39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Good morning, Members. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis who is the Illinois State Director of Capitol Commission, serving the political Leaders of Illinois. Pastor Lewis is the guest of Representative Morrison. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Pastor Lewis: "If you'd bow with me in prayer. Father, in Exodus 15:11, Moses writes, Who is You... Who is like You, O Lord, among the gods? Who is like You, majestic in holiness, awesome in glorious deeds doing wonders. It is good to begin this day with a pause where we can reflect upon You before turning to the business of today. Thank You for our lawmakers. And I pray, Lord, that you will give these men and women wisdom and patience with one another throughout the weeks ahead. The end of Session isn't quite here yet, but it is quickly approaching, and these Representatives will spend more and more of their time here in Springfield. I pray that You would comfort each one along with his or her spouse and children while they're away. May they exercise meekness and moments of frustration, seek and honor You above all else as they govern our state. In the name of Your Son, Jesus Christ, we pray, Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance."
- Conroy et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

39th Legislative Day

- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Bradley, Feigenholtz, Flowers, Gordon-Booth, Mell, and Zalewski are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Bellock and Hays are excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, on a count of one hun...

 please take the roll. On a count of 109 present, a quorum
 is established. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is House Bill 2496. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on April 12, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1816. Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 31, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. And House Joint Resolution 32, offered by Representative William Davis are referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Turner: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, we have House Bill 2496. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2496, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill.

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

 No Motions are filed."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Drury: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Drury: "I'd like everybody to give a warm Springfield welcome to Jacob Vile. He's 10 years old. He traveled down here from Wilmette, Illinois, today to be our Page and help us all out. And his grandmother came down from Northbrook, Illinois, Patty Vile, and if we can all wave to her up in... up in the gallery today. Let's give them a big Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Members, we will begin on the Order of Second Reading. We have House Bill 2765, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2765, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 513, Representative DeLuca. Out of the record. House Bill 353, Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 353, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Drury, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."
- Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 makes some minor changes to the original Bill, just a... sets a deadline

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

for when a commission appointments can be made and talks about and lists the number of meetings and reduces the number of meetings that the commission has to have. I ask for your... an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 353. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1140, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 1573, Representative Jefferson. Out of the record. House Bill 374, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. This is... Amendment #1 is a gut and replace Amendment. And what this does, it becomes the Bill, and it authorizes up to \$2.5 billion in bonds to be issued to pay down the backload of human service provider-related bills. This has been worked on over the last six months between key members of the Republican staff, past and present, the Senate Republican staff, Democratic staff, Representative Golar. And what this Bill would do would authorize the sale of \$2.5 billion in bonds. Two billion would be used to pay

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

down the ... the bills that we are paying prompt payment interest on. That draws back \$1 billion worth of federal money which is driven into that bond sale issue which would make this a five-year bond issue. From this point, we would be paying less by \$20 million a year in bond interest than we would pay in prompt pay interest to those people. There are tens of thousands of Medicaid providers and people who we are paying interest to who we are forcing to borrow money at a much higher rate. So, in this effort, we have worked with House and Senate. There is still more work to be done on it. This will place House Bill 374 in position that I think it can be a valuable tool towards addressing some of the backlogs of bills. And I would stand to answer any questions. And ask for an 'aye' vote and your approval to adopt this Amendment and place this Bill in the final form."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 374. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "State your point, Sir."

Bost: "Yes. In the gallery with us today, are fourth and fifth graders from Lick Creek School which is kind of in my

39th Legislative Day

- district and kind of in Brandon Phelps's district, and we'd just like to welcome them here today."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. And welcome to your Capitol. House Bill 2839, Representative Durkin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2839, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1140, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please the read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1140, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 513, Representative DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 513, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2856, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2856, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."

39th Legislative Day

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2623, Representative Fortner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2623, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2432, Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2432, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2335, Representative Gabel. Representative Gabel. Out of the record. House Bill 1573, Representative Jefferson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3319, Representative Halbrook. Out of the record. Representative DeLuca."
- DeLuca: "Mr. Speaker, can you please move House Bill 513 back to the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 513."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move House Bill 513 back to the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3112, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1

39th Legislative Day

- was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1457, Representative Leitch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2773, Representative Hammond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2773, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 160, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 160, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2335, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. House Bill 1584, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 3011, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3011, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1323, Representative Berrios. Out of the record. House Bill 3380, Representative

39th Legislative Day

- Tabares. Out of the record. House Bill 2760, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2760, a Bill for an Act concerning health facilities. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Sosnowski, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreed upon Amendment that solves any concerns with the Bill. So, I'd just ask for approval, and I can speak more to it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2760. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 3379, Representative Tabares. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3379, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 1199, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1199, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Second Reading of this House..."
- Speaker Turner: "Out of the record. House Bill 3191, Representative Tracy. Out of the record. House Bill 1694,

39th Legislative Day

- Representative Wheeler. Out of the record. House Bill 3191, Representative Tracy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3191, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2453, Representative Riley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2453, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Members, we'll be moving to the Order of Third Readings. Please be in your seat and prepared to present. House Bill 3388, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3388, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3388 is an initiative of the Cook County Sheriff's Office. It requires the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board to conduct or approve a training program in animal fighting awareness and humane response for local law enforcement officers. It came out of the experiences of Cook County Sheriff's Department in breaking up various dog fighting rings. I know of no opposition. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House... Representative Reboletti."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how much would this cost to... to provide this extra training? Is there a cost?"

Burke, K.: "It... it's not extra. It would just be worked into the curriculum of... of the Training Standards Board. So, it wouldn't be extra hours; it would just be part of the curriculum."

Reboletti: "And so, every new police officer going through training would be taking this course?"

Burke, K.: "It..."

Reboletti: "It'll be added into the... so many hours during..."

Burke, K.: "It will be added to the current program, yes."

Reboletti: "And... and how long would the... would the course last?

How many hours would it be?"

Burke, K.: "I don't think they have worked that out at this point. I think they're... the Training Standards Boards will work through that in conjunction with their educational people."

Reboletti: "And that's something they'll probably do through a rule, then."

Burke, K.: "Pardon me?"

Reboletti: "Will they do that through a rule or they'll have to come back here for us to tell them how long it would... it... it should be?"

Burke, K.: "I don't think they... I don't think we are going to dictate how long it should be or what their particular curriculum is. Or what... what the specifics of their curriculum is."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Kelly, I... as I read through the analysis on this, I guess the question I have is, why?"

Burke, K.: "I think the experience came out of cases that the Cook County Sheriff's police developed where there were dog fighting rings. And I think, that as a learning experience that their officers had not had specific training on this. And I think, the feeling was if they had... if law enforcement had some more specific training on how to recognize dog fighting and just create awareness, it would make them easier to find these rings and break them up and get those dogs out of those types of conditions."

Sacia: "I... I appreciate that, but how... how far-reaching is this? Is it... Are we dealing with a significant issue here? I know you mentioned dog fighting and I know there have been instances over the years of cock fighting and other animal fighting. It... it just seems like, you know, knowing what law enforcement under... law enforcement officers undergo for training and the amount of significant sensitivity training that they receive this day and age, and then I see something sponsored by the Humane Soci... well, I... I shouldn't say it's sponsored by, I don't know that... the Humane Society and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals neither of which is my favorite organization. And... and we get these folks bringing something that puts a requirement on... on a law enforcement

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

training course that is already, again, in my opinion, quite sensitive and... and deals with issues. Have there been issues where law enforcement officers did not treat animals properly or...

Burke, K.: "No. This is... and just to... for background, Representative. This an initiative of a law enforcement group..."

Sacia: "It is."

Burke, K.: "...the Cook County Sheriff's Department. And I believe, the other supporters have just... they're in support; it's not their Bill. And the issue is not... it is more how do we protect the public because, as you might ... I'm sure you know from your law enforcement background, is that when these animals are bred to fight, they're... they're aggressive. They are trained to be aggressive, and that can be a threat, not only to the other animals, but to... to the general public. And so, I think the sheriff's office... I think their reasoning in doing this was to let law enforcement be more aware of what is out there and the potential signs of a dog fighting ring and be able to ... to train them to have better awareness of this and better investigation of these dog fighting rings and protect the public as well as protect the animals."

Sacia: "I really appreciate that, Representative, in particular, your knowledge of the Bill. I... I'm sincere in that. I mean, it helps when somebody can really articulate it, and you just did a 180 for me. So, thank you."

Burke, K.: "Well, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Golar."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Golar: "Thank you. I stand in support of this legislation. In my community, it's a real problem in regards to dog fighting. Just recently, we had a one-on-one, the Legislators in my district with my commander who's been working very hard, not only on these kinds of issues but with just crime in general. And he was able to talk about his officers having the training. No more than three blocks of my home, they were able to identify 20 dogs in that home. And they were able to take them out and take that down; that's a real problem. And I really applaud Representative Burke bringing this to the attention of this Body. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "I think this is a good public safety measure. It protects not only the animals, but protects the public from... from animals who are ill-trained and maltreated. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3388 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 99 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 3388, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2377, Representative Conroy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2377, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."

