

Currie: "Right."

Durkin: "Who ultimately makes that determination? And who will...

I guess the point I'm saying is that..."

Currie: "There... it would be the parliamentarian."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Durkin: "Right."

Currie: "It'd be the... the legal counsel."

Durkin: "Right."

Currie: "The same way those determinations are made today. What is a preempt... a Home Rule preemption that requires 60 votes?"

Durkin: "Right."

Currie: "What's a Home Rule preemption that requires 71?"

Durkin: "Is there..."

Currie: "So those are the decisions that are made by the parliamentarian in each chamber daily, and this would be no different."

Durkin: I guess the... and I've discussed this at... "Well, previously with your counsel, fine counsel and your predecessor was a fine chap too, the young man who's been in the chamber, Mr. Ellis. But I also know that this parliamentarian works directly for the Speaker and whether we have the Majority or not it is a partisan position. I'm just going to make a recommendation. I'm going to vote for your Bill, but I think that we should have a somewhat outside... one of the agencies prepare a note of some sort, which we do for a number of these types of requests where we do have a third party who will... can file a note, is there been an increase or not? Whether it's DCEO Department of Insurance. But I think it would be wise if we had another person who would be able to make that determination, someone who is not in that partisan position to make that call. That's all; that's my recommendation.

147th Legislative Day

- I'll bring it up next Session, but I'm going to support your Resolution."
- Currie: "I appreciate your comments."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution 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, Mr. Clerk. There are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill... and the Resolution is adopted. Chair recognizes Majority Leader Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirement so that Senate Bill 2861 can be heard in Transportation: Regulation, Roads and Bridges Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Is there leave? There being no discussion, leave is granted. Ladies and Gentlemen, on page 14 of the Calendar under Concurrences appears House Bill 3366, Mr. Turner. Please proceed, Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3366 is a... this is a... 3366 is a series of Bills that represents the rewrite of the Criminal Code and the Code of Corrections by the Criminal Law Edit Alignment and Reform, the CLEAR Commission. This particular Bill recognizes and consolidates offenses related to harms to children in a new Article 12C in the Criminal Code. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Sir, can you tell us briefly what the Senate Amendment does?"
- Turner: "The Senate Amendment recognizes and consolidates offenses related to harms to children in a new Article 12C

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

in the Criminal Code. The Bill restructures the placement definitions, offenses of and penalties. Ιt consolidates some existing criminal offenses set out in separate sections into a single section in an effort to eliminate redundant language and save space. The vast majority of these are purely technical changes, some minor substantive changes resolve legal inconsistencies, clear constitutional issues and provisions that already covered under the provisions of law. In addition, majority of the Bill contains revisory changes made by the Legislative Reference Bureau that it wanted to enact sooner than its annual revisory Bill. The Bill reflects the recommendations of the CLEAR Commission, LRB and staff of the four Legislative Caucuses."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for clarifying that. Mr. Turner moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3366. And on that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, there's also some issues regarding forfeiture law. Could you briefly describe some of the changes with the forfeiture provisions?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir, Representative. House Bill 3366 incorporates the seizure and forfeiture provisions related to the offense of unlawful transfer of a telecommunications device to a minor and to the general forfeiture law, Article 12B of the Code of Criminal Procedure that was created by a previous CLEAR Bill rewriting forfeiture provisions."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Is... is this the last of the CLEAR Bills as far as all the revisions of the Criminal Code?"

Turner: "I think so."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this actually does conclude the entire work of the CLEAR Commission. And I would like to thank all of those who've been involved with it over the years that have worked very diligently to rewrite the entire Criminal Code, to make it more accessible and readable for practitioners both criminal and defense oriented, for the courts as well as for the public. And I'd like to thank all of those Members and the attorney, Pete Barony, for all of his hard work. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill having received... excuse me, and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3366. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 16 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4983, Mr. Acevedo. Please proceed, Sir."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 is just a technical change.

I believe it changes... just adds a dash. It's just a technical change."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in...
Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm going to draw your attention to the analysis to Senate Amendment #1. I believe that this Amendment actually expands the class of people to include persons that have been honorably discharged or who have been awarded a Southwest-Asia Service Medal, Kosovo Campaign Medal, Korean Service Defense Medal or Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal?"

Acevedo: "You're... you're right, Representative. I was looking at the wrong thing."

Franks: "Right. I wanted to make sure that we were describing this."

Acevedo: "Yes."

Franks: "It came in through committee yesterday and I know that you were in Exec..."

Acevedo: "Yeah."

Franks: "...so we had... Representative Dugan had handled it for you yesterday. There was a couple of brief questions in committee that may be brought to you today, so I wanted to make you aware that this is an expansion of the class of the people this would pertain to. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for... that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4983. Those in favor of the Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Currie. Dunkin. Leader Currie. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4983. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 18 of the Calendar, House Bill 5771, Representative Golar. Please proceed, Representative."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm... I make a Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5771."

Speaker Lang: "Please explain briefly what the Amendment does."

Golar: "Yes. The Amendment is a technical change in the original Bill. In committee, there was an agreement between the... my colleagues, the Republican colleagues, in regards to the... the first Bill stated that we would have a certificate of good conduct for 3 years, and the new language is actually for 2 years. It would allow and ease the process for individuals returning to get a good... code of conduct. And I think that this will help for those individuals that have been out of the process and they have demonstrated good behavior before applying on trying to get themselves back into society. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5771. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, prior to this Amendment being adopted, what was the term that the person had to wait to file for this certificate of relief from disabilities?"

Golar: "It was actually... it was 1 year."

Reboletti: "That... your Bill had 1 year?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Golar: "That is correct."

Reboletti: "And currently, under… under Criminal Code it's 3 years, is that correct?"

Golar: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "And your Amendment moves it to 2 years?"

Golar: "Yes. Because we felt that 1 year based on many of the difficulties that individuals coming back into society trying to put their life on track, that it would be better if we gave them 2 years rather than the 1."

Reboletti: "And I know that one of the concerns was that your legislation changed the burden of proof from clear and convincing evidence, which is a pretty high standard, down to preponderance of the evidence which is more of a civil standard. Your Amendment returns it back up to the higher standard of clear and convincing evidence?"

Golar: "Yes."

Reboletti: "And I know we had a... a long conversation about this after the Jud II meeting and it's my understanding that very few people have actually taken advantage of this or have been able to apply for it? Do you recall the number we talked about in committee?"

Golar: "Yes, that's correct. What has happened, I think this particular measure even with myself I was not aware of this and actually was seeking on trying to do some things to help individuals' back that had committed offenses and put them back into society. And I was told that this was a good measure that I could work on. And I think your question and what many individuals questions are is that no one has really heard about this particular measure. And so, we

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

talked about some things in committee to actually get the word out so that many individuals not only in my communities, black and brown, but other communities across the State of Illinois would be able to have this information and pass it on to individuals that have paid their debt to society and are trying to get back on track and enter the workforce."

Reboletti: "And what does the certificate allow the individual to do once they have received it?"

Golar: "Well, it actually allows them to show a... somewhat of a preponderance of evidence that they have demonstrated. For example, there are many individuals in society that have their college degrees but they are felons. And it's been 10 years, 20 years and they cannot get a job. And so, this really allows them with a certificate of conduct to have the employer... prospective employer to look at their record and allow them to take on a job. And actually what... what is more important is... and help them obtain the license to... to get this."

Reboletti: "Representative, I appreciate you taking my thoughts into consideration and working with Senator Hunter on this and I'll be supporting your legislation. Thank you."

Golar: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, so right now the current law is what?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Golar: "The current law originally was 3 years, we actually moved it in the… in the statute and the Concurrence to 2 years, I mean to 1 year and then my… to 2 years, I'm sorry. No, it was 1 year. And so, what happened is that in the discussion they… the… my colleagues in committee stated that they felt that the 1 year was not enough time for a person trying to demonstrate to come back into society. And we would allow it just for 2 years."

Flowers: "Okay. So current law would require that a person that's convicted of a felon..."

Golar: "Correct."

Flowers: "...to wait 3 years..."

Golar: "Correct."

Flowers: "...before he or she could have their record expunged?"

Golar: "That's correct."

Flowers: "Okay. And now your... and these people have already paid their debt to society."

Golar: "Correct."

Flowers: "So, what was the purpose of extending the… extending it to 2 years? I know it was a compromise that was made, but what is the point?"

Golar: "But it was 1 year. That's... that was in my original intent of the Bill. And in order... in the discussion that we had in committee, we felt that 1 year was not enough time. And that was..."

Flowers: "But they paid their debt to society."

Golar: "I understand that, Representative."

Flowers: "And they want to get a job."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Golar: "But my... but it is important for me as it is in other sometimes to yield to your colleagues in order to get those... that measure passed out. And maybe we could revisit this again to see how it's working out. Because right now, since 2010 when the Bill originally was voted upon, it's only 30... 30 people have taken advantage of this..."

Flowers: "So, let me..."

Golar: "...many of them don't even know about it."

Flowers: "So, let me ask you this. If someone wanted to know about this, Representative… well, I'm sure… I heard you say that it was discussed in regards to… I heard you say that it was you and the previous speaker had discussed ways in how to promote this."

Golar: "That's correct."

Flowers: "Should... maybe we should have the courts... for those who've had these records of the last two years and there has not been any action, maybe they should automatically have a certificate of clearance? You know, but it... it appears to me that we are asking them to go a little longer without employment because this could impede their employment. And maybe had we left it at that 1 year, they could have found employment a lot sooner. So, chances of recidivism, because we've extended to two years, is greater. So that means maybe fewer people will take advantage of it."

Golar: "Well, we thought..."

Flowers: "Just food for thought."

Golar: "You're absolutely correct, but we actually discussed that. However, and sometimes in 1 year, being under their

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

probation officer, there might be some benchmarks that they have to follow in regards to that. So, we just felt that the 2 years was better in terms of helping them along their way rather than the 1."

- Flowers: "I... I understand what you're saying and I respect what it is that you're trying to do, Representative. I just don't see how extending it another year is helping a crippled person to walk when you're extending their crippledness because they cannot get this mark off their back. Because they have to wait another year before their record is cleared before they can find a job in order to feed their family or either go to work. That's my only concern. I understand..."
- Golar: "And that was the reason... and that was the reason for having it 1 year but the agreement was with the committee, in order to get this measure passed is that we'd do it for 2 years, Representative."
- Flowers: "And not only that, I... you also made the standards a little higher. The previous standards was probable... that is highly probable, now the standards are clear and convincing evidence? So, I mean, if I don't have a record is that not evidence enough that I should earn this certificate that would help get this expungement?"
- Golar: "Well, if the individual has in getting out of an institution has been incarcerated and they come out and they continue to demonstrate and within a 2-year period, I think that's enough time for them. Now 1 year was the original intent of the Bill, that's what was written up."

Flowers: "And the standards."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Golar: "And I do understand that you're saying now that the standards are higher for them?"

Flowers: "Yes. Yeah. You made it even... you made the... how do I, other than my record, my record should speak for itself other than, what other clear and convincing evidence? You know, sometimes because you negotiated with the committee that doesn't mean that it's always in the best interest of the people whom we trying to serve. But I thank you, Representative, for what it is that you tried to do. But my biggest concern is that we made a good Bill somewhat bad. But it's still..."

Golar: "Okay. I... I... you know that's your opinion, Representative."

Flowers: "Yes."

Golar: "And do respect that. And thank you."

Flowers: "Thank you."

"Those in favor of the Lady's Motion to Concur Speaker Lang: will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gordon. Sosnowski. Representative Gordon. Representative Gordon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5771. And this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 of the Calendar, under Consideration Postponed, appears Senate Bill 3442. Before we proceed, we had a very, very lengthy debate on this Bill, a very lengthy debate. I'm going to ask Mr. Tryon to give a one-minute explanation,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

one-minute explanation of the Bill. And we're going to go directly to a vote. Mr. Tryon."

Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Although Senate Bill 3442 did not receive its Constitutional Majority of 71 votes, only 70, we have spent a lot of time trying to work with those opponents that are op... had opposed the Bill, primarily on Home Rule. We unfortunately weren't able to come to an agreement with that. This Bill will be an innovative Bill in the country, first of its kind in the country, setting up a statewide recycling program for plastic bags and plastic film products to be paid for by the manufacturing industry and the retail industry. And I would... I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "We'll allow one person in opposition that would be Representative May."

May: "Thank you. Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that a lot of you are familiar with the Bill. Since we last had the vote and this Bill failed, we did try to meet and come to some sort of an agreement. So, I appreciate the Sponsor bringing us together. However, we offered and said, just give us a handful of communities to be a laboratory to try different things. We think this is a low level, that this does not work and we're codifying failure. We only got to 6 percent in Lake County. In Washington, D.C., they got to 80 percent by taking a different approach. All we wanted was to have a handful of communities to try different things because we're preempting what they can do and this was turned down. I

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

would further point out that the fiscal note shows that this will cost the state money, the fees involved will not cover the cost of the program. So, for those reasons, I... I reluctantly stand in opposition. I know some people think this is an environmental Bill. It's an environmental problem, it is not an environmental solution. We don't think that this will work."

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, for what reason do you rise? I thought we had a nice plan here."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I... I do enjoy your plans, but I have my own plan. So, if I may? Just briefly, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "If you insist, Sir. Please proceed. You have one minute."
- Reboletti: "Just... just briefly. Ladies and Gentlemen, if we're going to do some type of recycling program, it is important that we have uniform standards across the state. That is what this does. Vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill.

 Those... this Bill will require 71 votes, 71 votes. Please...

 please vote your own switches. Those in favor vote 'yes';

 opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Coladipietro, Lilly,

 Ramey, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this

 question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no' and 2

 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the

 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

 Bill 3514 also under the Order of Postponed Consideration,

 also previously debated. We'll allow the Sponsor and we'll

 allow one on each side for one minute each. Mr. Zalewski."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, very... thank you... very briefly. This Bill... I've been asked by Members, subsequent to the vote, what does this Bill do? It simply gives the director of the Illinois Medical District Commission more statutory authority to... to for a very limited number of reasons, recollateralize assets. There is no levy authority in the Bill. This is not a tax increase. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti for one minute."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

- Reboletti: "Representative, you and I had a conversation about this Bill. Was it... is it true that Governor Blagojevich basically gutted this entire commission or... the whole process, so really they can't do the job that they're supposed to do?"
- Zalewski: "I would say there's been a change in leadership. The new leadership at the District Commission needs this Bill to... to fix some of the past mistakes."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Acevedo, Halbrook, Hernandez, Kay, May, Pritchard, Soto. Please record yourselves, Members. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 90 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

147th Legislative Day

- Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very brief point of personal privilege. The last Bill that Representative Tryon had he was very passionate about passing it and then he voted 'present'. I just wondered why."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I'm not trying to start a trend here, but on House Bill 1645 I inadvertently was recorded as a 'yes' vote and I would like to be recorded as a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Tryon."
- Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know I'm in great company with... you press the wrong button sometimes, but this actually happened on my Bill. As I was looking up, I pressed the 'present' button and I would like the record to show that I am a 'yes' on Senate Bill 3442."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will definitely reflect your intentions, Sir. On page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate-Bills Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 3146, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3146, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Can we amend the Bill and then discuss it on Third Reading?"