"Thank you, Speaker. Today, I'm presenting HB 2377. Conrov: This Bill elim... eliminates salaries and benefits of six commissioners and the chairman of the Forest preserve of DuPage County. The board meets once a week. Forest preserve commissioners in DuPage County receive a base salary of \$53,500 per year plus a pension, and dental, and medical benefits. This is a total compensation package of up to \$80,709.50 per commissioner. The chairman of the board receives \$112,258 in salary plus a pension, dental, and medical benefits with an extra \$3,000 for a car allowance. Although this compensation package is \$149,577.20 annually, this is entirely disproportionate to the salary of forest preserve commissioners in neighboring counties. In most counties there is not a separate forest preserve board and county board, instead, the duties and roles of the forest preserve commissioner are absorbed by existing county board members who don't receive additional compensation for their forest preserve duties. This makes DuPage County unique in that we are paying two people a two full-time... at two fulltime salaries to do the same job that other counties are doing with one person on one salary. I am not proposing that we eliminate the Forest preserve Board and would never propose legislation that I believe would weaken its ability to accomplish its goals. We need people committed to conservation, improving natural habitats, preserving open spaces, and maintaining a system that can continue to

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

provide recreational and educational opportunities for our families. But I think we can do it more efficiently, more economically, and most importantly, in a way that is far more accountable to our taxpayers. This Bill gives us the opportunity to reach our goals by turning to local environmental organizations and individuals demonstrated commitment to improving the forest preserve. I am confident we can do this just as school boards, library boards, and other commissions across the state are already doing. When I presented this in committee, the committee Members suggested that I should be ... it should be left to the voters to decide, that this Bill should be amended to make it so that it is a referendum. I heeded the advice and filed Amendment 2 to make sure that we are protecting... to make sure that it is run as a referendum. Amendment 2 allows a referendum to appear on the next General Election ballot and also ensure that any reasonable incurred by board members while performing their act... actual duties will be reimbursed. I would be happy to answer any questions. And hope that this Amendment... And hope that because of this Amendment and my willingness to compromise with the other side would make the committee members willing to support this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Members, I know it's Friday and it's been a long week, but can we please keep the noise level in the chamber down so that Members can hear the debate going on. Thank you. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Representative, if... Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, I... I don't think I've ever seen anything like this before. And I know that your... your explanations were long and drawn, but I hope that we can just have a conversation so that I can truly understand it. This, specifically, is only DuPage County."

Conroy: "Yes, it is."

Bost: "And... But why are we doing this through State Law and not allowing your county to handle this on their own?"

Conroy: "The enti... the county will... I will gather the signatures and they will decide."

Bost: "But you could do that without state legislate... without legislation. You... you have the right to... to put a referendum on the ballot in your own county anyway, correct for anything."

Conroy: "Represent... Representative, let me explain my district to you. I'm in DuPage County, and I'm a Democrat. My district has the majority of the working class folks in it. And I have made a pledge to make every cut I can in terms of fat in terms of government expenditures. And this is somewhere where my district and the entire district... the entire DuPage County will benefit."

Bost: "I... I'm not arguing that you're trying to do something that you feel is right. I'm asking you, you have this authority in your county right now, to allow local control to handle this. Am I wrong?"

Conroy: "I was elected in November..."

Bost: "I know you were elected, Ma'am."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Conroy: "...and I choose... I am choosing, with this position, to be a leader in terms of cutting fat in DuPage County."

Bost: "So, now wait a minute... now wait a minute. Now, listen to what I'm saying."

Conroy: "I hear you."

Bost: "Local control. And I'm not trying to fight with you. I don't need you to attack me and tell me how great it is that you won your election. I'm trying to talk seriously about this Bill, Ma'am and I'm seriously talking about it because you're setting a precedence. You're coming from this General Assembly stepping into doing county business. Am I wrong?"

Conroy: "DuPage County is where the 46th District resides."

Bost: "Okay. But that's not what I'm saying. The local county has this power right now. If the county would choose to do it, they can put this referendum on the ballot and run this to the voters. Can they not?"

Conroy: "Well, Representative, clearly they have not chosen to do this in the past. And I have identified this..."

Bost: "So..."

Conroy: "...is an area where we can save taxpayer dollars."

Bost: "So, let's... let's look at it this way. You've chose, from the State of Illinois, to shove this down the county's throat."

Conroy: "You know, before I filed this Bill, I spoke with the chairman of the county board, and he was not... he did not oppose this Bill."

Bost: "Then why..."

Conroy: "He supported my effort to file it."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Bost: "Then why didn't he do it at the county level? See, I'm just trying to figure out why we feel that we're so much better, here, that we're going to override the county or allow the county not to do their job. And we're going to come in and say, you know what, either... either one of two things. This is a power grab between you and them..."

Conroy: "There's no power grab here."

Bost: "Okay. Then this..."

Conroy: "The power grab would be to eliminate the board. I have no intention to do that."

Bost: "Okay. Then this is just a political move to... to draw attention because you're trying to do something from the state level that needs to be done at the county level."

Conroy: "Is your opposition that I'm a Democrat and trying to be fiscally responsible?"

Bost: "Oh, Ma'am. I... I got way over that Democrat and Republican thing a long time ago. And if you want to keep bringing that up..."

Conroy: "Then why is your entire caucus told to vote against my Bill?"

Bost: "Do what?"

Conroy: "Why was your entire caucus told to vote against my Bill? I have amended..."

Bost: "Ma'am, I don't know how your caucus runs, but our..."

Conroy: "I..."

Bost: "...caucus doesn't tell anybody how to vote."

Conroy: "Representative, I amended this Bill."

Bost: "So, don't tell me what happens in my caucus, Ma'am."

Conroy: "Representative, I... I amended this Bill, twice."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Bost: "You do not tell us what happened in our caucus."

Conroy: "I amended this Bill."

Bost: "Because you have... you weren't there."

Conroy: "I amended this Bill."

Bost: "You weren't there, Ma'am."

Conroy: "Twice. I amended this Bill twice. The second time I offered to give you as many signatures as you would like if I could get bipartisan support..."

Bost: "...and I am telling you that this is county..."

Conroy: "...and I was told no."

Bost: "And I am telling you that this should be handled by the counties not this floor."

Conroy: "That's your opinion."

Bost: "You're right it is. You know, for you to come out here and say this is based on partisanship, Ma'am, you don't know this floor well enough to do that."

Conroy: "You've given me no choice."

Bost: "Oh, yeah. I gave you a choice. And I'm going to tell you I know... here's what I do hope from a partisan side. I hope that your constituents see exactly what you're doing here."

Conroy: "I hope my..."

Bost: "And you're trying to go... And you're proving that it's the wrong thing to do."

Conroy: "I hope that my constituents understand..."

Bost: "You are going to go ahead and override your own home county..."

Conroy: "I hope my constit..."

Bost: "...and decide, from this Body, how you're more important than they are."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Conroy: "In no way does my district think I'm more important than anybody but my constituent. Let me explain to you that I believe in this. I have worked very hard in what I want my constituents to know and DuPage County is that I did everything I could to amend this Bill to get bipartisan support. And I was shut down."
- Bost: "But maybe the problem isn't bipartisanship, maybe it is that there's certain ideas and beliefs that some of us believe that your county should do their job and we should do ours."
- Conroy: "Every time I had a push back from your Party, I amended it to oblige them and was told no."
- Bost: "Well, Ma'am, I'm going to tell you, you said some things on this floor that aren't true. This... I'm telling you... I will tell you this about my caucus. We don't take a caucus position; we never have. And I guarantee you on a Bill like this, it's not worth the fights that we might even have in our own caucus."

Conroy: "Well..."

- Bost: "I don't know how you run your caucus or where it is or...
 or anything like that..."
- Conroy: "I'm in no position to run my caucus."
- Bost: "...but I'm telling you, this is not a based on partisanship, it's based on a disbelief... how we disagree on how we should handle legislation from this Body. I do not believe it's our responsibility to tell the counties what they need to do."
- Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members. Can we please hold the volume down in the chamber. There's a heated debate going

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

on. Can we please hold the volume down. Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "I'm going to keep the volume way down. I just have a very quick question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Cassidy: "Through the course of amending the Bill, were the concerns of the Sierra Club alleviated?"

Conroy: "The Sierra Club, they support the board as... as it is. They want the board to remain; that was their concern. Their concern was that I would try to remove the board, and I have absolutely no intention of doing that. So, they filed in opposition, but they did not come and speak."

Cassidy: "So, are they still opposed?"

Conroy: "They haven't removed their opposition, but I've reached out to them and haven't gotten any reply."

Cassidy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, how... what was the size of the DuPage County Board back in the 1990s? Do you... Are you aware?"

Conroy: "Back then they had... they separated... 10 years ago, they separated the forest preserve board. So, when they did so, the board... the county board got an extra \$30 thousand a piece to do the forest preserve work. They separated members and then they were able, somehow, to decide on their own compensation."

Fortner: "Do you know why this Body allowed the boards to separate?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Conroy: "From what I understand, it was because they felt there was too many conflicts of interest."

Fortner: "That's right. In particular, there were places where the board, it was felt and there was certainly members of the public that felt and asked their Legislators to act in such a way to take what was then, a 24-member board and to say, we want to make sure that the roles of the forest preserve, in protecting the natural lands of the county, were well respected and were not going to be at any time subjugated to people who might want to do road development or other types of projects..."

Conroy: "And I agree with that."

Fortner: "...that would interfere with that. And because of that, and recognizing that the board was going to split into one group of 18 and one group of 6, there were 24 members at the time divided into six districts, if I'm... that... what... the decision was, that in order to keep the parity, recognizing these were both important functions and that none of the members were to be put out, the intent of this Body, at that time as reflected through the people of the county was, in fact, to keep parity and salary as well as parity in district size and other respects just to make sure that those functions were both separately and importantly provided for."

Conroy: "Representative, what I would say is that, you know, the majority of folks here are willing to get rid of the Lieutenant Governor's position to save money. This is money that can be saved for the taxpayers of DuPage County. And not eliminate their position."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Fortner: "I understand what you're trying to do. I think that goes against the... the intent of what we have tried to do in acting for the people of DuPage County when this Body acted to say, this is an important function. We, essentially, said we're going to take 24 members and divide them into two groups. We don't want to suddenly diminish one group and have them have no salary or reduced salary. We said they should maintain the same salary structure as all the other members. What I see here, is a real undermining of that important function of the forest preserve to protect the open spaces, to recognize that this was an aspect of parity that this Body created when we agreed to help preserve the natural open space of DuPage County by dividing the forest preserve and making it a separate body. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, do you recall the genesis of why the DuPage County Forest preserve was carved out of the county board?"

Conroy: "I believe, Repre... Representative Fortner, just went through that."

Reboletti: "Right. Do you... do you remember that?"

Conroy: "Ten years ago."

Reboletti: "Why was that?"

Conroy: "Mr. Fortner just went through the whole entire reason."

39th Legislative Day

- Reboletti: "I... I understand what Representative Fortner just said, Representative Conroy. I'm asking you the question."
- Conroy: "What I would say to that is why they were separated; I believe their missions are very different. I believe them being separated is a good thing; I support that. I support what they do as a board. And I'd also like to mention that I just received a message from Chairman Cronin who says that he thinks that this is a good Bill, and we should allow the voters to make the decision."
- Reboletti: "Did you talk to the chairman of the forest preserve? Did he take that same position?"
- Conroy: "Now, why would someone in that position take that position? I'm sorry, but if you were going to take my pay away for one... one meeting a week, I would not want you to do that."
- Reboletti: "To the Bill. You know, I... I've heard a ton of discussion about partisanship and that this Sponsor's Bill, only working people in DuPage County happen to live in the 46th District. That is amazing because the working people throughout DuPage County live in all of the districts. They're Republican, they're Democrat, they're Independent, they're seniors, they're minorities. I didn't realize they all got into a car and moved into Glendale Heights in Villa Park. That's number one. Number two, we don't have a caucus position on this Bill as eloquently stated by my other floor Leader, Representative Bost. It's a... It's amazing that we're going to decide if an entity should receive pay based on 500 valid signatures when any type of referendum you would do in a countywide situation would probably be 5

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

thousand signatures, 10 thousand signatures. I don't know if the county chairman also believes that the county board members should not receive any remuneration for their service or county board members across the state shouldn't receive any remuneration. I would suggest if Members want to vote for this, I'll be more than glad to say I'll work with Representative Conroy, we'll take all 102 counties, and say nobody makes any money anywhere in public service. Why would we do this to DuPage County? We have staggered terms, number one. So, some members would serve with pay, some members would not serve with pay. And you were talking about partisanship, Representative, I had а Bill dissolve the forest preserve, and it went subcommittee. I wonder if that was partisanship. This entity was created by leq... legislation down here in 1996. It became effective in 2002. But for us to similarly decide that the pay should be removed by a referendum is working contra to the entire mission of (a) the forest preserve and what it is we do down here. In that same committee, myself and Representative Franks were trying to get rid of mosquito abatement districts in DuPage County and couldn't get it out of committee on a partisan roll call. So, we can't abolish mosquito abatement districts, but we can dissolve the pay for the forest preserve chairman and the forest preserve commissioners only in DuPage County. Maybe we could amend the Bill and say Cook County commissioners shouldn't make any money also or Macoupin County or anywhere else. Why we're doing this now, by referendum, I'm not exactly sure where the hue and cry has been. You, also,

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

spoke about the fact the Sierra Club had removed their opposition. When I spoke to them last week in my office in Addison, which is full of working class people, they were opposed. They were opposed to my legislation. I have no doubt that we can streamline services in the forest preserve and the county board. And maybe, at some point, the forest preserve should go back into the county board which is where I had talked about for the last four weeks, four months or so. This situation is something entirely new. I would argue it's unconstitutional. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we keep the noise level down.

We're having trouble hearing."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want... I ask for a verification if this were to receive the Constitutional Majority."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the wrong way to go about dealing with salaries for an elected Body. The people of DuPage County are represented by six coun... forest preserve commissioners. They make a salary. If the people don't like the salary, they can vote the folks out. The forest preserve just reduced their salary. I think the job could be done by the county board. So, this threshold of 500 signatures is less than what we need to get on the ballot. I'm not sure what the exact amount of compensation should be, but I think there should be some fair amount of compensation because people don't only go to one meeting a week or a month. The forest preserve commissioners that I know attend many events throughout their district, as well

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

as throughout the county. They have committee hearings. They have subcommittees. They review budgets. So, it's not a simple thing of just throw it up there, we'll take the salary away and take a victory lap. Yesterday, we reduced our salary by a small amount, I guess, that maybe we should make zero also. Maybe we should just file a Bill that says every elected official throughout the state should make zero. If that's what the will of the Body is, that's fine. I represent DuPage County as well; I've lived there all my life. It's very simple. This was created by legislation. If we're going to deal with something regarding it, it should be by legislation. Let those forest preserve commissioners and the forest preserve president have the ability to set their salary. If they want to reduce it, they should reduce it. If they want to increase it, they should increase it. But this should not be fought here on this House Floor."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Representative Conroy, do you know the background of the six members of the DuPage forest preserve commission? Do they have naturalist backgrounds?"

Conroy: "No, not necessarily."

Willis: "Okay. Also, do they... have we ever voted on issues in this chamber that are particular to a certain area of the... the state and not necessarily statewide?"

Conroy: "Yes. We do it all the time. That's why we're here to represent our areas."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Willis: "Thank you. To the Bill. I, too, live in DuPage County, and I do see that we have members of this commission... the forest preserve commission, in fact, the chair happens to live right down my block; he's one of my neighbors. These members, while they are admirable in what they do, we do... we are in a crisis on salaries in this area. And I do believe that we're not necessarily by passing this Bill in this chamber, if we are lucky enough to pass it, we're not cutting their salaries immediately. We're giving the people in the community the option to make that decision. I think this is an admirable Bill. I support this Bill. I hope the rest of this chamber will see what we're trying to do to take some fiscal responsibility for this area. Thank you very much. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "First of all, an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."

Reis: "How many votes will this take for passage? Oh, I forgot to address my question to Representative Franks."

Speaker Turner: "Sixty votes."

Reis: "Sixty votes. Okay. All right. Now, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, what do the... what does the mayor of Villa Park make?"

Conroy: "The mayor of Villa... right around six to eight thousand dollars a year."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Reis: "Six to eight thousand?"

Conroy: "Yes."

Reis: "And the aldermen there or may..."

Conroy: "They get a very small stipend as well."

Reis: "Do you know what the aldermen of the City of Chicago make?"

Conroy: "I'm not familiar with that, but I believe they get a large full-time salary."

Reis: "I'm pretty sure it's over 85 thousand."

Conroy: "I'm pretty sure it is as well."

Reis: "Okay."

Conroy: "But I don't live in Chicago."

Reis: "We're saving money, though. What about your county board members? What do they make there?"

Conroy: "With the county board, they make \$1,000 less than the forest preserve board members do."

Reis: "Will this Bill affect their salaries..."

Conroy: "No, it will not."

Reis: "...'cause we're wanting to save money there?"

Conroy: "No, it will not. That... that would be a totally different issue."

Reis: "Is that on your radar too?"

Conroy: "That is not presently on my radar."

Reis: "And you're a former school board member. What does your superintendent make?"