Speaker Lang: "Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Again, can we adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, that's all right with you? Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3146, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This is the first of the Budget Implementation Act that contains very many provisions. Most of them are items that we have done in previous Bills. For example, we would allow up to 80 million in short-term cash transfers from the General Revenue Fund to the Tobacco Settlement Recovery Fund with repayment at the end of the year. We do this because of cash flow issues. The tobacco settlement money doesn't come in until April. We have been doing this annually in Budget Implementation Acts since fiscal 2002. It also sets the share of personal income and

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

corporate income taxes that would go into the Income Tax Refund Fund. Perhaps it would make sense since there are lots of different provisions in the measure for me to be available to answer any questions you may have on specific portions of the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. And on that question, Chair recognizes Minority Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to just comment on the budget process in general and not on this particular BIMP Bill. But as... as most of you know in this Body and that are following State Government, we've attempted to work with the other side of the aisle in the budget process because of the problems we have as a state. And one of the things we talked about with our budget mess is, it is kind of a puzzle and pieces need to fit together to, you know, show the road map out of here. And one of those pieces is the need to do pension reform, as you... we've expressed to you before. And the condition so to speak or a part of the puzzle was we said to the Speaker and all of you is we've got to Medicaid done and we've got to do retiree health and we have to get pension done. As we talked about yesterday and certainly want to be respectful of where we are here and have our inside voices working, the... the need to fix these things because long-term we can't sustain them. And we find out yesterday or when a Bill is filed at 7:15 in the morning that there is a tax... property tax increase component of a pension reform Bill that shifted the debate from pension reform to a property tax increase to the tune of at least \$20 billion for downstate and suburban schools

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

and the unfunded liability that goes even higher into the billions, which would put significant strains on schools. So we have said until you do that, it's impossible to do pension reform. But that last minute concept thrown in there. And so, it made it very difficult for us to continue down the road of working on the budget. The idea of paying 900 million... or spending less was good, paying off some bills was good, but you've got to have the overall picture, and your refusal, on the other side of the aisle, to get the pension problem done is disheartening. You've got the savings, whatever they are, sitting on the table. All we have to do it take out the property tax increase component and we can get pension reform done. What's kind of funny about this and, but very sad is when you found out that we were not working with you on the... the budget anymore the number of... the spending number increased by \$50 million. It kind of resorted to those old ways of spending by the Democrats. Spend more, tax more, borrow more, don't live within your means. So, before the day started we had a budget that was \$50 million less. Tonight you're about to pass a budget out the House that's 50 million more dollars than when we were working with you. I think it's indicative of... it is helpful when we work with you 'cause you can't control yourselves. You need to spend, you have an appetite that you can't control. You want to tax property... property owners when it comes to ways to solve problems. And you say if we're going to pass a budget on our own we have no choice but to spend an additional \$50 million. Even for us with a \$33 billion budget, \$50 million is a pretty

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

significant number. Fifty million more dollars, that's what happens when you're left to your own devices. If I didn't get that out, I'll say it one more time. Fifty million more dollars with the budget you have put together tonight to pass it. So, Mr. Speaker, if we're ever going to get out of this mess and I... I'm disheartened by it. A week ago I really thought we were... I really thought we were on the road to a path of recovery. Medicaid reform, retiree health care and then we hit a brick wall. We still can do pensions, I'm hopeful. I've talked to the Governor's Office a few minutes ago, I met with the Speaker this morning, we had a Leader's meeting a little while ago. We want to do pensions but we have to do it right and we have to do it without taxing downstate and suburban property owners to the tune of at least \$20 billion. So for those reasons, you will not see us supporting the budget. We remain committed to trying to get a pension Bill done. We do work better with you when we can come to consensus. That is good for us, that is positive for the state. We have shown a year ago that we wanted to work with you and we did. We also were told a year ago that we were going to do pension reform, didn't happen. We were told this year we were going to do pension reform, it's not happening. And so, for those reasons, I don't think you'll see a lot of votes on this side of the aisle. I'm sorry that you couldn't contain yourselves and keep the budget number where we had it. Fifty million dollars is a lot of money, but I guess it shows your true colors. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2332."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close on the Bill."

"Thank you, Speaker. First of all, let me point out Currie: that the 50 million is well within the budget resolutions, the spending resolutions that were adopted unanimously in this chamber for both fiscal '12 and fiscal '13. We are not exploding the caps, we are not going above the caps. We are well within the revenue numbers, the spending numbers, that the Members of this chamber, Republicans and Democrats approved some time ago. And let me say that Senate Bill 3145 is not a budget Bill, this is a Budget Implementation Bill and the provisions are those that we need to support in order to make the budget that ultimately will pass and will become the spending plan for fiscal '13. In order to make that work, we must pass this Bill. And I would appreciate having unanimous support as we ought to have for these provisions which were approved by both caucuses. What isn't in this Bill should not be a reason to vote 'no'. I encourage your 'aye' votes on Senate Bill 3146."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cross, the Lady has closed and you spoke in debate. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Cross: "Well, I... I'm curious. She referenced the fact that she was able to spend 50 more dol... 50 million more dollars that wasn't in the budget this morning but is in the budget tonight. I'd like the Lady to explain to the chamber and to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

the people of the State of Illinois why she can justify spending 50 more... 50 million more dollars tonight when this morning the budget did not include that extra 50 million dollars. It's an issue she brought up. And I'd like to explain to... have her explain to us the justification for that and how she did it."

Speaker Lang: "Well, Leader Currie has closed. And so, on the Motion the Lady moves for the passage of Senate Bill 3146. 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? Gaffney and Harris. Please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Majority... Minority Leader Cross."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mind you cutting me off like that and that's fine we'll... we'll deal with that. And I'm perfectly happy, we've got about 9 or 10 more of these Bills to do. But you had the presenter of the Bill explain to us in her closing that it was just another \$50 million different than this morning and it was well within the cap. And I think the people of the State of Illinois have the right to know why you changed a budget that this morning was \$50 million less and why and how you did that? And I don't know why you would be afraid to have somebody answer that question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Reboletti: "It's amazing, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we just found \$50 million under the mattress, maybe downstairs in the basement. I have providers, as do all of you, that are waiting nine months to a year to get paid. But now, because Republicans aren't joining us in a kumbaya, we can all change what we want to do and go back to the old ways. Only we can tell ourselves how to spend, you can't tell us how to spend it. I don't know what important things we just spent 50 more million dollars on. We just cut education \$200 million. Maybe that 50 million could have went back in the education budget, but no. Don't want to work anymore together, sobeit. But I don't know how we just found \$50 million when we have \$9 billion in unpaid Medicaid bills; we have \$80 billion in unfunded liabilities for pensions; we have people leaving the State of Illinois because the tax structure is screwed up. But we just found \$50 million. I don't know how to explain that to my constituents. I have no idea. We're broke, but we have \$50 million. I love your accounting methods."
- Speaker Lang: "Page 7 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2348,

 Mr. Clerk. This will be handled by Leader Currie. Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2348, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. If we could adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third, I would be grateful."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "And again, if we could adopt Amendment 3 and discuss the Bill on Third, I would be grateful."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, does this Bill have any additional revenue appropriated from the last time that we had seen the Bill, or there were negotiations?"

Currie: "Yeah. The only change in Amendment 3 would be to take the transfer out of the… it permits, again, the transfers to the Standardbred and the Thoroughbred Funds, which had been taken out by Amendment 2."

Reboletti: "Does this Bill..."

Currie: "But that's the only change."

Reboletti: "I'm sorry, Leader. Does this Bill at all deal with the closures of any..."

Currie: "No."

Reboletti: "...facilities throughout the state?"

Currie: "No."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Currie: "So, can we adopt..."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia, do you mind if... do you have a question on this Amendment or do you want to wait for Third Reading, Sir? Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of Amendment 4 say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment 4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2348, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you very much. Amendment 4 did become the Bill. And the issue with the standardbred and the thoroughbred horses was actually in a different Bill that we've already adopted. This the supplemental appropriation. is includes, first of all, some issues that are... that are relevant to the fiscal '13 budget and that is, we take off the top money to pay for items like group insurance, the pension fund. So, fiscal '13 spending is included in that... in that... in that amount. That... in addition, we are doing the fiscal '12, the current fiscal year supplemental and... and there are many items in this... in this Bill, many settlements of lawsuits. Most of the money... most of the money is going to pay for the shortfall in the group insurance program. In Amendment... we also did have an

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Amendment 3. The real Amendment 3 provided money so that the procurement officer could hire people to do the Medicaid eligibility, the verification of eligibility that we adopted when we did the major Medicaid reform. Again, I could discuss each of the items in the Bill, but it's lengthy, complex and primarily technical. So I'd be happy to answer any questions you have of specific portions of the Bill."

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

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia, you were not recognized for that purpose. Mr. Schmitz."

Schmitz: "Speaker, I... to the Bill. I appreciate the brevity and I... I for one here on our side of the aisle we want a full and open debate, but I think we should move it along as quickly as possible because if my calculations are right since we started this morning at 8 a.m. with budget votes in committee that we're adding about \$4.5 million every hour. So, if we can keep this thing moving so we stop that 50 million from getting larger."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how does this Bill address any debt service?"

Currie: "Yeah. It does make debt service and I think some of the appropriation is to put into the newly created fiscal '13 backlog payment fund."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "What does this do with respect to the old bills, with respect to Medicaid?"

Currie: "Pays down 1.3 billion."

Reboletti: "What does this Bill do with respect for the Chicago Teachers?"

Currie: "Gives them a... the statutorily required amount, about \$11 million."

Reboletti: "And that's nothing more than what we are required to give to that system, is that correct?"

Currie: "That's the statutory requirement, that's right."

Reboletti: "There's also some lawsuits that are settled here?"

Currie: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Do you know what the total..."

Currie: "There's one called <u>Dearden v. Miller</u>. It involved an accident involving an EPA employee. There's one settlement of <u>Benjamin v. the Illinois Department of Professional...</u>

<u>Financial and Professional Regulation</u>. And Randy Stitle, the chap that was found not guilty but had been on death row, he too was given an award... won an award."

Reboletti: "With respect to Floor Amendment #4 that you've offered or had offered, it says there's an extra \$500 thousand appropriation from GRF to the Board of Higher Education for Grow Your Own Teachers Program?"

Currie: "That's right. And the… as you may remember, the amount in that program had been in the current fiscal year, 2.5 million. In the Appropriations Committee, the amount was reduced by \$2 million to 500 thousand. And this Amendment would restore 500 thousand of that initial 2 million."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Reboletti: "To the Bill. Amazingly enough, we found another \$500 thousand in the last five minutes; now, we're at 50 million, 500 thousand. As Leader Schmitz indicated, I can only imagine what comes next."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia. I think you spoke in debate, Sir."
- Sacia: "I still want to adjourn, Sir. I'll wait until we're between Bills, if you'd recognize me then."
- Speaker Lang: "Possibly. It will be an appropriate time to get you. Mr. Rose."
- Rose: "Speaker, under House Rule 55(a)(2) a Motion to Adjourn is always in order even when it interrupts debate. And I confirmed that on Wikipedia as well."
- Speaker Lang: "We're going to take Mr. Sacia's Motion. The Gentleman has moved that the House stand adjourned and from the Chair, I will recommend that all Democrats vote 'no'. Those in favor of Mr. Sacia'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 55 voting 'yes', 63 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "I'm sorry. I'm assuming we're still on the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Sullivan: "Representative, back to the… the Grow Your Own money, a lot of how we're paying for this \$50 million in new revenue, supposedly, can you explain how we're going to pay for that?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Currie: "We stayed within the spending caps that were approved unanimously by this House of Representatives. We are not overspending; we are well within the... the limits for both fiscal '12 and fiscal '13. In fact, I'm told we're at least 4 million under the caps we approved."
- Sullivan: "So, you're taking transfers from last year to pay for all this. And so, you're going to tell me that you're not breaking the agreement that we made for fiscal year '12?"
- Currie: "That's right. We're staying within the... the spending level approved by this Assembly for fiscal '12. And we are within the amounts that were approved for fiscal '13."
- "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, for fiscal year Sullivan: '12 we had a cap in the amount of money we wanted to spend. And what we're doing now by the increase in \$50 million is we're going to prepay some bills, some transfers into this year thereby going over the cap that we all agreed to. I know the Majority Leader will say that we're not, but we've also talked about all the Medicaid transfers from before. And so, if we're using up all these transfers, how do we get to that? We break what we promised we wouldn't do. So, when you vote for this and 63 of you probably will, you're basically saying we agreed to not spend more money than a certain amount, but I lied. I'm going to just break it 'cause my Leader told me to. That's what's going to happen. So now the Majority Leader is saying, well, we're going to stand to these allotted money of 33.7 and some change. What happens next year when we're in the same position? We need to find more money to pass a budget. I believe that the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Majority Leader said, well, we got to pass a budget so we need to do this. What she's saying is, we've got some people that have more needs otherwise they're not going to vote for the budget. That's really what she's saying. So, we're going to break what we promised for this fiscal year and next year we'll probably break that too. And when I say we, collectively, I mean you. So go ahead and vote for this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Sacia: "I move to make a Motion that we table this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia, that requires a written Motion.

Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. There isn't \$50 million in this Bill. This is not a budget Bill; it's a Budget Implementation Bill. And it does deal with both... I'm sorry, it's the supplemental; it's not the \$50 million thing you're talking about. Pay attention to what's here, not with what's someplace else. And what this does do money off the top for fiscal '13 is take for responsibilities for group insurance, paying the Medicaid bills, paying the old Medicaid bills, \$1.3 billion. Isn't it time that we went right ahead and did that, get that out of our way, get that done, behave responsibly with fiscal restraint. We are in this measure just making sure we have the transfers for fiscal '12 that will make it possible for us to stay within our limits. The only responsible vote on this Bill is a 'yes'."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "The Lady has closed. The Chair will recognize the Minority Leader who has now turned his light off. So, I'm not sure what he wants to do."
- Cross: "I want to be respectful of the rules. I'll wait 'til the next Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes'; 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Cross, did you wish to speak at this time? Gentleman declines to speak. Chair recognizes Mr. Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I filed a Motion to reconsider."
- Speaker Lang: "On that Motion, Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Yeah, I move to... to let that Motion lie on the table."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to give Mr. Sacia his Roll Call. The Gentleman has moved that the House reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2348 passed. Those in favor of Mr. Sacia's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed will vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Davis, Leitch, Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'yes', 64 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. The next Bill on the Calendar is Senate Bill 2378, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. And I'd move to adopt Amendments #1 and 3. And please withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment #2. The Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I'm going to wait 'til we debate the Bill on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the House adopt Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 2378 without... without objection we'll take them on one Roll Call... or one vote. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And both Amendments are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I'd like to... will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor hasn't explained the Bill yet, Sir, but he will yield to you as soon as he does."

Cross: "That's fine."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members. The... this is basically the... one of the Bills out of the General Services Appropriations. Just for the record, we cut \$51.2 million from fiscal year '12, pre-supplemental, which translates to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- almost \$200 million cut from what was requested. I'll be happy to take any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Minority Leader Cross."
- Cross: "Representative, we didn't get an answer earlier from one the previous Sponsors of one of the budget Bills. Can you explain to us, in the totality of the budget situation, why the budget increased by \$50 million from this morning 'til tonight?"
- Crespo: "Leader Cross, I would be glad to answer any questions in regards to this particular Bill. I cannot answer that question."
- Cross: "Well, this is part of an overall budget and you are one of the approp folks. You... this morning were part of a process that had a budget that was \$50 million less than this morning and now it's increased by 50 million more dollars. We'd like somebody to explain to us why it went up by \$50 million tonight?"
- Crespo: "Again, Leader Cross, I believe that we were still under what we said we were going to be under."
- Cross: "I'm not sure what that means. But what I do want an answer to is why is this budget 50..."
- Crespo: "Leader, let me..."
- Cross: "Let me ask... finish the question. Why is this budget 50 million more dollars than the budget was this morning?"
- Crespo: "Well, let me... let me just add something here, Leader Cross. Last Thursday we had a meeting with Speaker Madigan, yourself and some of the approp chairs. And in that meeting, we were told that Republicans were not going to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

support our Bills unless... unless we kept some institutions open. Where we going to find the money? We didn't know. But you know what, your folks decided you wanted that otherwise you were not going to play ball. And we had a hard time because some of the folks in my caucus said, wait a second, how is it possible that we're working on our budgets, we have been told you have to cut Medicaid, you have to cut education, you have to cut a lot of the services that a lot of folks here represent and they played ball. But Leader Cross, you came over to us and said, well, we can't close these institutions otherwise you know what, we cannot support your Bills. And surprisingly you know what, we did find the money."

Cross: "I got it. I get it. All right."

Crespo: "Isn't that something."

Cross: "Now, Representative, I'm asking you one more time.

Representative Currie didn't answer it and I'd hoped that
you could. Why is the budget 50 million more dollars
tonight than it was this morning? It's a very simple
question, I think."

Crespo: "Well, it's not. Leader Cross, what you're asking is not on this Bill. If you want to ask a question in regards to this Bill, I'd be more than happy to answer that."

Cross: "Are you... do you not know why it went up \$50 million?"

Crespo: "There's not \$50 million more in this Bill. As I said when I... when I opened earlier, Leader Cross, we actually cut in this appropriation budget \$51.2 million from fiscal year '12, presupplemental, which translates into \$200 million cut from what was requested from these agencies. So

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

this Bill that I'm talking about now, that I'm introducing, actually is cutting from fiscal year '12, presupplemental."

Cross: "I think the point is, is we've tried to make in the last half hour, 45 minutes, is that once we got into this arrangement tonight and you went down the road, no one has denied that it's 50 million more dollars, Representative. We have approximately \$8 billion of unpaid bills. I guess my question to you would be, why wouldn't you take that \$50 million and pay down those bills?"

Crespo: "Which \$50 million, Leader Cross?"

Cross: "The \$50 million that appeared tonight in the budget process, 50 million more dollars than the budget that we had this morning that has now grown by 50 million. Why don't you use that to pay down bills?"

Crespo: "Leader Cross, again, with all due respect, the \$50 million that I know about... it's 51.2 that this committee cut from fiscal year '12, presupplemental. The \$50 million that you're alleging that this is additional... an increase is not part of this Bill."

Cross: "Okay. Thank you for the... the answers."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Sir, can you tell me, is there anything in this appropriation Bill or in the subsequent appropriation Bill that you're going to put forward that is above what we worked on in committee or..."

Crespo: "No, there's not."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Harris, D.: "So, this Bill contains everything that we worked on in committee and nothing else?"

Crespo: "Well, we're actually like... actually below what we were told to spend, Representative, a couple million dollars below like we did last year."

Harris, D.: "So we haven't added anything to this Bill or your subsequent Bill?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Watson: "Representative, did any Members of your caucus ask for any facilities to be put back in the budget?"

Crespo: "Any Members of my caucus? I'm pretty sure we have some downstaters that have the same concerns, yes."

Watson: "Well you seem pretty affirmative when you stated that our side came to you and said we had some wishes. Do you have any Members that came in and said, gee, I would like to save my... my prison, maybe?"

Crespo: "Well, they're supporting the budget, Representative.

They're supporting this budget. And the point I was trying to make was that some allegations are being made..."

Watson: "I'm sorry, John, what?"

Crespo: "We're... they're support... downstaters here are supporting the budget."

Watson: "Are they?"

Crespo: "As far as I know, the downstaters on... on this side are supporting the budget."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Watson: "Do you find that amazing... shockingly amazing that two days ago, three days ago they wanted to meet with us? And now all of the sudden the way this is all coming about that they... they are happy? I wonder why that is?"

Crespo: "I can't speak... say whether they're happy or not."

Watson: "If you had to guess, what would you think, Rep?"

Crespo: "All... all... hey, listen, all I know is we started this process, we met with your side early on."

Watson: "Right. Right."

Crespo: "We tried to come up with a framework. And there was some discussions early on, Representative, trying to determine, okay, what do we do, what would you like? And one of the things that we talked about is how much do we take off the top to pay unpaid bills?"

Watson: "To the Bill."

Crespo: "And..."

Watson: "To the Bill. Here's the deal, you know that we worked with you. You know that people over here took votes that maybe they didn't have to take in good faith. And now you know this, that, yeah, your downstaters are taken care of. And where is everybody else? Hanging the bag. What lesson do you think you're leaving for next year or the year after? You want to run it alone? You want to go down on this ship alone, then do it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. This is like a game of Clue. I think I actually found what happened to the \$51 million. We cut all of these things for \$51 million and then we simply moved it into a different line item. Ladies and Gentlemen, just

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

follow the money. Cut the Comptroller, cut all these other agencies, you name it. So we were supposed to save money. Where did the savings go? To a different line item; it's sleight of hand. We didn't save any money. I just found the \$51 million. That money should be going to pay down our debt, but no, we have extra money now to go spend on other things. This is just ridiculous. The idea was to work together to try to solve our problems, but now maybe we'll... I can't wait 'til the next Bill we'll find some extra walking around money for whatever other pet projects we have."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think part of the problem is we found out that we didn't have the money to close the facilities. But I think the \$50 million certainly did a little walkout when we found out that House Republicans were no longer on it. And so, \$50 million will now be divided up in little perks that go out to Members on the other side in order to get them to vote for the budget."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have Speaker Madigan explain why we're going down this ridiculous road."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan is not in the Chair at the moment."

Sacia: "I know he's not in the Chair, but he is the Leader of this chamber and he's standing up there with you. And I hope to God he stays in the chamber because if he leaves it's shameful. This is a shame, Mr. Speaker. It's absolutely sinful that we have an opportunity, after weeks

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

of working together on the budget, but now we're going to play hardball. I wonder how many Members on the other side of the aisle are aware that our Leader Tom Cross has a daughter with Type 1 diabetes. Mr. Durkin has a daughter with Type 1 diabetes. And all of the sudden diabetes is zeroed out of the entire budget. This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. Speaker Madigan, who is the same as the rest of us, but he's been in charge here for many years, is playing hardball and some kind of a game after we have all worked so hard for so many weeks. We're less than 30 hours from adjournment and all of a sudden we're going to show those Republicans what we can do. Is this what we're all about? This is shameful."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Partly in response to previous debate, I did not take the position that I would not adopt a state budget unless I got some other issue. Let me say that again. I did not take the position that I would not adopt this budget for the entire State of Illinois unless I got some other issue that I selected. Concerning the recent arrangements in the budget, earlier, this chamber adopted a spending resolution cap. It \$33,719,000,000, \$33,719,000,000. cap at adjustments today occurred because there was a interest on the part of both Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Cross and I worked through to provide an appropriation for all of the facilities where the Governor is proposing to close the facilities. Mr. Cross and I personally went to committee. We explained to the committee that we could work

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

through the budget, we could provide that there would be an appropriation so that all of the facilities proposed to be closed by the Governor would have an appropriation. And it was fully explained to every Member of the committee that despite the appropriation, the Governor has the ability to close the facilities. I repeated that several times before the committee so there'd no confusion among Democrats or Republicans. That what we were proposing to do was to provide that the appropriation, the authority to spend would be such that the facilities could be kept open. But as always, the Governor can close facilities if he so wishes. Today... and by the way, that money came from FY12 money, not FY13 money, FY12 money. So you might arque, well, that money could have been used to pay bills. You might argue that. Well, it won't be used to pay bills, but it will be used as an appropriation so the facilities will have an appropriation. And again, that was a joint program. Next, today, we provided an additional \$50 million for the general state aid formula and we did that because of gains through refinancing the state debts, and the money was dedicated to schools. All of that having been done, this would provide for a total appropriation 33 billion, 714 million, which is 4.4 million under the cap that was established earlier in the spending resolution. Thank you very much for your interest."

Speaker Lang: "Minority Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to have a debate without emotion. And I would point out that when we had that discussion with the approp committees

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

about the facilities we did have some consensus from both sides. But today our point is we are now spending an additional 50 million over and above that. And that is what's troubling; 50 million over and above that. But Mr. Speaker, perhaps now would be a time to discuss why this has broken down. I did condition working with you on having a pension Bill. I did it a year ago and I got pushed aside at the end and I let it go. It's a controversial issue; much to my chagrin it didn't happen. But this year, time and time again when we met I said, Mr. Speaker, I got to do pension reform. It's something our caucus wants, it's something the state needs. We have an \$85 billion unfunded liability. Our systems are going to go bankrupt or we're going to have to cut other budgets. I know, Tom, we're going to do it, we're going to do it, we're going to do it. Every week I said, I got to know, are we going to do it? We're going to do pension reform. So, my question, Mr. Speaker, is and you knew where I was on that, I said I had to have it as a condition of the budget. Why not take out the cost shift? Why not, not tax downstate and suburban schools? Let's grab those savings today, whatever they are. They may be 50 billion, they may be 30, they may be 60. Let's pass a pension reform Bill without a cost shift tonight. Tonight or tomorrow morning and be done with it. We get the budget done, we'd have done Medicaid, we've done pensions, we've done retiree health care. A successful Session with bipartisan collaborative effort and be done with it. And my question to you is, why not? Why not do it?

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

I think the people of the State of Illinois deserve an answer."

Madigan: "Mr. Cross, the Pension Committee will meet tomorrow morning."

Cross: "Without the shift, we'll consider a Bill?"

Madigan: "The Pension Committee will meet tomorrow morning."

Cross: "And what does that mean?"

Madigan: "It means that the committee will meet tomorrow morning."

Cross: "And what will they hear?"

Madigan: "They'll hear whatever they want to hear."

Cross: "Well, we know what it takes to have a pension Bill. We know what will pass the House, what will pass the Senate and what the Governor will sign. And we can do it without the cost shift, without the \$20 billion property tax increase on downstate and suburban schools. Then we can pass a pension Bill, finish up the budget process, have a successful Session. Can we expect that tomorrow morning?"

Madigan: "I'm not going to offer you any predictions. I'm just telling you the committee will meet tomorrow morning."

Cross: "Well, that is a shame, Mr. Speaker, that we can't get an answer. It's one of the reasons we're here today in this mess. It's one of the reasons you saw Representative Bost express some frustration yesterday. It's one of the people... reason the people of this state continue to be amazed at why the state is in a complete disarray. Why we can't get rid of an \$85 billion unfunded liability, why a budget passes tonight 50 million more dollars than it was this morning. Because we continue... continue to go down the road

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

of not wanting to address the real fundamental problems and the inability to control the chronic spending that has gone on in this state year in and year out and unfortunately continues tonight. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Lang: "Returning to the Lady's Bill... the Gent... Oh, excuse me. I lost track, Sir. Mr. Crespo to close."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. We have another Bill after this, but you know, let me first of all, I want to thank Minority Spokesperson Sandy Cole who sat on the committee, Al Riley who's the... the vice chair. We... we worked on... on these Bills the way we... people expected us to work together. And I'm very proud of the work that we did. Not only did we do what we were supposed to do, but I think we actually built some strong relationships as well. I sure do hope that all of this will pass with time and that we build on what we've done so far and keep doing what's right for the state. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill 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 64 voting 'yes', 54 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2409, Mr. Crespo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2409, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Crespo."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to adopt Amendments #2 and 5. And please withdraw Amendments 2... Pardon Me."

Speaker Lang: "Just to... just to alleviate confusion..."

Crespo: "...I'm sorry."

Speaker Lang: "...let's do... let's do, Mr. Crespo, let's do one
Amendment at a time. Start with the first one and tell us
what you want to with it."

Crespo: "Amendment #... hold on one second. Amendment #2 actually becomes the Bill, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "We're told it's numbers 4 and 5, Sir. Would that be correct?"

Crespo: "One second, please."