Conroy: "My superintendent, not sure what it is this year. I actually hired him a couple years ago, and he's a little over \$200 thousand which I think is absolutely ridiculous."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Reis: "Now, are you... is that on your radar, too, to lower that?"
- Conroy: "I would love to see all of us find a way to lower some of those out of... out of control salaries."
- Reis: "Okay. Now, here's my real question. Do you think it's right for this Body to go to the aldermen of Chicago, your county board members, your superintendents and dictate their salaries?"
- Conroy: "I don't think those situations are the same as this.

 This isn't this..."
- Reis: "You're saving money. You're saving money."
- Conroy: "You know, and that's semantics. But what I would tell you is that this situation, DuPage County forest preserve, is the only forest preserve in the entire state that gets paid this way. Everyone else makes a stipend of between zero and 3 thousand dollars. Now, I amended this Bill to give them expenses, reimbursement for their expenses and I also amended it to run it as a referendum. I, also, offered to give you as many signatures as you would like on that referendum as I was told 500 was not enough."

Reis: "And..."

- Conroy: "I did that and then was told, I'm sorry, we still won't vote for it."
- Reis: "And I'm not in those discussions, and I can assure we barely even talked about this Bill in caucus. And we did not take a caucus position. If we do take caucus positions, trust me, there are some major Bills that I'd like to take caucus positions on and that'll be a debate for another day, but we don't do it. But my question is, and I don't

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

have a dog in this hunt, I agree that these salaries are outrageous, but let the local people do this. We are setting a precedent here where Springfield..."

Conroy: "That's exactly what I'm doing, Representative."

Reis: "No, you're not."

Conroy: "I'm putting it on the ballot and letting the voters decide just like we're doing with the Lieutenant Governor's position."

Reis: "That is our job. It's in the Constitution for us to set up that referendum."

Conroy: "Well, I take..."

Reis: "It's not in our Constitution to set up local referendums for park board district's salaries. We're going way beyond the scope of our duties here. Way beyond. And that's my concern. I don't care how you... how much those people make, if you think it's too much, which I do let the local people initiate the referendum and do it because we could go to probably over 800 school districts and sav the superintendents make too much. We're going to decide in Springfield that... To the Bill. To the Bill. We're going to decide here, in Springfield, that they're making too much. We have other park districts here; we have a long list of them, maybe we say they're making too much. Let's set up a referendum from Springfield and let the people decide on those salaries. So, I just ask that regardless of whether you think this is too much or not, I think most people in this chamber agree that it is, think about what you're doing here. There are a thousand examples of where we could introduce a Bill to force a referendum on someone's salary

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

or what they're doing. This is not the role of State Government. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Just now spoke with the Sierra Club, Representative and they are still opposed to the Bill primarily for the reason that they are concerned about the interplay between the county board and the preserve district with regard to conservation efforts. And they want to ensure that the board remains professional and focus on conservation. Would you be willing, as the Bill moves forward to the next chamber, to continue to have discussions to ensure that conservation is prioritized?"

Conroy: "Absolutely. And I've told the Sierra Club that."

Williams: "Great."

Conroy: "And I've tried very hard to assure them. Their concern was that I would try to eliminate this board. I believe in this board. I believe in what they do, and I will continue to support that. And I will work very hard to maintain that."

Williams: "Well, I commend your efforts then. And I will be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Well, I didn't think that we'd have so much debate on this, Representative, did you? Let's talk about what this Bill does and what it doesn't do. What... what you're trying

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

to do, in my understanding, is to simply allow the voters the chance via referendum to determine how much they're going pay people on a board, correct?"

Conroy: "Yes, Representative. My goal is to allow the voters to number 1) be aware of the salaries that are being paid.

Number 2) to be aware that everywhere else in this state these folks are being paid between zero and 3 thousand dollars a year. And it's to let them make an informed decision, as voters, as to whether they feel this is appropriate."

Franks: "How many people are on this board?"

Conroy: "There are six members and one chairman."

Franks: "And how were they appointed originally?"

Conroy: "They... they have to be elected."

Franks: "So, they're elected right now. So, were they... were they created by statute? I believe they were created by statute. So, they were created by statute. So, what we're doing or what you're trying to do here is via statute, allow the citizens more of a voice, correct?"

Conroy: "Yes, I am."

Franks: "So, this would be the proper way to do it because since it was created by statute... through statute you're empowering the voters. Would that be something you'd agree with?"

Conroy: "Yes. My entire goal is to give this power to our voters."

Franks: "Okay. One of the previous Representatives got up and said they can't believe what a low bar it is for only 500

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

signatures. And they said this is nothing else in statute like that at all. Remember that argument?"

Conroy: "I do."

Franks: "Well, let me tell you. I ran a referendum last summer in McHenry County that cost 500 signatures to determine the whole way that our county would be run to be whether it would be a county executive form of government or maintaining the kind of government they had. So, it wasn't, simply, a referendum on salary, it was a referendum on the entire form of government and the signature requirement was 500. Did you know that?"

Conroy: "I did not know that."

Franks: "So, 500 really is the standard in this state when it comes to referendums. So, I want folks to understand this is nothing nefarious; this is not a lower standard. It's the standard that's been in the books for over 30 years. So... so, what you're trying to do, I understand, is to simply say, if the voters even care, and they might not care at all because I... correct?"

Conroy: "That's correct."

Franks: "You know, I passed a similar law, years ago, that would allow... 'cause we have a... a conservation district in McHenry County, and at that time I had passed a law that said if the voters cared, they can, via referendum, get the signatures and then determine whether the con... the preservation district should be elected rather than appointed. That law has been on the books for 10 years and no one's cared enough to run a referendum, but at least the citizens would have an opportunity to weigh in if they

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

chose. Now, I presume, this is pretty much very similar to that."

Conroy: "Yes, it is."

Franks: "So, all you're really doing is allowing the citizens, should they care, to put the question on the ballot so they can self-determine whether they wish to pay these type of salaries."

Conroy: "Yes, it is. And that's also why I supported the Constitutional Amendment on the Lieutenant Governor."

Franks: "To the Bill. I... I can't understand the rancor against this Bill. This was something that was created by statute, being amended by statute to allow citizens to have a larger voice. Every day we talk here, on the House Floor, how local control ought to be put forward. This is the ultimate local control Bill. This would allow citizens, should they desire, to be able to weigh in on salaries of elected officials. I think that the citizens throughout the state would be clamoring for this. I would hope that we could make this larger than just yours for the forest preserve district. I think we ought to try this as an experiment to see if the voters wish to get involved on this issue. I don't see any valid reasons to be voting against this. And I'd encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "To the Bill. This has been very interesting debate.

And it's also good to hear from some of the champions of the taxpayers who've spoke over the last few minutes.

They're the same ones that, a few years ago, need to be reminded that they're ones that voted for the now famous

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

pension holiday which has decimated our pension systems, but never mind that. This Bill, clearly, has a questionable issue regarding its constitutionality. We have a clause in our Constitution called the Special Legislation Clause; prohibits special legislation, the type which we're presented here with today. But more importantly, I know freshmen come in every two years, and they need to be able to deliver something back for their district. But how about doing something that has substance rather than pandering. This is complete political pandering. It has no place for this Body. I would request a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

"To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Sandack: there's been tremendous rhetoric and some rancor, to use a word of my esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle, let's make sure we know what we're doing. First of all, I'm not going to impart any ill will upon anyone. I think the Sponsor has worked hard. And I think she's diligent. And I think her intentions are good. But let's make sure we know what we're doing here and please be careful before you push the green button. Look, the propriety of this unit of government is fair game for local government and for taxpayers to determine. That may be a good referendum question, but that's not what this issue is. And to be clear, this is saying should these people, should these public officials get nothing for their service lest you have any doubt if our salaries were on that ballot, if a school board's salaries were on that ballot, if a city... any unit of government put before the... the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

taxpayers, how about you get nothing for serving, we know what the answer's going to be. Look, local control means letting the county deal with this situation. Let's vote 'no' and work on a Bill. If we want to consolidate units of government, if we want to do the right thing for taxpayers, let's put it in their realm in the right way. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy to close."

Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. What I would say is that this Bill gives the taxpayers the ability to be educated as to the fact that our forest preserve board is the only one in the state that is paid at these out of... out of control prices. They will receive a stipend and will be in the same place as every other forest preserve in the State of Illinois. We are going to allow, if this passes, the taxpayers to make the decision. I believe that's important. And I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, there has been a verification requested by Representative Reboletti. Please be in your seats and vote your own switches. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2377 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the roll... record. Representative Conroy."

Conroy: "I'll take that Roll Call."

Speaker Turner: "On a count of 48 voting 'yes', 60 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2377, having received...