Speaker Lang: "While we're sorting this out, Mr. Reboletti, would it be all right with you if we move all of this to Third Reading and do our debate there? Thank you. Out of... we're going to take this out of the record, Mr. Crespo. We'll move on to the next Bill; we'll come back to you. The next Bill is Senate Bill 2413, Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2413, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Rose for a Motion."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Rule 55(a)(8) and (c), I previously filed a Motion in Writing to recommit this Bill

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- to Rules. Under Rule (c)... subpart (c), that precludes all Amendments and debate on the question."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved that this Bill be recommitted to the Rules Committee. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Franks, Mr. Leitch, Mr. Mitchell. Mr. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'yes', 63 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. Mr. Rose, while you're standing there yelling, I will tell you that there were no lights on when you finished your remarks. Your Motion has failed. Mr. Davis on his Motion."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we'd like to adopt Floor Amendment #3, which becomes the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker... Oh, I need to withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "Okay. Let's start with that."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Rose, we're in the middle of a Bill. I can call on you when I get to you. Your light is on... Mr. Rose, your light is on. I see it here and I will get to you when we get to you. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment #3 makes two changes to the overall Bill. As was

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

stated earlier, it includes an additional \$50 million that will be added to the general state aid formula as well as it includes \$500 thousand that will be put into the arts and foreign language line. That's what Amendment #3 does. I'd like to go ahead and adopt that Amendment and then we can debate the rest of the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, is it all right with you if we adopt the Amendment?"

Reboletti: "No."

Speaker Lang: "All right. The Chair recognizes Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although the... you've now ruled. Under House Rule 54(a)(2), that Motion should have been assigned Standard Debate status pursuant to House Rule 52(a)(2), which meant that I should have been given an opportunity to speak in favor of the Motion. There should have been people allowed the opportunity to speak against the Motion, I should have been allowed the opportunity to speak in closing on the Motion. I have another one pending. I hope you'll do that the next time around."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Rose. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, J.: "Representative Davis, I understand there's been some more money put in some of the line items that were not there initially?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, I just spoke of the arts and foreign language line, Sir."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Mitchell, J.: "Well, that was only used as an example, Sir. Has more money been added to or subtracted from early childhood?"
- Davis, W.: "More money or subtracted to early childhood?"
- Mitchell, J.: "Pardon?"
- Davis, W.: "It remains the same that we passed out of committee, Sir."
- Mitchell, J.: "Okay. Do we still have the parent mentoring program?"
- Davis, W.: "Yes, we do have the parent mentoring programs."
- Mitchell, J.: "And that's funded at a million dollars?"
- Davis, W.: "I believe so."
- Mitchell, J.: "One million dollars. Can you tell me what that program is?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, it's an opportunity, so I understand it and I think we both heard the same explanation for..."
- Mitchell, J.: "I never heard an explanation."
- Davis, W.: "Well, that means you must have missed the meeting that day."
- Mitchell, J.: "If I missed a meeting, Sir, it was because I wasn't told there was a meeting."
- Davis, W.: "Well, then that's your staff's responsibility, not mine. So... so, if you want to talk about it, then we'll talk about it."
- Mitchell, J.: "Well, we... I would like to talk about it, that's what my question was."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, the parent mentoring program is an opportunity for parents to receive training to be able to help in schools... in classroom settings."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Mitchell, J.: "To receive training from whom?"

Davis, W.: "From whom?"

Mitchell, J.: "That's what I said."

Davis, W.: "From the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant Refugee Rights."

Mitchell, J.: "That's who's going to train them?"

Davis, W.: "Yes. They already have a program that does this type of training and they would provide the additional training based on what was allocated in our committee."

Mitchell, J.: "So, they already had the program? Was it a volunteer program then?"

Davis, W.: "What do you mean is it a volunteer program?"

Mitchell, J.: "You said the… we already had that program and they're going to continue to train them."

Davis, W.: "No, I said they had the program already, Sir."

Mitchell, J.: "Who's they?"

Davis, W.: "The organization who I just named."

Mitchell, J.: "Okay. So they already had the program without the funding?"

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

Mitchell, J.: "They already had the program without the funding? That's what you're telling me?"

Davis, W.: "This will allow their program to expand, Sir."

Mitchell, J.: "Pardon?"

Davis, W.: "This will allow that program to be expanded to include, I believe, approximately 40 new schools statewide."

Mitchell, J.: "And who were they serving before?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Davis, W.: "I believe mainly... mainly Chicago area and suburban Cook."
- Mitchell, J.: "And now it's going to be statewide?"
- Davis, W.: "That is the opportunity for it to go statewide, Sir."
- Mitchell, J.: "Do we have any indication of how many students statewide need this kind of mentoring program?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, it's not students. This is about parents."
- Mitchell, J.: "Oh, so it's not going to kids it's going to parents?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, it's a parent mentoring program. I believe that's what you called it, correct?"
- Mitchell, J.: "That's what it says in the analysis."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, I just wanted to make sure we're on the same page. It's a parent mentoring program that would train parents to be able to go into classroom settings."
- Mitchell, J.: "So we're going to train parents to mentor students and they're going to go into the classroom? Do we have any research that shows that program was successful before?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I don't have any research that says it was not successful."
- Mitchell, J.: "I've got a lot of programs like that, Representative."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. I'm... you asked if I had some research and no I don't."
- Mitchell, J.: "The problem is, Sir, is that this state is leaking very badly. The ship has almost sunk. Here we are at a time when we have to tighten the belt. We don't have

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

as much money to spend as we had before. And we're going to add a brand new program for \$1 million, hasn't been tested. We don't even know what it is and that's the problem with this budget. We are losing money in general state aid. We didn't get the increase that was requested in early childhood, which means we're going to leave out a lot of kids, but yet, we can still have Teach for America, parent mentoring, about 10 other programs that could get along for a year..."

Davis, W.: "Representative, it was not 10 others programs. If you're going to... if you're going to say it, then at least be accurate. It was not 10 programs."

Mitchell, J.: "How many was it?"

Davis, W.: "If... I think it was 5, Sir."

Mitchell, J.: "I believe it was more than that, so let's be accurate."

Davis, W.: "I believe it was 5 programs."

Mitchell, J.: "You don't know anymore than I do, Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "It wasn't 10, Representative."

Mitchell, J.: "The problem is we're funding these programs at a time we're cutting general state aid, that we're cutting early childhood, and we're keeping those programs alive that could survive for a year without funding. We've done it before."

Davis, W.: "Right."

Mitchell, J.: "But yet, this committee chooses to reduce the money to children in the classroom through general state aid to keep programs alive for adults."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

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

Mitchell, J.: "I... that is a problem with the... To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm sorry, but we didn't prioritize things in this budget. We just simply had a sidebar meeting where any program you liked, you got money for. This is a bad, bad, bad Bill to quote another Representative that uses that phrase. We did a poor job with this. That's my opinion. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "We are all very passionate about education and making sure that every child has the opportunity to reach their full potential. It's not about how much we are spending in education, it's about how we are choosing to spend those dollars. This committee did not stay within appropriated authority level of House Bill 76. That's great, education got 50 million... or \$500 thousand more. We don't know who suffered at the hands of that. Some Legislators support programs and specific initiatives that serve only a limited number of students when there are 2,087,628 public school students in this state to be educated. Our mission should have been to make sure that the programs we included serve the largest number of students across the state in the best possible way. Many of us on the Appropriations Committee kept our eye on general aid funding hoping to give our schools flexibility with the most dollars possible by allowing them to keep their best practices that serve children well. We

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

did not do that in this education budget. We did cut \$161,352,014 and that is at a 90… 89 percent appropriation rate… proration rate. We reduced early childhood by \$24.9 million. Transportation is flat at \$205 million; that's a 74 proration rate from last year. Chairman Will Davis, the committee and the staff worked very hard to reach consensus, but there was a split vote on that committee. I just hope that each of you have taken the time to read this very important Bill. You can decide if you are serving all the children that we are responsible to educate in the best possible way. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... again, I'm not sure there's an increase of \$50 million in general state aid. Where did that increase in \$50 million occur as well as the arts and foreign language \$500 thousand come from?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I believe as it was stated earlier, Representative, the \$50 million came from the restructuring of some... of some debts. And they took the dollars that were saved by that restructuring and increased general state aid by \$50 million."

Reboletti: "Was that what the committee had agreed upon prior to the last 48 hours?"

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

Reboletti: "Was that what the committee had agreed upon notwithstanding the last 48 hours?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Davis, W.: "Well, I can honestly tell you that, Representative, I think everyone on our committee wanted more money in general state aid. So, we did not meet to discuss this, but I'm explaining to you that some debt was restructured which created \$50 million that was put in general state aid."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I can appreciate the fact that we want to spend as much money as possible on education. Being the parent of a fourth grader, I understand that completely. But when we look at increasing things, \$50 million, \$51 million and we don't use that to pay down old debt, what is the message that we're sending? We should be using every last dollar that we can save by whatever means those dollars are accrued to pay down old debt, to refurbish the pension funds, anything that will help get us out of this total process of eliminating everything which is supposed to be important to us. The fact of the matter is, is that we are \$80 billion in debt with our pensions and \$9 billion in debt with our Medicaid bills. We're not making any debt with this here, we simply need to spend appropriately. This does not achieve that measure. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Despite all of the back and forth that has been taking place, I do want to take the opportunity to thank the Republican Members of the committee who at least up until a certain point worked bipartisan with us on formulating a budget. There were probably some things that none of us liked in the budget; we all would have preferred to see more money in general state aid. We didn't necessarily want to see the cuts in

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

early childhood, but as was mentioned earlier, we started this process with House Resolution 706, something that many of... many of you on your side of the aisle voted for. So that set us down the path that we were going to have to make cuts in those areas. Now maybe you don't want to admit to that, but that's how we got where we are. So the fact that some additional dollars were found that we could put back in general state aid to help deal with our proration why should I be ashamed of that? Why should I be ashamed of pushing more money into the classroom? And to one of the previous speakers that talked about some of the lines that we put money back in, he neglected to include agriculture education, something that he supports. He supports that line. So maybe you don't like this budget, in some respects I don't either. But this is the hand that we were dealt when we voted on House Resolution 706. If you'd like me to pull up the Roll Call, I'll be more than happy to do so and read off the names of people on your side of the aisle that voted for it. So, here we are. So, if you decide not to vote on this education budget, obviously, that's your choice. But you know what, I'm going to support as much money in general state aid as I can. So, if you don't want support it, I hope that you tell your school superintendents that you did not support additional \$50 million in general state aid. If you support it, great, I certainly hope that you do, but this was the best education budget that we could come up with; under the circumstances, I encourage you to support it. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

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

 Mr. Mitchell, for what reason do you rise?"
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe my name was used in debate."
- Speaker Lang: "Sir... Sir, the Chair rules your name was not used in debate. Representative Kosel."
- Kosel: "I yield my time to Representative Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "You have no time; we're between items here. Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, next Amendment."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2413, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We had some debate as it relates to the Amendment. We've adopted the amended... Amendment. This is the Bill. You have any additional questions, be more than happy to answer them."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, number one, I did not support the money to go into ag education simply because that was a curriculum item, but I talked against that, I even tried to explain to some of my Members that that's not the program they thought it was. That's a curriculum program; the curriculum's already there. That money could have been used in general state aid and not funded that line item. We counted up 8 line items just off the top of our heads. So, my 10 wasn't far off because if I

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

grabbed the Bill I could probably find a few more. This is not a good Bill. We didn't do the best job we could. There was too much sidebar. There were too many times that decisions were made such as the money in bilingual was reduced at one time, and when we came back to the next meeting, it was raised. There was no discussion. Ladies and Gentlemen, we could have done a much... much better job. I still reiterate my own claim of a good vote is a 'no' vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Chapa LaVia: "Representative Davis, there... you've placed in 50 million new dollars into general state aid, all right. Is that correct, Sir?"

Davis, W.: "Correct."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. And what was the thought behind not putting more money in early childhood or special ed?"

Davis, W.: "What was the reason why?"

Chapa LaVia: "Why you didn't put more money into those two categories when you had the opportunity? I mean, from the 50 million you could have supplanted some of that money back into what was taken out of early childhood and special education."

Davis, W.: "Well, if I... if I understand your question correctly..."

Chapa LaVia: "Right."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Davis, W.: "...you talked about special ed and early childhood, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, Sir."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, we funded special ed at the appropriate level to make sure that we were meeting our maintenance of effort obligations with the Federal Government."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "That's one thing."

Chapa LaVia: "Let's stop there for a second. Do you know Illinois is 51 compared to all 50 states behind Columbia in the way we fund special needs in education? Do you understand that?"

Davis, W.: "I don't disagree, Representative."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Okay. And then now the special... I mean early childhood."

Davis, W.: "In early childhood, we based our decision with early childhood dollars based on the State Board of Education's information that they provided for us. They made... they suggested that there be reductions based on previous years where there were applications..."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "...that were not funded as a result."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay."