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to... point of per... clarification. Representative, that last comment that I'll take that Roll Call, you just proved to the Body the intent of the legislation. So, thank you for your discussion."
- Speaker Turner: "House Bill 2362, Representative Brauer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."
- Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill for Hope School here in Springfield. And what has happened over the years, their students have instead of being referred from DCFS are now recommended from DHS and it leaves them out of the ability to collect capital from the Capital Development Board. And this just simply would allow them to be eligible. I'll answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2362 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2362, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3383, Representative Costello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3383, a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3383 amends the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. It provides an additional two years of full-time enrollment to state universities or community colleges for members of the Illinois National Guard or Naval Militia who are currently serving and have served 10 years or more. I thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Turner: Indicates that he will."

Ives: "Representative Costello, you know I'm a fan of veteran Bills. I was just wondering, could you explain to me what sort of educational benefits these same particular soldiers already receive."

Costello: "So, Representative, currently they receive four years. Why I believe this is a very important piece of legislation, number 1, like I said in my opening statement, you have to be a current member of the National Guard, so you are currently serving. You would have to serve at least 10 years or more before you are eligible for this particular piece of legislation. Also, I believe you may know from being in the military, the 10-year mark is a very pivotal time for people that are... that are in service as most people decide if they're going to continue and make it a full-time career or not. So, the additional two years, I believe, is important as well 'cause many people who have

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

served 10 years, may have been deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan for say 2 or 3 of those 10 years. So, many times, you know, the 4-year commitment is not enough to even get them through their bachelors."

Ives: "Okay. To the Bill. While I want to support veterans, here's what we do know. We know that all of the state universities had their credit downgraded about two weeks ago. We know that University of Illinois, as it stands right now, is owed by the State of Illinois over... almost \$500 million. We know we haven't been able to provide enough money to fund our back bills which approach \$10 billion. And we also know that in many cases these same individuals have already received educational benefits which is why they initially may... well, which is part of the benefits that they receive for initially going into the service. And while I appreciate their commitment, at this time, in Illinois with our fiscal crisis, I cannot support this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I'm not sure I understood your comment. If an individual has been deployed, I understand the National Guard Tuition Assistance Program, and if an individual has been deployed... Well, first of all, let's back up. An individual who serves for 1 year in the National Guard is then eligible for the National Guard Tuition Assistance Program at a university."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Costello: "IVG, Illinois Veterans Grant."

Harris, D.: "Okay. But if you serve 1 year, you get that benefit, correct?"

Costello: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, as long as you are an active member, you are eligible for what, 4 years of that assistance?"

Costello: "So, you would have to have served 10 years in the National Guard be..."

Harris, D.: "What... what..."

Costello: "...for this particular program."

Harris, D.: "Not... not for this Bill. What is the... And my point is, what is the current situation? In other words, as I understand it, if I ser... if I join the Guard and I serve for 1 year, I am then eligible for the tuition assistance. Is that correct?"

Costello: "If you serve, yes, the four year."

Harris, D.: "If I serve, after my... after my..."

Costello: "But... but there's not a 1-year enlistment, correct?"

Harris, D.: "No, no. But once... I'm not eligible until I serve
 my first year."

Costello: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "So, once I serve my first year, I'm then eligible.

And I'm eligible for 4 years, correct, 4 years of assistance?"

Costello: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, my question is, what difference does it make if an individual... what difference does it make if an individual is deployed? If they're deployed, they're not

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- attending school. So, they haven't burned up their 4 years of assistance if they're... if they are deployed."
- Costello: "Yeah. David, as I understand it and I've... what I believe, like, for instance, you have a time period to... to actually use your school credits. So, what this does, you will receive 4 years right now; this would be an additional 2 years. So, maybe, part of the situation, to explain it, would be if we did it on a credit system instead of a time system."
- Harris, D.: "Well, you may... you may have just answered my question. I understand what the Bill does. But you may have answered the question with your... with your comment that you have a limited amount of time in which to use the benefit you initially have. I wasn't aware of that and I'm not... are you sure that's part of the program now?"
- Costello: "I believe so. For instance, IVG, separate system, once you start it, I believe you have 10 years to use that.

 That's the separate Illinois Veterans Grant."
- Harris, D.: "Right."
- Costello: "But... but again, I mean, what's very important about this legislation is you have to be a current member of the Illinois National Guard serving."
- Harris, D.: "Right."
- Costello: "So, you've already served 10 years, you've reenlisted, which I believe the minimum enlistment is 4 years, so we're talking about somebody who's going to have 14 years in. Most people, as... as, I believe, you well know who have put 14 years in are going to do their 20. So, if you look at the investment the state already has in those

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

people, I think it's a... in my opinion, extremely important to try to entice them to stay in for a career."

Harris, D.: "And I understand it; I'm not questioning that. I just... I just don't understand why they... they're not eligible to continue the initial benefits that they get, which I believe is 4 years of assistance at any public or state-controlled university or community college, once they have served their initial first year. You're saying there's a time limit to use that benefit; I'm not absolutely sure. I'm going to support your Bill."

Costello: "Yeah. Please."

Harris, D.: "I'd like you to take a... I'd like the Senate Sponsor to take a look at that..."

Costello: "Absolutely."

Harris, D.: "...and see if that's really the case. But I appreciate your answers. Thank you."

Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, what was the genesis of this legislation?"

Costello: "I'm sorry, Ken, I didn't hear your question."

Dunkin: "What... what was the genesis of this relate to... this legislation?"

Costello: "The Illinois Veterans Department. So, the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs."

Dunkin: "So, they... they asked you to present this?"

Costello: "Yes, Sir."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Dunkin: "Do you have an idea of how many veterans' grants and scholarships that we currently have today?"
- Costello: "So, the people that use this particular, the 4-year program in 2012, there were 1978 members of the National Guard, again, currently serving in the National Guard who used this particular program."
- Dunkin: "So, there are a number of other... there are a myriad of veterans' scholarships that we have in the State of Illinois. Are you aware of those?"
- Costello: "Yes. And... and those, I believe, can... many of them people use after they get out of the service. Again, the difference being with this legislation in this particular program, it's designed for people who are currently a member of the National Guard. And it's an... it's designed as an incentive to try to get them to make a career out of it. As I'm sure you're well aware, by the time you've put 10 years into the military, the... the state has a significant financial commitment into most of these individuals if not all."
- Dunkin: "Right. So, currently, we have community colleges, state university, even private institutions and private community colleges, they currently do this. So, you're saying it's only for those when they complete their active duty?"
- Costello: "No. That's the Illinois Veterans Grant. This is for people who are currently serving. And this is the Higher Education Student Assistant Act. So, that... it's different from the Illinois Veterans Grant which, again, most people

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

use after they get out of service, so they depart from service."

Dunkin: "So, if we... do you have an idea of how much this would cost?"

Costello: "You... you know, Ken, I don't have an exact idea, but it... going back to the fact that last year, 1978 people used the 4-year program, it would be a percentage of that. So, it's kind of impossible to say exactly what it would be, but under 2,000 people, again, used this last year. And I know, it does cost a little bit more money, but to replace those individuals if they depart from service is also going to cost the state a significant amount for training. We, as a state, push and require higher education for many promotions, so this is a way to help those people with that education."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, is... do we currently do this for any other agency; for example, individuals who are Department of Corrections guards or Illinois State Police to incentivize them to... to go to school? 'Cause I know in Chicago, if you're a Chicago police officer, you are able to... if you finish your education or you get your bachelor's degree, if you get your masters degree, many individuals who are city employees, especially Chicago police, they end up going to law school or they end up getting their Ph.D. Do you know if the Illinois State Police does this currently, or any... any other agency, Department of Corrections?"

Costello: "You know, Ken, I'm not aware of it offhand. So, that's my, you know, honest answer."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Dunkin: "Okay. See... this... this reminds me a bit of the Illinois Legislative Scholarship that this Body here debated, and debated very strongly. And I know, look, my brother is a Marine, seven years active duty. My uncle died. My brotherin-law is in the Air Force right now, and... I mean, just all around me, they're people that I love who are veterans or current... actively serving. But this is a waiver. When it said... when it said now this is another waiver coming from the Legislature, correct?"
- Costello: "Correct. But again, I go back to the fact these are people currently serving. We have moneys invested in them and to replace these people, in the National Guard, would cost us money as well. So, we're trying to get people who are experienced to stay in and make the National Guard a career."
- Dunkin: "Yeah. But so, if they're... so, we're paying them to be in the National Guard, they're serving already."
- Costello: "Very... very... I would say a very minimal amount for what they do."

Dunkin: "Sure."

Costello: "The time they spend away from their family. The fact that numerous, if not a large percentage, of our National Guard has been deployed over the last, say, 10 year-period. We've been in Afghanistan, I think, about 13 years; we're in Iraq, you know, for, I don't know, it's 10 or 11 years. These people have... have gone through a... a very serious commitment; time away from their family. And I think this is just an extra step to try to, again, get people to stay in the military who have experience."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Dunkin: "And... and thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I certainly respect your background and you know I love your mom, so I know you're a good guy. And I know your intentions on this legislation. This is a waiver as this, you know, I've wanted... would you... let me ask you this. Would you be willing to help me reintroduce the legislative scholarship waivers?"
- Costello: "I would not, Ken. I believe that that's a completely different situation. I respect your opinion on that. We just have a differing opinion on legislative scholarships."
- Dunkin: "Well, Representative, this is a... this is a waiver. You acknowledge that, right? It's a... We're going to make a determination."
- Costello: "Ken, what this is, is a waiver for people who protect our company... our country, our freedom, the right for us to have this debate right now, people who have been in harm's way... put themselves in harm's way. You know, it's, to me, two different situations completely."
- Dunkin: "Well, Representative, it's a... so, if I have someone who, let's say, goes to Illinois State University, they have an ROTC program. They, then, can be incentivized to join the ROTC for the next three years."
- Costello: "That would be terrific."
- Dunkin: "And so, there's a net benefit when we have individuals who go to college, right?"
- Costello: "Absolutely. And... and what I would say is I would love to talk to those individuals about serving our country in the military."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Dunkin: "So, you would be in favor of a legislative waiver being reintroduced here? I mean, I think this is your second legislative wai... waiver for veterans since I've been here. Am I right, Representative Costello?"
- Costello: "Ken, what I think is this is a terrific program for people that serve in the National Guard. And what we ought to do is try to incentivize them to make a career out of the National Guard because, once again, we have a very significant financial commitment into these men and women already."
- Dunkin: "And so, here's a... here's a serious question for you.

 If they take advantage of this program, will they be able
 to also take advantage of the multiple other veterans'
 grants as an active duty member?"
- Costello: "They could. And again, difference being most of those are taken advantage of after they depart from service or ETS, end of time in service."
- Dunkin: "All right. So, they'll be able to take advantage of this. So, and the general over here, he raised some good points as well. So when they come out, this pro... this program would make them ineligible? Or they can, also, take advantage of the other..."

Costello: "No. They would not..."

Dunkin: "...veterans' waiver programs."

Costello: "...be eligible for this program once they were out of service. This is only for people who are currently serving. So, you have to be, number one, you have to have served 10 years. So, the minimum reenlistment, I believe is 4, so you've got 14 years in. Ten years is normally the decisive

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

point when somebody decides if they're going to make the military a career. So, this is an incentive to try to get people to stay in for 10 years so we can recoup those moneys that we have already put into their training and education."

Dunkin: "And so... so, they only get that little small monthly stipend, correct?"

Costello: "They..."

Dunkin: "National Guard. We're talking about the National Guard."

Costello: "Correct."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Mr. Dunkin. Can you bring them to a close? We have a few people wishing to speak and a lot of Bills to move through on Third today."

Dunkin: "Okay. I just want to be... last question. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if you're an active National Guard member, you cannot take advantage of a community college veterans' grant or a GI grant as well? 'Cause if so, that means they'll be double or triple dipping as veterans."

Costello: "No. I don't believe so, Ken. Again, this is... this is the ... specifically, this deals with people currently serving."

Dunkin: "Yeah."

Costello: "The other... the other programs, Montgomery GI Bill which is federal, the Illinois Veterans Grant which is a state program, you have to have ended your time in service. So, again, this is dealing with people who are current members of the National Guard."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Dunkin: "And this'll be the only grant that they'll be able to take advantage of?"

Costello: "Right. And they have to have 10 years in before they can even become eligible for this 2 years."

Dunkin: "Thank you for the clarification."

Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to ... to the Bill. I think this is one of those times when there's a real easy and clear-cut answer on how we should be going. We're talking about our... what we want to do for those that have served. Number 1, this is one more way we can show and express our appreciation. Number 2, the Sponsor has indicated this is an incentive to continue their service. We've spent money... taxpayers have spent money to train these people, and you hate to train them and then lose that expertise. This is an incentive to keep them there. So, express an appreciation, retain experience, on top of that, it cuts a cost. And we're always talking about cutting costs, and this can cut a cost by retaining that experience. A very well-intended Legislator made reference or compared this to legislative scholarships, and I would beg to differ that there should be no comparison on this and legislative scholarships. The legislative scholarships the press continued to talk about and we heard about abuses of those scholarships and sometimes involved political issues; this does not. This was brought to us... the initiative of the Department of Military Affairs; the very people that are working with these soldiers. They're

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

saying this would help them with what they're doing. No, in any way, should this... not in any way should this be compared to legislative scholarships. This is simply an opportunity to help those that have served; those that have been protecting our freedom. The very people that either have or are willing to stand in harm's way for our freedom for us to continue to have the opportunity to preserve this democracy to debate the issues, like this, in the open. I think there's only one way to go on this and that's a 'yes' vote for what they have done and will continue to do. Cut a cost, offer an incentive, and a way to express our appreciation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, explain to me, now, the benefits that an Illinois National Guardsman receives for service.

How much college tuition are they eligible to be waived?"

Costello: "So, Representative, in the initial enrollment into or enlistment into the National Guard, once they've served, you know, that time period which, I believe, the minimal length is 4 years, they can receive 4 years during that service. So, again, the difference with this particular legislation and the Illinois Veterans Grant, the Illinois Veterans Grant is after you have departed from service. This, specifically, is while you're in service as a current National Guard member."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Pritchard: "Do we have any estimate as to the number of guardsmen this would involve and what the cost would be to the universities?"
- Costello: "So, the... the number of guardsmen that used this in 2012 is 1,978. So, cost to the universities, if this piece of legislation came in, would be a percentage most likely of that the following year. I... The exact number I could not tell you 'cause it, obviously, it deals with what the cost of that particular education is at the specific school."
- Pritchard: "But that cost is somewhere around \$7 million, in other words, is what you're saying right now."
- Costello: "Well, I can tell you this and... So, a pilot who's in the Illinois National Guard, I believe by the time their initial training is complete, we have well over a million dollars into every single one of those men and women. And if they decide to depart from service after 10 years and go be a commercial airline pilot or what have you, we have to put another million dollars into that specific person to fill that slot. So, I would prefer to look at it as this is a way to try to enhance benefits for them to retain them and in turn, what I believe, is saving the state money."
- Pritchard: "So, in other words, this is a great benefit to the Illinois National Guard and the State of Illinois?"
- Costello: "In my opinion, it absolutely is."
- Pritchard: "Then, why don't we have the State of Illinois and the Illinois National Guard pay for that extra education option? Why are we mandating that universities and colleges bear even more unfunded liability for what we all want to

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

do and that's reward, in some fashion, the service that our men and women have given us."

Costello: "And, Representative, if you would like to introduce that legislation that would, obviously, be up to you. This is an extension of a program that is in place. And as I've said before, it's an enhancement to keep people who have served 10 years in the National Guard. So, you know, hopefully that 10-year point, being the pivotal point of reenlistment and making it a career, you know, hopefully this enhances their benefit enough to get them to stay in and what, I believe, would be a way of saving money for the state."

Pritchard: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I, like many of you, want to reward our men and women who serve our state and our nation and feel that education is one of the great legacies we can give them. But at some point, we have to stop passing on the cost of state programs on to someone else. Right now, our colleges and universities are not being funded what we even appropriate to them and here, the Governor's budget says they're supposed to take another 5.4 percent cut in their budget for next year. And now, we want to put more liability on them for educating students that they're not able to capture fees and tuition. I think this is a good intent, but let's put the money where our intent is and have the state pay for it. I would ask you not to support this version of our aid to veterans."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello to close."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Costello: "Thank you for the spirited debate. And I know we all want to try to do the right things for veterans. I would just point out to you that this legislation passed committee unanimously. In my opinion, it is a cost-saving measure for the State of Illinois. I thank you. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3383 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Durkin, Morrison, Roth, Sandack. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 98 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', House Bill 3383, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect, for the rest of the day, Representative Fortner is excused."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request, Sir. House Bill 2583, Representative Dan Burke. Out of the record. House Bill 116, Representative Ives. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 116, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. HB116 eliminates future pension credit accumulation for members of part-time state boards and commissions upon reappointment. This Bill will reduce future pension liabilities and bring benefit parity between all board members for service on these boards. This Bill

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

passed committee on a 9-1 vote, and no one testified in opposition to it. I urge you to vote 'yes' on it."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 116 pass?' Representative DeLuca."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

DeLuca: "Representative Ives, I'm just curious if the Amendment removed any of the opposition."

Ives: "Yes, it did."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank..."

Ives: "The Amendment was adopted."

DeLuca: "Thank you very much."

Ives: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 116 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Chapa LaVia, Durkin, Jakobsson, Jones, Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 86 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 17 voting 'present', House Bill 116, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 71, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. House Bill 774, Representative D'Amico. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 774, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We need to adopt a Floor Amendment that's technical in nature."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "I believe the Amendment has already been adopted, Representative."

D'Amico: "Okay. Yep. All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What
House Bill 774 does is it just... it adds vehicles to the
Department of Transportation identified as emergency
traffic control vehicles. That's it."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, this kind of technical in nature?"