Davis, W.: "Appli... some applications were even withdrawn."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. And I know this is painful for you I know it's painful 'cause you have always been in it for the kids like I have. But... to the Bill. I want to explain some stuff. Over the last 4 years we have socked out of early childhood 80 million... \$80 million out of early childhood.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Now, when you look at the correlation with the school district that is often forgotten in our correctional system, Juvenile Justice Department, what you find in the correlation is that about 80 percent of our children the less... 1 thousand... I think there's about a 1,011 in the Juvenile Justice that they had no early childhood. They didn't have the ability like most neighborhoods that are more affluent to have preschool. So, when they start Kindergarten, if they do start Kindergarten, already two years behind their fellow colleagues and never catch up. And what now you find is that deterioration of an educational system that everybody here who's been here more than 10 years, and Mr. Miller up there can tell you who's been fighting for equitable education dollars for all kids across the state, has deteriorated year after year after year. I have to agree with my colleagues, Representative Pihos and Representative Jerry Mitchell about education, the dollars. I can't say it strong enough. We have never, ever put enough money into education in the State of Illinois. And as long as you don't put enough money there, you're going to get the results we have and the deficits we have that we have to deal with. Whether it's paying \$72 thousand a year to incarcerate a juvenile and not paying money you need to in preschool, we're going to get what we get, Democrats. We're going to get what we get. Okay. And Republicans, you understand this 'cause you're paying for them too. Because it's coming out of your money to support somebody that's in juvenile justice 'cause we didn't supply early childhood dollars. Early childhood and special needs

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

kids are drastically growing across the country. It's something astronomical. What are the numbers, Sandy, about kids that have Autism? Male children who have Autism in the State of Illinois... what it's something like 6 out of 10 kids or something like this. It's astronomical, okay? So, I'm just telling you, we're going to hit the wall. I know, I know, I love him like a brother. Representative Davis has done a good job being the Appropriation Chair. I used to be it and I think it's a double-edge sword whether I don't have it or have it this year. But I go to sleep sometimes worrying about my babies. One thing it's not equitable is education we derived from birth. So, please, you know, I know all the hard work you did on the committee. I will not be supporting this on the grounds that we have never, ever, ever, ever given enough money and attention to education in the State of Illinois. And the end result is more dollars into welfare, more dollars into prisons, more dollars out there which we should be educating them, giving a great possibility in life so they can make good paying jobs. Right? So, I will be standing in a strong 'no' on this piece of legislation, this budget. I apologize, but I cannot vote for this again a year. Taking away more money away from early childhood and taking away more money from special needs kids. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell, this time your name was used in debate. Please proceed."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Sir. And just to answer the Lady's question just a little bit. Although the Illinois State Board of Education gave us information that was three weeks

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

old when they got it to us and told us later that that might not be quite accurate, early child came to us later after the decisions were made to put money in programs and told us how much money they were going to lose. So, they are getting a tremendous cut, you're right, Representative Chapa LaVia. That is happening. And it's unfortunate because that's one of the areas that really truly need the money along with general state aid. These other programs, parent mentoring and all of the rest could survive a year because they're dealing with adults not with children. That's the problem with the budget. And when you start going to individual Members and allowing their individual loves, then you have to take the money from somewhere. Therefore, that's why we wound up with the kind of cut we have in general state aid and early education. Doesn't make the Bill any better. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I'm not sure how we could have put more money into education. Last year we just raised \$7 billion with a 67 percent income tax hike. How soon we forget. Imagine if we would have kept our books straight, we would have not taken money out of pensions and spent more than we had. That tax hike could have went into the classroom, maybe avoided people going to prison. Nobody wants to send children to prison. That's not a... a great investment. Obviously it costs more, but the simple fact is you have overspent. And now these are the ramifications of 10 years of failed policy."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos, your name was used in debate. Please proceed."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Several things. Number one, when we asked the State Board of Education to go through their exercise we didn't have \$50 million more of appropriation authority to spend. So, again, I would remind this Body I would put a 'no' vote on this because the Education Appropriations Committee went above the spending authority as authorized in House Resolution 706. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the of early childhood. I really take that as misinformation that Republicans on this side of the aisle haven't worked on early childhood. Since Jim Edgar was Governor and put out the first early childhood task force, we were there. I've always worked on early childhood. I've been on Human Services-Appropriations for I don't know how many years, probably 20 'cause this is my twentieth year, 18 of which I was either the Chair or the Minority Spokesman. I served on Edgar's task force. When we had money... extra money to bring home, I put money into my school district, \$300 thousand that went for bilingual and education in early childhood. I know many Members on this side of the aisle who put more money into early childhood and it was one of their most important issues. I think it's really a fallacy to say that the people on this side don't care. They understand the importance of early childhood. It's one of the issues that you can't retrieve; you're only

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

4 or 5 once and that's really important. We were there when we went for the early Kindergarten; we were there when it went for bilingual. We've been there for all of that for... over these years. Quite frankly, I think the Lady misspoke. Perhaps she hasn't been here as long as I have. But quite frankly, we have been big supporters of early childhood, one of the biggest in this state. And this caucus has been right out there working as hard as they could in that area."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Thank you. Last year we had a very contentious vote on the House Floor concerning regional superintendents and at that time there was a decision made by this Body, not with my support by the way, that we would fund regional superintendents out of PPRT, Personal Property Replacement Tax. And that decision was made on this House Floor and it said that we would do that for one year. To the Sponsor. Is the \$12 million for regional superintendents that is in this budget now going to be taken out of PPRT?"

Davis, W.: "That is correct."

Kosel: "So we are breaking our own word here on the floor, Ladies and Gentlemen. We are saying that even though we said that would only happen for one year, that it will now happen for a second year in the amount of \$12 million out of PPRT. Just so you are aware. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Appreciate all the comments. Again, if anybody heard me when we voted on House Resolution 706, I told you that this would be painful moving forward. I guess some of you didn't believe me. But here we are talking about the pain that is taking place because we had to make cuts to programs that are extremely important to many of you on both sides of the aisle. But those are the cards that we were dealt. We were dealt with a 4 percent cut from the previous year. So for those of you who are suggesting that we needed to put more money into special ed, which I don't disagree with, or more money into early childhood, which I don't agree with, the question was where was it going to come from? Because House Resolution 706 said that we were going to have 4 percent less. Now just like for those of you who were supporting facilities, prisons and other things, there was dollars found to help support those facilities , so I ask for more money to help support general state aid. And I was granted that opportunity with additional \$50 million. So, again, for those of you who don't want to vote for the budget, fine, I understand. But believe me, I'm not going to wear the jacket for not voting for an additional \$50 million. Hopefully your superintendents will hear the debate and will know that you voted not to give them an additional \$50 million. For those of you who know what general state aid does, if nothing else it is the most flexible line of spending that a school district has, which means that they can take those dollars and fund any of the things that we've already talked about if it's their choice. If it's

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

their choice, they can do that. Hopefully, they will use these dollars wisely and will fund programs that we couldn't fund currently in this budget. So again, thank you very much. Thank you all that participated in the process. I'm sorry it had to come to this, where you're not going to vote for it, but, oh well, I guess that's the way things happen here in Springfield. So for those of you who are going to support the budget, please do so because this is the best budget that we could come up with under the circumstances. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Brauer, Costello, Dunkin. Mr. Brauer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes' and 58 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, returning to Senate Bill 2409, Mr. Crespo. All right. Mr. Clerk for an announcement."

Clerk Hollman: "Corrected Committee Report. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2378 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2409."

Speaker Lang: "Now returning to Senate Bill 2409, Mr. Crespo.

Please read the Bill."

Crespo: "Thank you."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2409, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2,

 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor

 Amendment #2 has been filed by Representative Crespo."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo on Amendment 2. Mr. Reboletti, may we just adopt the Amendment? Is this that Amendment you want to move, Mr. Crespo?"
- Crespo: "Yes, Speaker, 2 and 5."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr... withdraw Amendment #4, Mr. Clerk. Please proceed Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Crespo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Amendment #5 just makes some technical changes to the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2409, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. And Speaker, it's Mr. Crespo for you. The… the Bill… never mind. The Bill, actually what it does, it… it's the second part of the appropriations for general services. And it appropriates in GRF \$386.9 million, all funds 6.2. The difference from fiscal year '12 is a decrease of 12 percent in GRF and 1.5 for all funds. Take any 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."

Reboletti: "Representative, does this Bill contain the Department of Natural Resources?"

Crespo: "Yes, it does."

Reboletti: "At any time during your hearings did the Department of Natural Resources come to you to ask you for additional resources, especially in the area of Conservation Police?"

Crespo: "Representative, I know as far as DNR they actually came asking for less than what was appropriated in fiscal year '13. And as a rule in our committee, those agencies that came under fiscal year '12 presupplemental, we did not get to them until later on, if we had to and in this case we did not. So, they... they got basically what... what they asked for."

Reboletti: "I'm... I'm just trying to figure out why they asked for less money and now there's a Bill that's trying to move around here asking to raise license plates \$2 a plate and all kinds of other fees. I'm not sure why they didn't just tell you that they had a shortfall that they needed to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- fill. Did you try to accommodate them? Did they ask... did they tell you they had a shortfall?"
- Crespo: "Representative, they... they made their request like all the other agencies. This committee was just looking through those and in this case, this is all they asked. And we gave them what they asked because they came below fiscal year '12 presupplemental. What was behind their reasoning, Representative Reboletti, I can't tell you that."
- Reboletti: "With respect to the Gaming Board, Representative, I see there's a 4.3 percent change. Could you explain what that line item is?"
- Crespo: "One second. I think because of the video gaming implementation they are making some assumptions where they believe they're going to need more help with additional police. So they need more revenue, more funds to do that."

Reboletti: "Where is that revenue coming from?"

- Crespo: "And just for the record, there's no GRF; it's all from other state funds by the way."
- Reboletti: "What... with respect to the Court of Claims, I see that's up 2 and a half percent, is that correct? Or am I reading that wrong?"
- Crespo: "One second. I'm sorry, Sir, you say you see an increase in the Court of Claims?"

Reboletti: "That's correct."

Crespo: "For... for how much?"

Reboletti: "I see a 2 and a half percent... at least in our analysis it's listed under other funds. There's a... it looks like a 2 and a half percent or 2.2 percent increase overall?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Crespo: "You know, basically it must have been for some awards that they... they presented to the committee, and they needed to... to meet that... that demand."
- Reboletti: "And then I'm looking at the line item between General Revenue and then other funds under the Executive Inspector General's Office where I see in the other funds a negative 25.3 percent cut and the total is minus six and a half percent. Could you explain what those cuts are?"
- Crespo: "One second. So, the Public Transportation Fund, I understand that are reserve left from last year and that's what they're using."
- Reboletti: "And then I'm looking at the Financial Professional Regulation line, there's a one and a half percent increase under other funds with about a million five change. Could you explain what that is, Representative?"
- Crespo: "Yeah, that's all for operations. Again, no GRF. We used other state funds for that."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cole."

Cole: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the… will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cole: "Representative Crespo, I'd like to speak similarly to what Representative Pihos said for her education budget. It was a pleasure working with you and your staff. I know everyone that served on the committee was appreciative of the respect and the ability to work on... so many times coming to agreement on a lot of things that we worked on. I just wanted to mention that and I... I certainly appreciate the professionalism of the committee. Thank you."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. I want to... I don't want to belabor over much, but thanks to Representative Cole for the nice words I think it's a testament to her as well as the other side who worked on this committee. Like I said earlier tonight, we established some good relationships. I was really proud with the work that we did and hopefully this will be the start of some more things that we can do together. And I ask for an 'aye' vote. 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 65 voting 'yes' and 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2454, Representative Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2454, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment. Representative Feigenholtz on the Amendment."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Amendments 2 and 3 and adopt Amendments 4 and 5."
- Speaker Lang: "Amendments 2 and 3 are withdrawn. Mr. Reboletti, can we take 4 and 5 on a voice vote? The Lady moves to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- adopt Amendments 4 and 5. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendments 4 and 5 are adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. A Motion to recommit this Bill to the Rules Committee has been filed by Representative Rose."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Rose."
- Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under House Rule 55(c), a Motion to recommit precludes all Amendments like the ones that you just adopted."
- Speaker Lang: "You want to proceed on your Motion, Sir?"
- Rose: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you have to start over again at the very minimum and have a vote on the Motion."
- Speaker Lang: "The Speaker was not made aware of your Motion, Sir, so we're..."
- Rose: "It was filed at 7:03 p.m., exactly one hour ago. My speak light was on from the minute you called the Bill, Mr. Speaker. So, procedurally, if nothing else 'cause you're going to pass the Bill I assume because of the way the night's going, you might want to clean up the record because you just violated 55(c)."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Currie moves that we reconsider the vote by which Amendments 4 and 5 were adopted. All in favor of that Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed... did it occur to you that I was trying to do something you wanted me to do? Well, Mr. Rose would point out that his Motion precedes everything even your comments Mr. Reboletti. So Representative Currie moves that the House reconsider the vote by which Amendments 4 and 5 were adopted. Those in

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

favor will vote 'yes'; those opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Davis, Mr. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendments are brought back to Second Reading. And on Mr. Rose's Motion, do you wish to debate it, Sir?"

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll withdraw the Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws his Motion. Now, we'll go back to where we were. Representative Feigenholtz move that Amendments 4 and 5 be adopted. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendments are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2454, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2454 is a product of the House Human Services-Appropriations Committee that worked painstakingly in a bipartisan fashion to try and save core services for the most vulnerable people in the State of Illinois. Under very, very difficult circumstances, we worked to... some of the highlights of the Bill essentially are in the Human Services budget, that we restored a lot of money to TANF and child care, that we made sure our veterans stayed intact, that our public and local health protection grants were saved and that we shored up our communities' mental

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

health services and DD services. I'd be glad to answer any specific question Members might have about this budget."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Mulligan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Mulligan: "Representative, Floor Amendment 4 and 5 eliminate some of the things that were in the Bill earlier, I think earlier today actually. Could you explain what you cut out in these two Amendments?"

Feigenholtz: "House Floor Am... that Amendment eliminates the mental health transportation; it's a reallocation of resources from transportation and research."

Mulligan: "Did you eliminate mental health money, particularly mental health transportation?"

Feigenholtz: "It was reallocated."

Mulligan: "Where was it reallocated to?"

Feigenholtz: "It was reallocated to the Department of Children and Family Services."

Mulligan: "Did you eliminate the money that Representative Leitch requested to go into juvenile diabetes research at the University of Chicago from the amount that we put into zero?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think that there were long conversations in our committee about what our goals were.

And we felt that direct service funding was a priority. And that's where we directed the money."

Mulligan: "Would you just give me the 'we' part? Would you define 'we'?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Feigenholtz: "The House Democrats."

Mulligan: "I think that... I've been here 20 years and every of my 20 years I've served on Human Service-Appropriations, 18 of those I've either been the Minority Spokesman and 2 years I was actually the Chair. I've worked with a lot of different people and I've enjoyed working with you, Sara, I enjoy how you work and that we usually mesh in what we're doing. This was a particularly bad year; we knew it was going to be before we started because of the amount of revenue that's down. But when you have revenue down and unemployment high, what you have is you have a lot more needs in human services in everv different domestic violence, particularly in things that happening, people that can't do things what they normally do because they've lost their job. I think we worked very well until the end when suddenly this turned into a little game. I don't think the people of Illinois deserve a 'game' in human services. This is a very interesting budget. It was a good budget before you started whacking away at it or your staff started hitting it. Quite frankly, we should had because I have had better in what we thought considering how bad the year was we had done a pretty good budget there. Now you've cut things that everyone at the table agreed to, both Democrats and Republicans. I find that to be really too bad and I don't understand it. So I quess what I want to know from you is, what are you going to do about it? Do you plan on coming back with a supplemental at some time later on to put this money back

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

in? How are you going to help these people that you've penalized in what you've taken out?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, our committee focused on core services. And we also were under a lot of pressure to stay under our spending cap as you well know. There are many agencies who suffered dramatically on headcount and operations from the cuts that we had to make to this department. So, I'm not sure exactly what you're asking me. I think that we are living under our House Resolution, the same Resolution a prior Approp Chair referred to and trying to focus our dollars where they're better spent."

Mulligan: "Well, I think there are different areas that impact different parts of the state, such as the mental health transportation that was eliminated, appropriations community-based alcohol and other drug abuse prevention, particularly when you have high unemployment those things happen. And quite frankly, it then turns into domestic abuse. There's also other things with targeted case management counseling and auxiliary services used transition program, all of those things that are a problem. I really want to know how you're going to settle this once we're out of there and these things kick in and you're walking through the grocery store and somebody comes up to you and says, why did you cut my money and why did you ruin our program?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative Mulligan, I was walking through the grocery store last year and heard that. And so hearing it again this year and some of the other tough votes we've taken on the Medicaid Reform Bill that we passed, this is

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

something we're going to have to be astute enough to answer our constituents with. We're going to have to go home and tell them we did the best we can and that we have no money to spend."

"Representative, I've always been astute enough to Mulligan: this. And I have people in my district that understand that I work hard in Human Services and have reelected me generally just to get there. But there are other people in this Body that will have the same problems that are going to have a problem with this and this budget is inadequate the way it is presented. And I think, quite frankly, I don't know if it was you, I'd hate to say that it would be, but I think staff suddenly decided that we're going to have a punitive budget at the last minute today. I find that unconscionable and it's really too bad because this is one of the most important budgets in the state. It helps people that are really having a problem and I really feel bad that this is happening. Not only that, I'm not quite sure what you're going to have with the Governor when I've been asked from people on the Governor's staff about certain parts of this budget and what we're doing with it. This is really very sad."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bellock: "Thank you. And I want to… before we start the questions, I want to say thank you, again, to Representative Feigenholtz for all of her work on this

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

budget and directing us all of which we worked together on and Sam, also thank you very much for all of your hard work. I wanted to ask you some questions about things that I'm not sure have been either eliminated or added to since we met. So under the Department of Public Health, was the grant to the University of Chicago for the juvenile diabetes research, was that eliminated?"

Feigenholtz: "Research... most research dollars as you know from being on this committee, Representative Bellock, have been eliminated for direct services. You and other Members of your caucus have historically been supportive of that kind of funding shift."

Bellock: "I agree it's part of that. But I think that we had thought the this 2,475,000 was still in the budget. Going on to the Department of Children and Family Services, was \$515 thousand added for targeted case management since last we met?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, it was."

Bellock: "And 577,600 for counseling and auxiliary services?"

Feigenholtz: "Yes, we were a little concerned about some of our cuts to DCFS."

Bellock: "Forty six thousand, six hundred additional for youth and transition program?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Bellock: "So, all of those were added since we last met in our meeting?"

Feigenholtz: "I would say reallocated because we didn't spend an extra dime."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Bellock: "Okay. Moving on to the Department of Human Services,

 I see an additional \$2 million added in to asthma
 prevention. Is that correct, no?"
- Feigenholtz: "No."
- Bellock: "Under Floor Amendment #5? I have increases appropriation payable from Tobacco Settlement Recovery."
- Feigenholtz: "That was actually a technical error in the Bill,

 Representative. One of them was lined out and now they're

 lumped together."
- Bellock: "Okay. And then there was some eliminations, but was there an additional amount added into the AIDS education and drugs since we met?"
- Feigenholtz: "There was a reallocation to HIV prevention."
- Bellock: "But we had agreed upon, hadn't we, the money for the breast and cervical cancer program?"
- Feigenholtz: "We also reallocated some more money into that 'cause as you know, in the Governor's introduced, both of those lines reduced dramatically."
- Bellock: "Okay. So how much additional was added into this budget since we last met?"
- Feigenholtz: "The reallocation was 2,475... I'm sorry 3,475,000, but it's cost neutral, nothing new."
- Bellock: "How is it cost neutral? How is it cost neutral?"
- Feigenholtz: "We increased... we increased 3.4 and decreased 3.4, which would make the Bill neutral."
- Bellock: "So you eliminated several of these other grants... are those grants under DHS? The Youth Tobacco Prevention, the Illinois Adult and Youth Tobacco Survey, those were all eliminated?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Feigenholtz: "Representative, those are not in the DHS budget.

They're in the Public Health budget and they are essentially lumping one into one line, three lines. There's no cost differential on that."

Bellock: "But those decisions were made not in committee, correct? That's our concern, Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Those decisions were made today."

Bellock: "Not in committee?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Bellock: "Correct. And was Representative Mulligan at the last meeting?"

Feigenholtz: "I don't believe that she was on the roll, no."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments. I guess my concern was that in all the talks that we had, especially regarding the Medicaid reform, we were looking for some money that we thought we could maybe get towards the children on the ventilators. And I would liked to have been a part of that discussion if there was money to have been changed out of this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "I'd like to commend everybody that worked together on this budget. This was a very particularly hard budget. And for anyone that sits on the department... on the Appropriations-Human Services Budget Committee you know that cutting programs that affect our most vulnerable, our women, our children is very, very hard. We were given a very small amount of money and there were a lot of worthwhile programs. And there were a lot of discussions around some of the reallocated items that were in here. And

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

personally I had a problem when we're trying to allocate funds to pet projects for a particular Member, there should be no sacred cows and we took care of that in this budget, there are no sacred cows. We addressed this budget effectively and I'm very proud to stand in support of this budget because it does what we came here to do and that is to provide resources, core services for our women, our vulnerable children, our most populations. individuals who don't have paid lobbyists, who can't come down here and advocate for themselves, those individuals who voted for us to come here and to advocate and to stand up for them and for the services that would protect them. is а great budget. I commend Chairperson Representative Feigenholtz for everything that she has done. And I am urging everyone to stand in support of this budget. This is not a partisan issue, this is about doing what is right for the women and children of our state when you have no money. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Leitch: "For over the last 3 years the community-based providers have not been paid or had total disruptions in the payments because the state has spent \$28 million on the contract known as Value Options. Is that money still in this budget?"

Feigenholtz: "There is no specific line for the issue that you're talking about, but there's been a lot of conversation and thanks to you, you've brought this to the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

core. The committee is forcing the department to take a very, very serious look at who they're working with. And... but I believe that it... it may be still in the budget. That... that's a discretionary item for the Department of Human Services to decide."

Leitch: "I think it's very unfortunate that we are wasting \$28 million on a contract that hasn't worked. Certainly those of you in the private sector would know that if your customers didn't have the billing system work for 3 years, somebody might get fired or somebody might change that system. So perhaps it's a metaphor for the system that we have such a ludicrous system between the Division of Mental Health and HFS that results in such poor performance to the mentally ill in our state and to the citizens of the State of Illinois. The second point is, I realize the Division of Mental Health was very, very embarrassed when they did the downstate transportation expenditure last year to felons. And I know that when they had to withdraw that contract and they did their very best to cover that up and not have that become public, that doesn't mean that the people who are served in downstate mental health programs don't need transportation. I don't know how the community-based system functions without the ability to have transportation, especially as facilities are closing and these changes are being made. So, I am very, very curious as to what might cause you to remove the ability of mentally ill people to be transported in downstate Illinois."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, there is a myriad of answers to your long... many... your questions. First of all, you'll

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

probably get a lot of agreement from Democrats and those of us on this side of the aisle who've been working in concert with you about the contract that you're referring to, that we have absolutely total... you have our total commitment to make sure that this right gets wronged. I know that today the secretary, very early this morning, was in committee talking about how we got into this mess with this contract. And that if we pulled the plug on it, we would be in the same mess. So, we... we actually had a very interesting conversation with her, and we're going to monitor that on your behalf and on the committee's behalf to be good stewards of the public dollar. On the second issue, the mental health grant lines are... are fully funded or as well funded as we could possibly have them this year, unlike last year. And we are hoping that the discussion about the transportation grants continue. It was unfortunate that the one vendor who was working was... was questionable. And I would be more than glad to have a conversation about what it would take to get a reputable vendor, but it was zeroed out in the Governor's budget. There are... if we... although it's an important service, I'm not sure I would consider it a direct service. In the suburbs, we have providers who actually pick up mental health clients and that is part of their contract and part of what they already include in their work. Perhaps that may be a solution as we move forward."

Leitch: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

- Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- Franks: "Representative, I know how hard you've worked on this.

 I just wanted to ask you a couple of questions. I'm looking at the Human Rights Department line and I see that the Commission on Discrimination Hate Crimes was funded at the FY12 levels. What are those levels?"
- Feigenholtz: "We're looking, Representative. These are very big budgets."
- Franks: "I know. I know. And the reason I'm... I'm focusing on that one, as you may recall and perhaps it's changed since, but I was under the impression that this commission has been inactive for a number of years. And they haven't met in years."
- Feigenholtz: "This is... the line that you're... first of all, the commissioners are in the Comptroller's budget."
- Franks: "No. This is the Commission on Discrimination and Hate Crimes. It's in the Human Rights Department line item."
- Feigenholtz: "So, the commissioners are funded in the Comptroller's budget, the 77,5 that you see in this lump sum is staffing for that commission."
- Franks: "Right. Okay. That's... and how much is that line item?"
- Feigenholtz: "Seventy seven thousand, five hundred dollars."
- Franks: "Okay. I think that probably just goes to one employee who is the Director of this Commission that hasn't met in years. Is that... I don't know if you know or not?"
- Feigenholtz: "It... I'm... it's uncertain. I do know that the line's been cut by 50 percent though, it was \$155 thousand."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Franks: "Right. I remember 'cause I was complaining about it last year as well."

Feigenholtz: "Well, you won."

Franks: "Well, no, I didn't. It should have been zero for a commission that doesn't meet and doesn't do anything, yet we're still giving them \$77,500. I just don't understand how that happens. And you know, we passed a Bill here to get rid of some of these boards and commissions that cost the state money and don't do anything. This one's worse because we're actually paying people and they haven't had meetings, I think it's on their third year now. So perhaps when this... should this go to the... I don't know if it's going to the Senate or not..."

Feigenholtz: "Representative Franks, I just want to assure you that we went through some very painful exercises in this committee. The proportional cuts to the smaller agencies have a much greater impact on... on these..."

Franks: "I agree with you."

Feigenholtz: "...on these agencies."

Franks: "I agree with that."

Feigenholtz: "Removing one staff person is monumental. For all we know, that commissioner is answering phones because they can't afford a secretary. I know that that is the circumstance with the Guardian and Advocacy Commission, which takes care of so many wards of the state. So we're... we try to be a little bit careful with these tiny commissions and agencies that our committee oversees. But we always welcome you to come in and visit. I wouldn't want to ask you to actually join the committee."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Franks: "I can see your point. Well, to the Bill. I appreciate the hard work that you've done. And I understand that there's the choices that have to be made. But I just think that when we see things like this, we have to point it out because these are the continuing abuses that have put us in this... put us in the position that we're in. And sometimes we have to just take our medicine and cut our losses. And that's what I would suggest we do on many of these commissions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Watson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Watson: "Representative, could you describe or explain the Amendment that was added this morning that has to do with giving the administration the option to use funding either for a center or for transitional services?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, there... we inserted language, yes, that mirrors the Mental Health Act that allows flexibility to the department to use money that is in transition lines or state-operated facility lines to use... to shift the money to follow the resident. It is the spirit of the U.S. Supreme Court Olmstead decision. We have been sued and have consent decrees up the whazoo. And we like to give the department as much discretion as possible, so the money follows the person. It's the same language as we had in here last year."

Watson: "So, why was it just added this morning then?"

Feigenholtz: "It must have inadvertently been omitted."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Watson: "So it was not at the request of any... who brought it to your attention to bring it in?"

Feigenholtz: "I found it."

Watson: "So you... you just discovered this morning that it was...
it was something that we needed to have? You didn't realize
from all the years you worked on it that that was an
omission?"

Feigenholtz: "Actually, it's quite a large Amendment. I don't... it's probably 128 pages and it was... it was noted that it was omitted by the department and advocates but it...."

Watson: "Have you had any conversation with the Governor as to what you think he may or may not do with these funding?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, I... I am uncertain. I think that that's a policy question that all of us have of the Governor."

Watson: "But you haven't had any conversations with him as to what to do with it?"

Feigenholtz: "Nope."

Watson: "No. Do you think that maybe we could watch and make sure that should he decide to use... to transfer this money that he won't... make sure that he won't allow it to be used to put ads in Craigslist when they're trying to find places for people that live at JDC right now? Do you think you can promise me that you will stay on and watch and make sure they're not so careless with these people's lives?"

Feigenholtz: "I will certainly note that, Representative."

Watson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Sacia: "Representative Feigenholtz, this morning there was \$2,475,000 in this budget for juvenile diabetes research.

This evening that was zeroed out. Could you explain that for the benefit of the Body?"

Feigenholtz: "Actually, Representative, I'd be glad to although I have already explained it. If you take a look at the history of this committee, you will see that a great deal, if not all research grants, that ran through every agency in our budgets has been summarily eliminated and resources have been reallocated toward direct services and core services."

Sacia: "Representative, I... I appreciate your comment and I know responded to Representative Bellock earlier, there's little doubt that what really brought the wheels off the wagon this evening was this very issue. certainly, if it wasn't all of it, it was a big part of it. This is an issue that is extremely important to the Diabetes Caucus as I understand it. I know it is extremely important to my Leader Tom Cross, who has a daughter with juvenile diabetes. I know it's extremely important to Representative Durkin, who has a daughter with juvenile diabetes. And with no explanation... perhaps that's the crux of it Representative Feigenholtz. With no explanation, all of a sudden it's gone. And as individuals have been complimenting one another this evening for the hard work that's taken place over the past several weeks, all of the sudden this side of the aisle is pretty much zeroed out. And I know you could make an argument, that's our choice.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Yes, it is our choice, but it's our choice because of something very significant that happened."

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, Representative, is that a question?"

Sacia: "Disregard, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, you were supposed to put out a Bill for guardianship and advocacy, is that going to happen?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that there is an Amendment pending that hopefully we'll be seeing soon."