D'Amico: "Yes. Yes, it is."

Bost: "What... what actually does it do, seriously?"

D'Amico: "It... it just lets the emergency vehicles for IDOT use the red and white oscillating lights."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "I'd just appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 774 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davidsmeyer, Evans. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 774, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 163, Representative Osmond. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 163, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 163 deals with a pilot program for Lake County. It does not apply to any AM telecommunication towers. Provides that every new wireless telecommunication facility in Lake County require a new tower structure, a telecommunications carrier shall provide the county with documentation consisting of the proposed location, a slight... site plan, and elevation that specifically describes the purpose of the wireless facility location. And I'd be happy to answer any question."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Franks: "Representative, this Bill would require new towers for each request?"

Osmond: "Any new to... any new tower coming into Lake County would apply and what we're going to try to do is get the best location for them."

Franks: "Okay."

Osmond: "So, if it comes right next to something else, we're going to try to help them. And there was some opposition in the beginning, but we worked through all of it and now everybody's in agreement on it."

Franks: "I appreciate this Bill then, because I tried to get some siting language passed years ago and I couldn't."

Osmond: "Well, let my pilot program work, and then we can do one for you."

Franks: "Is that what this is, is a pilot program?"

Osmond: "Yes. It's strictly a pilot program for Lake County."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "And you'll be encouraging colocation, as well, I presume?"

Osmond: "I'm sorry. I couldn't..."

Franks: "You'll be encouraging colocation having the sharing of the towers?"

Osmond: "Yes, yes."

Franks: "I think it's great. And you might want to consider in the Senate, I don't know who your Senate Sponsor is, I'd like, if you could, maybe include McHenry and Lake Counties as your pilot program."

Osmond: "I'll ask them to do that."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 163 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 163, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 89, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 89, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. We've seen this Bill before, last year. I'm so glad to be able to call this today. In nine... For a bit of history, in 1991, the General Assembly passed the Property

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Tax Extension Limitation Law, known as PTELL or the tax cap, which would stop the rapid expansion of property taxes as home values skyrocketed. And under this law, property tax rates were only allowed to increase 5 percent or the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index, whichever is lower. Now, this law was passed during boom times when real estate values looked to be going nowhere but up. While this worked when property values were steadily increasing, the recent decline in real estate values have... have... Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please hold the conversation down. It's beginning to be hard to hear. Thank you."

"Has... The recent decline in real estate values has caused PTELL to move from protecting homeowners to actually hurting them. Now, despite the economy improving the last year, home values across our great state, unfortunately, have continued to fall. Now, common sense would dictate that property taxes should've decreased along with home values, but taxes on properties have instead continued to rise. And every day we all hear from our property owners who are outraged and shocked that their property tax bills continue to go up despite the fact their homes' values has been tremendously diminished. The fact is, more than 28 percent of all homes with a mortgage in Illinois were underwater as of the first of this year; that's the sixth highest of any state in the nation. Now, when PTELL was passed, a sustained fall in property values was considered a realistic possibility; investing in real estate seemed like a safe bet, a sure thing. Simply, no one

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

envisioned this type of devaluation. Now, Illinois homeowners are counting on us to update our PTELL law to be reflective of the present-day market realities. As example, in McHenry County last year, there was over 10 thousand assessment appeals. Now, by comparison, before we had the bubble burst in real estate, they never had over 700. With that goal, I bring House Bill 89 to this Body as a remedy to this serious problem. The Bill provides that property taxes cannot go up at all, not a single penny, in any year in which the gross value of property in a taxing district decreases. Now, there are exceptions in this Bill for new property growth or if voters approve a tax by a referendum. These are fair provisions to protect the legitimate interests of local governments and the citizens they represent. Moreover, it is important to understand that this legislation will maintain the revenues that local government units currently receive. Local governments will not receive a penny less. They simply won't automatically get increases when property values decline. Now, this legislation only applies when home values in aggregate decline. Should they begin to rise again in the near future, which is what we all hope for, this law will be null and void; it won't take effect. Now, as some of you recall, we already passed this legislation in February of last year. Senate Bill 2073 passed on a bipartisan Roll Call but wasn't moved in the Senate. Public response to proposal has been overwhelmingly positive. editorial boards and columnists across our state have written extensively about the need for this commonsense

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

legislation. Indeed, many of the ... us, in this room, campaigned on this issue and circulated petitions and you promised to pass this Bill. Now, I understand that the economic downturn and our state's financial mismanagement make it a challenge to meet local government obligations to area residents. But I know it's safe to say that everyone here understands that we need to update our outdated property tax limitation law. Illinois residents, especially our older neighbors living on fixed incomes, are being taxed out of their homes. And we should be encouraging Illinois citizens to own their own home not stripping them of that dream. Local governments need to stop looking at property owners as their blank check. Now, many taxing bodies, who have weighed in against this, act like victims when we discussed stopping their automatic levy increases when property values go down. When, in fact, it's the homeowners who are getting victimized by an unfair system. Government at all levels must always look for opportunities to increase efficiency and reduce duplication of services. Funda... fundamental fairness demands that we act. And I ask for your vote today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "You know, Representative, I know that you and I have both worked on many things on this floor. You know, I... I supported the tax caps, all of that, but I'm trying to look at the past voting history on this and you did... you did explain it, but now, last year, the House Bill that did

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

this failed, but then, the Senate Bill passed. Is that correct?"

Franks: "Yeah. What I did is I put the identical language on a Senate Bill and ran it as an Amendment about a month later and it passed overwhelmingly."

Bost: "Okay. And... but... but you couldn't get a Concurrence or how did that..."

Franks: "Well, the Senate Sponsor was upset with the Bill. He didn't..."

Bost: "So..."

Franks: "...he didn't like the fact that we put it on his Bill."

Bost: "Okay, okay."

Franks: "So, that's why we needed to run it clean again now."

Bost: "All right. Explain to me, again, it says that, now, your assessed evaluations or your taxes will not increase at all..."

Franks: "Well, the levy..."

Bost: "...even... even..."

Franks: "...won't increase."

Bost: "Okay. The levy won't increase."

Franks: "So, this... the..."

Bost: "So, basically, it takes away where, right now, with property tax caps they can go up about 3... 3 percent."

Franks: "Five percent. Right now, they can..."

Bost: "Okay."

Franks: "...go eith... up either 5 percent or the lower of the CPI, and that happens automatically. And that worked great when our property values were going up, but right now, it's just the opposite. When your property values fall, governments

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

are still getting an automatic increase. So, they're getting either the lesser of the 5 percent or the CPI. So..."

Bost: "Well..."

Franks: "...let's assume last year was like 1.5 percent. They automatically got a 1.5 percent increase."

Bost: "Maybe... maybe, well, and this is always hindsight 20/20. Actually, if I remember right, when the property tax were being passed for downstate, as we would argue, we were actually trying, several of us were pushing for a particular Bill that instead of capping the levy, it capped the assessed evaluation of the homes, and we thought that would be appropriate, but because DuPa... or because the collar counties already had caps, Cook County already had caps, the Bill was not allowed to come out that way. Do you think that might be a better way to... to solve this?"

Franks: "That's something..."

Bost: "Because... because..."

Franks: "...I hadn't really thought of 'til just now."

Bost: "...because then you're not... because if you change your caps from the assessed evaluation, we truly can deal with this that way, where if you change... if we do continue to go down the road that we've gone down, what happens is the levies go up but the assessed evaluation skyrockets and that's where it just..."

Franks: "Well, wha..."

Bost: "...chase the seniors out of their homes and everything else."

Franks: "Well, what this Bill will do, is when we passed, we, meaning the General Assembly, in 1991, we did this PTELL

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Bill, but we... and it only applies to non-Home Rule communities and those that have taken the PTELL and many of the downstate areas don't have it, some do, but many don't. But I don't think anyone ever took into consideration at the time when the Bill passed of the potential devaluation. So, this is just really fixing the existing PTELL law. I'd be happy to work with you on..."

Bost: "Okay."

Franks: "...another Bill..."

Bost: "Okay."

Franks: "...because our property taxes are out of control."

Bost: "I... I don't disagree with you. I... But I also know that we have, and you mentioned that, we have local governments that are fighting desperately to be able to provide the services that the... that their constituents are asking for. So..."

Franks: "And a lot of it's our problem because we've mismanaged here..."

Bost: "Oh, I agree."

Franks: "...in Springfield."

Bost: "I... I agree. You won't get a disagreement at all."

Franks: "Right."

Bost: "So, but... and that's what I see here. I see this kind of throws us into a box. We're either... we're either fighting for the property owner, but yet, we're trying fight for our local governments too and... and to try to find that balance point, and that's where this controversy and every... every Member in this General Assembly is... we're trapped at."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "And I think this is a fair compromise because they're still going to get what they got before. Last year, when they argued against it, they thought somehow that they would get a lesser amount based if the values went down; that was a miss... misconception. They're still going to get what they got last year. Okay. So, they're not going to get a penny less."