Mulligan: "I've had them actually ask if when I retired if I would like to volunteer for them. So I just may do that, free services are always good."

Feigenholtz: "It's a great agency."

Mulligan: "Right. One of the Legislators made a comment that there wasn't money in here for individuals. When you've been doing this as long as I have, you can tell where line items go and when money is in for individuals. So, let's not be foolish about the fact that there's money in here in certain areas for certain individuals and for things that are very important for them and their district because there is. And there was also money canceled out in other areas that would help other people. I think what I'll miss most when I'm not here is the negotiation, but I won't miss most the divisiveness after we've worked hard to make things the way they should be and then they're not. Or we go home and we find out that things that we've worked hard for have been canceled out. I'm particularly unhappy with the mental health budget. That to me, the fact that they're

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

not getting their bills paid, people... and providers around the state have been going out of business is to me a really sad statement. Also the fact that there have been people being paid to approve those bills that can't seem to do it in two years. I have an agency at home that has bills pending for last year and this year, that's a terrible thing to say. When we're paying some agencies, there's one that's being paid \$150 thousand a month to not be able to okay bills and not pay human service providers and mental health providers in the state. I think you need... definitely to take a look at that and figure out what's happening. And think if there's a supplemental, we ought something. I don't think you should be going home without making sure that those people are being paid and that the people that are incompetent are gone. The fact that we are told that there's going to be contracts let out, that the contracts will come back in June after we're here, given out and that some of these contracts are going to be let out for three years to incompetent people seems to me to mean there's something very wrong in how we're running this state and how we're spending human service particularly in a time when our budget is so bad. We should be as tight as we can with it, particularly to make sure that the services that are so badly needed are provided and not given into incompetents that are taking advantage of the State of Illinois. And if directors can't manage that, then they ought to be fired and the Governor ought to take note to replace the people that are on his staff not... if they can't run an agency that makes sure that the money is

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

spent competently, and that they can face an audit. We look at audits and we let it go and we don't go back over them and make sure that the details in the audit are taken care of. I think that's a shame. Audits are too late to follow. Also I disagree with one of the other Members and I will say that we should have been convening the Senior Pharmaceutical Committee, which is never been disbanded, and we should be looking at how we can help the seniors and what's going to happen because everything's going to change if Obama Care is not struck down in the courts. We're going to have a real mess here next year."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "I understand that there is no money for prescriptions for seniors, is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, one of the… that was… that was in the Medicaid Bill that we passed last week."

Davis, M.: "So, it's also here though 'cause I saw it. Okay.

Thank you for that. Someone..."

Feigenholtz: "We've never had a line in this budget for senior prescription. Medicaid seniors will continue to get drugs in the HFS budget, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Thank you. I'm glad to hear that. But I wanted to respond to a Member's question in reference to the Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission has been in effect since 1979 and the purpose of the commission is to provide a neutral forum for resolving complaints of discrimination filed pursuant to the Illinois Human Rights

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Act. The Illinois Human Rights Commission is dedicated to promoting freedom from unlawful discrimination as defined the Illinois Human Rights Act. The Act forbids discrimination based on sex, age, race, color, religion, arrest record, marital status, sexual orientation and it goes on to tell those who are protected. This Act forbids the discrimination in employment, real estate, housing, education, public accommodations. And the very fact that it has an executive director, there's supposed to be 13 commissioners, if they're not appointed, I don't know why, but by law there should be 13 commissioners, an executive director, general counsel and an assistant counsel, a chief administrative law judge. I wish I could say that this commission is no longer needed, take my word for it, it's needed today more than ever."

Feigenholtz: "I agree with you, Representative."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rose."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative... may I question the Sponsor?"

Speaker Lang: "Of course you may, Sir."

Rose: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Feigenholtz, in my Zen world I know that you and I have spent a lot of time on the Olmstead decision. And earlier this year I filed a Bill to require the department to come up with a plan for transition. Olmstead's here, we have to implement the… the documents were signed and filed at the Federal Court. Representative Feigenholtz, notwithstanding the work you put into this budget, does it trouble you on a personal

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

level as it does me that we are now searching in Craigslist for families or individuals to open their homes to adults with developmental disabilities? That's not a plan. That's not a plan. We're going to... oh, by the way, they get a tax free annual stipend. How do you get a tax free annual stipend via this company that opens its doors?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that that was an old contract,

Representative Rose, that I think we are not working with
this organization anymore is what..."

Rose: "This is from May 9th of this year."

Feigenholtz: "A lot happens in 10 days around here."

Rose: "Well, I... I hope you're right, Representative. I mean the... the bottom line is, this is more than budget making. I mean, yeah, we fill in lines and we say here's this dollar and this penny, but without a plan, we... People use the term most vulnerable population a lot. Yesterday, Representative Davis was kind enough... maybe it was yesterday, I don't know if it was yesterday or the day before, was kind enough to take a Bill out of the record that dealt with school kids t.hat. had developmentally disabled... thev were developmentally disabled. This issue is very close to me on a myriad of levels. At one-time, my district represented more developmentally disabled individuals per capita than any district in the State of Illinois. I just... what is the status update? You can't just do what's about to happen. And you certainly can't do what's about to happen on Craigslist."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I... I appreciate your commitment and your sensitivity to this issue. I think that all of us,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

this is not a partisan issue, all of us have great concern about how to transition people safely. There's nobody who wants to slam the door shut on these facilities. We are... I go to many meetings with the new Director of DD, Mr. Casey. He is working painstakingly with every family. He has volunteered to travel to all corners of the state to speak and work with these families just like his predecessor, Lilia Teninty did."

Rose: "But Representative, there's nothing in this Bill or any other Bill out there that I'm aware of that has any plan."

Feigenholtz: "This is a budget Bill, not..."

Rose: "I understand that."

Feigenholtz: "...a substantive Bill."

Rose: "Does the BIMP Bill have a plan?"

Feigenholtz: "The department has a plan, Representative."

Rose: "Their plan's Craigslist?"

Feigenholtz: "No, that is not their plan."

Rose: "'Cause that's what it looks like to me."

Feigenholtz: "You know, there's a working group. You ought to join it."

Rose: "Hey, Representative, I'd love to."

Feigenholtz: "I'm inviting you. You're in."

Rose: "I've... I've been working with this... I had a Bill earlier this year that the department came over and told me I couldn't call. They said, well, you can't do that. I would love to be in a working group. But Craigslist is not a plan. It's an insult to the families and those with developmentally disabled. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers. Sorry, Representative.

We'll wait for you. Don't run. Don't run. We've got 'til tomorrow at midnight."

Flowers: "Representative, thank you very much for your patience and Members of the House. Just one quick question and I know that... I know this year our budget is very tight and this is a very precarious situation for all of us. But once again, my biggest concern are the people who will need access to their prescription drugs. And were we able to find any dollars, just a few dollars, to help more people? Now, I understand the people that's on Medicaid, they are going to be taken care of, but I'm talking about those that's just above Medicaid who are on a very fixed income. And you know, a couple of ladies were here the other day and they showed me their Social Security. One of them was \$300 a month. And she said to me, Representative... it was her mother's, she said I... I just don't know what my mother's going to do. And I just need to understand, Representative, what do we tell these people? Is there any money out there that we could find that could just extend this program until the economy gets a little better?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, the person that you describe with the small Social Security check would be eligible for Medicaid and eligible for Medicare Part D prescription drugs."

Flowers: "That person would be. As I stated, I know people that are on Medicaid that would be taken care of, but there's others out there that will not. And my question to you,

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

again, where and how can the state give them some type of assistance?"

Feigenholtz: "There's a federal program called Extra Help that goes up to 185 percent of federal poverty level. And also this chamber passed a Fair Care... a Bill for Fair Care that also helps people who need charity care. So we are working to cobble together a safety net for the people that you're talking about, Representative."

Flowers: "Fair Care has... the Extra Help has been out there for a very long time, okay. And unfortunately a lot of people were not made aware. And the agencies were not letting them... because they were taking advantage of our Cares RX program. So now my question to you is, how do they know to qualify? What is it that we are going to do to make sure that the extra help and the Fair Care is enunciated across the state so people know that because Cares RX may be gone there may... there are other programs out there that they will fit into?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, it is my hope, as I'm sure it's yours, that with all of the reforms and modifications that we're making that the departments will begin to alert people and make them aware of all of these programs that are out there that we've not really been sharing."

Flowers: "And you know, Representative, and that was part of the problem that I had initially and still have with the department because nothing is changing administratively as far as getting the information out. They are still acting as if it's 1950. They're treating people as if it's in the 1950s, and that's just outright wrong. But I'm going to

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

work with you, Representative, to make sure that this department be the best that this state has ever seen as far as getting the information out to the people whom it's supposed to serve as well as respect. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I want to go back to the diabetes issue. How long has that line item been in the budget?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, you know, I... I recall that every year it seems to be eliminated and then it's restored and then it's eliminated and then it's restored. I... I can't really recall how many years we go back in some of these research lines. But if you take a look at the history of the Human Services budget, if you take a look at the cuts we've had to make we have systematically removed all funding for research in all of our budgets because they are not direct services."

Reboletti: "Is it fair to say that that money has been in a line item for about the last 10 years?"

Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry?"

Reboletti: "Is it fair to say that that money has been in a line item for the last 10 years?"

Feigenholtz: "You know, I... I... don't have a historical... any historical assistance. But I will tell you, Representative Reboletti, that these are not easy decisions that our committee makes. These are gut wrenching decisions that we make. Just like it was when we passed the Medicaid reform Bill, the Smart Act."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "And I... and I appreciate that. Representative, when...
I'm trying to look now in a chronological order going back
to earlier today, was that money in the line item today as
of this morning?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that this was a... I believe it may have been. I... I'm pretty certain it was."

Reboletti: "It was part of an Amendment that was voted out of committee, wasn't it?"

Feigenholtz: "It was not in Amendment 4."

Reboletti: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative? Was that in... that was in the Amendment?"

Feigenholtz: "It was in Amendment 2 and 3."

Reboletti: "And then, what time was that taken out?"

Feigenholtz: "I don't know. This afternoon."

Reboletti: "At... at who's request was that taken out? Was that the committee's request?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I believe that trying to get Bills passed here is a very complicated matter. We have a lot of Members who have their own pressures, their own individual causes around here that they like to champion, and in the spirit of building support for this Bill, those priorities were articulated."

Reboletti: "I can appreciate that there's going to be a lot of pain throughout the budget. I'm looking at new program, at line items and I'm looking at \$668 thousand out of GRF for a Sentence Advisory Council for the Department of Corrections. So we have been able to find some new money. Is that where part of the \$2 million went?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Feigenholtz: "Representative, Corrections is not in the Human Services budget."

Reboletti: "I... I understand. I've been trying to follow the money all day."

Feigenholtz: "Most of the money was directed to core service programs in the Department of Children and Family Services for targeted case management, for youth and family preservation."

Reboletti: "I just find it sincerely amazing... to the Bill. And we've heard other speakers regarding this issue, that today at some point in time it was in the budget. I know that the wheels have fallen off the tracks and we've used that term quite a bit. Now, we've just simply fallen into the abyss. So, now I guess we'll punish diabetics, Democrat, Republican, Independent alike, across the state because of something that happened within the last 24 hours. I just think it's inexcusable. We found \$50 million to put back in to schools, we found \$700 thousand for Sentencing Advisory Councils, but the diabetics will have to be punished."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This has been a enormously unpleasant year for those of us who have been trying to create a safety net in the State of Illinois for the most vulnerable citizens. We've had very, very difficult decisions to make. I know that I speak for my counterparts on your side of the aisle who have been for years working on these issues, to watch hopes dashed. But we, you know, I want to respond to Representative Reboletti. We still are working on diabetes

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

treatment, we just did not have the berth to fund research this year. And for that, I am sorry. But overall we have done our best to take care of the most vulnerable. It's a great committee. I especially want to thank Ashley and Shawn on your side of the aisle for all of the work they've done and of course, Clayton ... Clayton Klenke. We could not have done this with our... without our amazing staff and I would like for everybody here to give them a huge round of applause. They have done unbelievable work. Sam Olds, Dan Frey, and of course, John Lowder. This is a big budget. Rosemary and... and Pam and Patti and our fabulous committee. And as tough as this budget is to support, we're doing the best we can without any money. And so I would appreciate your support on this and you have my commitment to work through the summer, to work on a supplemental, if there's more revenue and please vote 'aye'."

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? Zalewski, Lilly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes' and 53 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2474, Mr. Arroyo. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Arroyo."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to adopt Amendment 2, 3 and 4 and discuss it on Third Reading after I... I would like to..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti? Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendments 2, 3 and 4. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And all three Amendments are adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2474, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Two will explain the entire Bill, appropriations for agencies within Appropriation of Public Safety. The committee with GRF allocations is \$1.576088 billion, becomes the budget. Amendment 3..."

Speaker Lang: "You're on Third Reading, Sir, just go ahead and explain your Bill."

Arroyo: "Okay. The Appropriation-Public Safety budget was... was a hard budget to pass. There was agreements, disagreements on both sides of the chamber. I believe that without your side... I believe that I... I spend more time with that side of the aisle than this side of the aisle. And I spend more time with you guys than I did with my wife for the month... six weeks that we spent together. So I think it's time to go home. And I see somebody... Jason, clapping over there. Jason, I don't want to spend no more time with you guys. I think we've spent too much time together now. So it's time

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

to go home. So in Appropriation-Public Safety Committee we... we cut... gave haircuts, I mean it was a magic word, cutting and cutting hair, giving hair cuts, trims, crew cuts and all that kind of stuff. A hundred and thirty eight million dollars it wasn't easy compared to last year. Last year everything was agreed to. I think I talked for five minutes and we passed the budget and we got out. This year was a little bit more complicated because we had detention centers to close, we had prisons to close. Nobody on that side of the aisle was for closing these prisons. But what came out of Tamms, which I... I have a really bad thing with Tamms, I thought that we were going to get to an agreement with closing Tamms, but we came to a different agreement with that side and some of my colleagues that we put it back to a maximum... to a medium... a minimum prison and everybody agreed to that. So a lot of the things we did, we agreed to. And now I think that there's little а disagreement. But you know what, if a family sometimes agrees and disagrees and disagrees to agree. So I hope that with that saying that we're going to agree to pass this appropriation budget for public safety with the help of you guys over there. Dave Reis did a wonderful job. Jason, he was the designated hitter. He came in the fourth inning and tried to bat a homerun. You know, I think that the other Members they had they weren't safe, so they brought a young man to try to beat me up and run me over the coals. Well, but I think I did a good job of standing up to Jason over there. And then Jim Sacia did a pretty good job, so thank you guys. But more ... more than that, I want to thank my vice

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

chair and I want to thank the Members of the Appropriation Committee. My guys that kind of showed me along on how to do this, you know, I'm just learning how to do this. But these guys... these guys that keep me, you know, sometimes we all lose our cool. I believe one of the Members over there was throwing things up in the air. So I was told not to throw anything up in the air. I don't have anything so, they... they took everything out from behind my desk so I don't throw anything. But I'm going to take the high road. Whatever you say I'm okay with it, just pass the Bill so I can home to my family. Thank you, guys."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo moves for the passage of the Bill.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what's the status of the Thomson Correctional Center?"

Arroyo: "What do you mean when you say the status?"

Reboletti: "Is it fully funded?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Is it fully... is it full to capacity?"

Arroyo: "Well, I don't... I don't know the capacity, but I know it's staying open. You were saying, is it staying open or is it closing?"

Reboletti: "No, I'm not. I'm asking... the reason I ask,
Representative, because I thought years ago we were selling
that prison to the Federal Government. Have we ever sold
the prison to the Federal Government?"

Arroyo: "I didn't... I didn't hear the question, Reboletti?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Reboletti: "Have... we haven't sold Thomson Correctional Facility to the Federal Government that had been talked about and voted on about maybe three, four years ago because the Federal Government was going to purchase it to put federal inmates in. So, that hasn't happened, has it?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "And that prison is not full to capacity, is it? So we're paying basically for a vacant prison."

Arroyo: "It's been closing; it's not in this budget, Sir."

Reboletti: "But the Thomson is still open. And what I'm saying,
Thomson is not closed."

Arroyo: "Thomson is closed."

Reboletti: "Has the surplus property ever been sold yet considered as Thomson?"

Arroyo: "Excuse me?"

Reboletti: "Has that surplus property ever been sold yet?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "Is the Federal Government still interested in purchasing it?"

Arroyo: "I don't know about that."

Reboletti: "Have... have we thought about taking it off the surplus property rolls, maybe closing other facilities and using a new facility?"

Arroyo: "In our budget we didn't discuss Tamm... Thomson at all, they didn't come to me and ask me if we wanted to buy it or sell it, Reboletti. So, I wouldn't... I really am not privy to talk about Thomson. I don't know anything about that."

Reboletti: "Is... and your budget contemplates keeping Tamms open?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "At what level security would that be?"

Arroyo: "It's going to be a medium... medium or less of a prison... capacity."

Reboletti: "And what would that cost to transition the facility?"

Arroyo: "Twenty-six million. Right now, it's at 26 million."

Reboletti: "Twenty-six million dollars? What... what... where would that money come from? Is that from the capital budget or from GRF?"

Arroyo: "It's an allocation."

Reboletti: "Is there a capital component to transition the facility from a super max to a medium security facility?"

Arroyo: "Not here, but it will be."

Reboletti: "What's that number?"

Arroyo: "I guess... there's not a capital portion in this Bill."

Reboletti: "Is that going to be part of the supplemental summer we're going to see? There'll be a supplemental appropriation maybe in Veto Session for it?"

Arroyo: "I'm not sure."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I... Chairman Arroyo, I commend you on the job that you've done and actually all of the Appropriations Chairmen and the spokesmen and the Members. And most of the Members of the House of Representatives serve on one of the five Appropriation Committees that are out there. And it's probably the most responsible budget that the House has put together in years thanks to the staffs of both the Democrat

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

and Republican Members. Everyone's under their silos and what I'm particularly grateful for is I have Dixon and... and Dwight and people who work at all facilities throughout, they're from Pontiac and there were a lot of closures. It wasn't just downstate Members from the Republican side of the aisle, it was also from the Democratic side of the aisle that had concerned about facility closures. And if you want to keep focused, this budget gives the opportunity for 2 thousand people in the worst times in our history to not lose their jobs and it does so with real money. Now back when I lost Sheridan in 2002 when George Ryan came in and because we were in a similar budget time he closed a dozen facilities throughout the state. Our answer to solve that was to overload a budget, to send a budget from the House to the Senate that overspent by a billion dollars. And then Governor Ryan went through and vetoed those items. Because of the work of John Lowder, the Republican staff, Representative Arroyo, the \$88 million involved in the number of the budgets that you have passed is in there as real money. And it's actually a result of the work that we did last year. Because we were able to pay in next year's budget for transfers out of money that we saved from last year by working together, \$88 million is available which keeps open Tamms and it required negotiations on all sides. Tamms was controversial. It will no longer be a... the facility that it was, a supermax. It will be a medium facility, which will be converted for a cost of \$8 million capital which is necessary. To do that, they have to put up some fencing, they need a cafeteria, they need to double

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

bunk the cells; that cost \$8 million. By doing that, you go from 400 inmates to 1200 medium security inmates who then ease some of the overcrowding throughout corrections. These are the things that you have done together. It's an amazing work product. And so, I commend those Members who spent hundreds of hours. The difference between 2002 and the facility closures where a dozen facilities closed and only one ever reopened is that we sent an unbalanced budget loaded with programs that couldn't be paid for; that's the not case here. In this case, the Governor has the ability to close things and he always does, but we have a budget, which under the five silos are balanced, which pays for with real dollars money produced from savings when this program worked last year. It is real dollars and if you want to focus, you've taken care of a social concern on one of the prisons. You've given the ability for Jacksonville Developmental to st... to stay open because by not closing it we actually saved \$17 million towards making these pieces work. So, please, do not sell yourselves short on the work that each Member has done. There is real money, \$88 million that is available to alleviate a lot of the problems and concerns. And we should fight to have the Governor keep the money in for those facilities, for the programs that they have for many reasons. But it is a budget which responsible, it is under the amount of revenue that we expect to come in. So we have kept spending below the expected revenues. We have paid down bills. And to both staffs and all the Members, regardless of what the Roll Call says on many of these issues, thank you for your work

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

because you do deserve credit, both sides of the aisle do.

And this Bill and the others should pass with support
because everybody designed this. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I, too, would like to thank our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working on this committee. It was very contentious. And ultimately came down to last Friday where we were at a loggerheads and... and it wasn't just our side of the aisle concerned about the was closings, Representatives on... on both sides of the aisle. And we came to a situation where we were wanting to keep facilities open, statutorily we are required to house our prisoners. And I know there was some philosophical issues that came involved with... with Tamms, but the other ones were just decisions made by the Governor in his introduced budget to just close those facilities. We have a responsibility to house these... these inmates, both young and old. So it came down to closing facilities versus some programs that was very controversial. And I also want to thank the agencies that came in multiple times. Appellate Prosecutor, Appellate Defender, statutorily they have a job to do and we've cut them to the bone. Lawsuits are involved that require us to fund them so that they can perform their job. And so we came to this loggerheads on Friday and with the help of the Speaker and... and Leader Cross we... we ironed things out on Friday and they wrote the Bill over the weekend. So we have this situation where we've conceded on Tamms and it's going to change philosophies, but we wanted

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

to keep it open. There's an overcrowding of prisons. IDOT my good friend Arroyo, every day talked about the road fund. But we had bipartisan support not to change the Road Fund, RTA, Pace, Metra is going to be funded out of District 1 again. It's a local problem; it's money coming from the local... local fund. Amtrak and... Amtrak will be funded out of the whole statewide Road Fund. That's the same as last year; we didn't change it. There were intense pressures to try to change that. So we also had a very controversial discussion on many days about the Violence Protection Authority, Neighborhood Recovery Initiative, money that was put into programs that the Governor created a couple of years ago. There was consensus among the group shift that to criminal justice; they have better capabilities and oversight in making sure that these dozens and dozens and dozens of programs are RFP'd correctly and the money is spent correctly. I hope that we have a Resolution on the floor to have a performance audit done of the recovery over the last couple of years. And I think that should be done. Forty million dollars each in the last two years and we need to make sure that those RFPs and contracts and moneys were spent wisely. So with that, there's a little good and a little bad in here for everyone. It was very important that we, committee of the downstaters, that we keep the facilities open. And we do our statutorily requirement to house inmates. It was very important to some of our suburban and city Legislators to keep some of the programs in place. So I... I guess I thought all in all it was a good compromise. We came in with the

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

help of the unspent money in keeping these facilities open and keeping our budget where it needs to be. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo to close."

Arroyo: "Thank you very much. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in a favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, please, Members. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 71 voting 'yes'; 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 7 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2332, Representative Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2332, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. The Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Committee Amendment... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Can we amend the Bill... adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third Reading?"

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2332, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the reappropriation of the Capital Bill. There's no new capital money in it. There are some additions to the payas-you-go program to the extent that the boating fund for example has money to build a dock or two. That money would be appropriated here as well. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd appreciate your support for the Capital Bill. The summer construction season is upon us and it's time for us to act."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, does this Bill include money for the Road Fund?"

Currie: "Yes, it does."

Reboletti: "Do you know what the amount is for the Road Fund?"

Currie: "I don't ... I don't have that figure."

Reboletti: "Has any money been swept from the Road Fund or is this the full amount?"

Currie: "This is the full... this is the reappropriation. This is what we did in the past year. We're just reauthorizing what we had already authorized in an earlier... an earlier Bill."

Reboletti: "This is from the Capital Bill of a couple years ago and there may be some tweaks or am I mistaken on that?"

Currie: "And it does... it does include new money from the Road Fund for the multiyear plan."

Reboletti: "And there is some pay-as-you-go in the Road Fund, is that correct?"

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Currie: "Yeah, There is pay-as-you-go for the Road Fund, but all... but others as well. The... the boating fund which I earlier referenced, for example."

Reboletti: "Is there... is there any bonding..."

Currie: "And the Road Fund is all pay-as-you-go."

Reboletti: "What about bonding authority? Is that included in...
any bonding authority included in here?"

Currie: "No. This is not... this is not a bond Bill, this is a pay-as-you-go."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Currie: "Just the re... just the bonds that we are reappropriating, right."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor... will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Zalewski: "Leader, is the… is the… is the money in here… just for clarification for an issue in my district, is the money in here for issues related to school constructions that have already been completed and the… and the… the schools in fact have to be paid back?"

Currie: "Yes."

Zalewski: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you. It's the reauthorization. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

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

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ford, Mr. Leitch. Please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mulligan, for what reason do you rise?"

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of personal privilege. I just wanted... I had forgotten, and when we were talking about the Human Service budget, to thank all the Members of the committee and to especially thank staff, both sides of the aisle particularly our House Republicans who spent many long hours working on it and I... So, I just wanted to add that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to say that I went over there and I was the best-liked Democrat Appropriation Chairman. I don't know if... they gave me an invitation to be able to join them on that side of the aisle next year. So, I'm trying to... I'm going to ask the Leaders and see what they want to do. But for right now, I think I'm going to stay on this side. But I wanted to ask the... the Speaker, is there a prize for getting more votes out of the Appropriations Committee? Is there a raise or something that we get? Do I get to go home a day early?"

Speaker Lang: "I don't think there's sufficient money in the budget for that, Sir."

Arroyo: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Lang: "I don't think there's sufficient money in the budget for that."

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

Arroyo: "Could I take it out of appropriation?"

Speaker Lang: "We'll... we'll get back to you on that. Mr. Clerk,
Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1122, offered by Representative Howard. House Resolution 1123, offered by Representative Pritchard. House Resolution 1124, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 1125, offered by Representative Dugan. House Resolution 1126, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 1127, offered by Representative Mulligan. House Resolution 1128, offered by Representative Mulligan. And House Resolution 1129, offered by Representative David Harris."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting immediately after Session: the Revenue Committee is meeting in Room 115, Judiciary I-Civil Law is meeting in Room 413, the Insurance Committee is meeting in Room 114 and Environmental Health is meeting in C-1. Health care Licenses has been canceled. Meeting a half hour after Session is the Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges Committee meeting in Room D-1. The Rules Committee will meet immediately after Session."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a lot of discussion and debate about the question of pensions.

There's a great deal of interest regarding that matter.

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

I've spoken to the issue in the committee; I've worked with a whole variety of people. And I have stated publicly, stated publicly, that on one of these issues in this matter which is called the shift of the normal costs to local school districts and the community colleges, that I think that there ought to be a shift in the responsibility to the normal cost so that going forward why the people making the spending decisions will be called upon to pay the bills. Today it's very simple. Spending decisions are made, the Bill is sent down to TRS, the state pays the Bill. I think that ought to change. I think responsibility for spending decisions should be placed on the... the... in the hands of the people and then those people should be called upon to pay the bill. I had an interesting meeting this morning with Governor Quinn and I was surprised that the Governor disagreed with me on the issue; he agrees with you. He agrees with the Republicans. He thinks that we ought to remove the issue of the shift of normal cost out of the Bill. I disagree with the Governor, but he is the Governor. This is his request and in light of that, I've arranged with the Clerk that the sponsorship of Senate Bill 1673 will be changed from me to Mr. Cross. And as soon as we Rules Committee will meet and adiourn, the release Amendments 4 and 6, which are the two Republican Amendments that you've been asking to be released from the Rules Committee. All of that will be before the committee tomorrow at 9 a.m. in Room 114. By that time, Mr. Cross will be the Sponsor of the Bill and those two Amendments

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

will be up before the committee. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie now moves, that allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, May 31 at the hour of 10 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until tomorrow, May 31 at the hour of 10 a.m."

"House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Clerk Hollman: Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1981, recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5457 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3616. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from Committee on Judiciary I - Civil Law reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3522. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: recommends be adopted is the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 6 to House 1577. Representative May, Chairperson from Committee on Environmental Health reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2012: do pass Short 6153. Representative Debate is House Bill from the Committee on Chairperson Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

action taken on May 30, 2012: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2861. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6179, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 6180, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an concerning employment. House Bill 6181, offered Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 6182, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 6183, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act Bill 6184, offered concerning employment. House Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 6185, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 6186, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. House Bill 6187, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. House Bill 6188, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. These are referred to the Rules Committee. House Bills-Second Reading. House Bill 6153, offered Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bills-Second Reading. Senate Bill 2861, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 77, offered by Representative Mathias, is also referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further

147th Legislative Day

5/30/2012

business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."