Bost: "Indefinitely or..."

Franks: "Well, until... and see this is... there's a built-in sunset on this. As soon as property values go up again in the aggregate, this goes away. So, I'm thinking this may be good for a year. I was looking... I have the March 23 Chicago Tribune, and it talks about local home sales spike and prices edged up in February."

Bost: "I hope... I hope you're right."

Franks: "Yeah."

Bost: "We all do."

Franks: "And I think... I think we're going to pass this Bill.

And it's my hope that it never has to go into effect, because I can see the sale prices increasing. I saw something yesterday in our local paper, where the inventory has decreased, the amount of time for sales has gone way down and the prices have gone up. Hopefully, we will nev... this will never come into effect, but I think we need to protect our taxpayers who weren't ready for this. When they're seeing that their homes lost 40 percent of their value, yet, their property tax went up 10 percent, they don't know what to do. They're screaming, and they're right."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Bost: "All right. Thank you. I appreciate the answers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. First of all, I want to commend Representative Franks for his work on this legislation and bringing it back in Session. Taxpayers are hurting. We have nine and a half percent unemployment in this state. Senior citizens, hardworking families can't pay their taxes. This is a fair Bill that will simply freeze the levy when housing prices fall. We owe this to our hardworking citizens in this terrible economy. I strongly support this legislation. Let's pass it today. Let's get it enacted. Let's bring property tax relief to our hardworking families. Thank you again, Representative, for bringing this legislation again."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Martwick: "So, Representative Franks, let me... let me ask you a couple questions about this Bill, here, that you've got. So, this would not cap property taxes, would it?"

Franks: "No. What would it do it would cap the levy so the governments..."

Martwick: "Cap the levy."

Franks: "...would still get the same amounts."

Martwick: "Right. So, the government would get the same amount of money that they got in the prior year, no increase whether even it's a minor CPI increase, right?"

Franks: "Correct."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Martwick: "And this is during a time when... during declining property values which is rare circumstance, we can assume then, as in the past few years, that it's the cause of a usually a pretty substantial recession in our economy. Is that correct?"

Franks: "I'm not sure I understood the question."

Martwick: "Well, you're not going to generally have declining property values unless you're in a pretty substantial economic recession, isn't that correct? Isn't that what history shows us economically? I believe it is."

Franks: "I don't think we've ever had the kind of growth that we had prior to this. I mean, there was a huge... I'm not sure economically. I haven't seen..."

Martwick: "Okay."

Franks: "...the statistics, but..."

Martwick: "Well, fair enough. Typically though... typically though that decline... declining property values only come about when there is a long sustained recession in our economy. So, during those recession times, in local governments, you're probably going to, if you've... if you've ever been part of a local government, you're probably going to see some declining revenues through other sources as well. That's true. Right."

Franks: "Sure."

Martwick: "Okay. So, while local governments may rely substantially on real estate taxes, there are other sources of revenues that are probably declining. In fact, in the town that I represented when I was a village trustee, we

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

had substantial decline in our retail sales tax revenues which were a substantial part of what we did."

Franks: "Sure."

Martwick: "So, it does happen."

Franks: "I'm... I'm cognizant of that fact."

Martwick: "Okay. Fair enough. So, when you do this, what you're doing is, is you're limiting the levy that they can... so they can assess no more in property tax dollars through the levy than they did the year before, right?"

Franks: "Correct. They will still get the same amount of money."

Martwick: "Right. Do you understand the purpose of assessing value properties? Do you know what the point of that is in the real estate tax process? Do you know what correlation that has to the ultimate bill?"

Franks: "Well, it depends what the mill rate is. I mean, I understand that, but I'm not sure where you're going with the argument."

Martwick: "Well, you see, the property tax assessment is not tied directly to the bill. The property tax assessment is a tool to spread the burden..."

Franks: "Sure."

Martwick: "...of the levy."

Franks: "Sure."

Martwick: "Okay. So, if you have a great recession where property taxes are going down, inevitably, you're probably going to have some businesses that have closed up that's closed their doors reported."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "The property values are going up with it. Wait a minute. I got to fix that statement. Property taxes aren't going down. Property taxes continue to rise, but the property values go down."

Martwick: "Exactly."

Franks: "That's the difference. But see, what I'm thinking is, the local governments somehow think that they're divorced from the economic reality, and they anticipate that when..."

Martwick: "All right. You know what..."

Franks: "...their citizens have less that they should somehow get more."

Martwick: "That's exactly where you're wrong, Representative Franks. And if you'll allow me to continue my line of questioning..."

Franks: "Sure."

Martwick: "...you'll understand this 'cause you're a very smart attorney. So, as property values go down, Representative Franks, you have businesses that, probably, are closing their doors, right, hence that's why you have reduced revenues. So, you have prop... you have commercial and industrial that might close up in a town, right, that does happen in a... in a recession. And when they do that, they have even lower, you know, are you aware of like vacancy relief for buildings that cannot get tenants, right? So, they're..."

Franks: "I know that 28 percent of our homeowners in this state are underwater."

Martwick: "You're not..."

Franks: "And I know that their mortgages aren't..."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Martwick: "It's not really in response of, Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Well, I know that people's property taxes are more than their mortgages in many counties."
- Martwick: "Well, of course, and... and you're making a very good point there, but what you're... what you're missing is, is that the assessments... when the assessment goes down for all of the businesses because of the hard economic times, the taxes that you're trying to hold for the homeowners are not going to go down even if you hold the line on the levy, in fact, they will go up."
- Franks: "They won't increa... The goal here is to stop the increase, the automatic increase."
- Martwick: "It will... you will not stop the increase. People will still, even in declining markets, people receive higher taxes because the assessed value does not determine the final bill."
- Franks: "I understand that. It's one part only."
- Martwick: "It is one component. It's one component. So, I get what you're trying to do here, but when you make a statement that these local governments have to stop thinking that they're just getting this free ride, then I have to think that you probably don't understand local government."
- Franks: "No. I... What I understand is the fact when people have less, government should have less. And they think that when people have less, they should still get an increase. I think that's a fundamental unfairness that needs to be fixed that was never anticipated when this Bill was

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

written. And it's our obligation to fix the mistake of a prior General Assembly and to quit penalizing the taxpayers in the State of Illinois who can't afford it."

Martwick: "I can see... I see, Representative Franks, I believe that in our COGFA numbers we have an increase in our revenues here in the State of Illinois. Are you suggesting, since we're still in this bad economy, that we return that extra money to the people?"

Franks: "I... Let's... If we want to talk about the mismanagement of the state, that's a different Bill, but we can talk about the mismanagement for a long time."

Martwick: "But you presume, Sir, that the mismanagement of the state means that every local government is mismanaging their local governments."

Franks: "No, I'm not saying that. This is not an indictment on local government."

Martwick: "But you're going to punish the ones that are running close to the belt..."

Franks: "Here's what I'm saying."

Martwick: "...as well as those that are wasteful."

Franks: "This is not an indictment on local government. What it is, is, we got..."

Martwick: "It most certainly is, Sir."

Franks: "We are victimizing our homeowners who have already been victimized. When you wake up and you realize that your homes are worth 40 percent less than they were just a few years ago, when you don't have the equity, but then what you get is a bigger tax bill. It is quite a shock. And we...

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

and people are losing their homes as a result of this, and we need to help them."

Martwick: "So, I... I couldn't..."

Franks: "We have an obligation to help them."

Martwick: "I couldn't agree more, Representative Franks, that we need to help local homeowners and... and try and hold the line on local property taxes, but the best way to do that is at the local level where you have responsible local governments that make cuts. And we have a referendum every two years. Do you know what that referendum is? It's called Election Day. So, when local governments are being wasteful..."

Franks: "Fifteen percent show up."

Martwick: "...we can run candidates, as many people probably did
here back in their towns and you can change those boards so
people will come in and make wise financial decisions. My
question is, what makes you think that this Body should put
a limit on local governments? There are local governments,
like the town that I was from in the village of Norridge,
where we won close to the belt, we run responsibly, and
what you're doing is you're handcuffing our ability to...
to..."

Franks: "Then run a ref... I'm not handcuffing anything."

Martwick: "Absolutely. This is exactly what this would do."

Franks: "You can run a... Wait a second."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse... excuse me. Excuse me, Representatives."

Franks: "When this Bill was... when this Bill..."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick, could you bring your remarks to a close? We have eight other people requesting to speak."

Franks: "When this Bill was written..."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Franks: "Wait. I want to fi... before he finishes up here."

Martwick: "You... you can respond when I'm done. Thank you."

Franks: "Okay."

Martwick: "I think that this is a fine idea to try and do what we can to provide property tax relief for property taxpayers across our state, but I think it's terribly, terribly misquided. If any of you have ever been involved in local government and if your local governments run clean and efficient, this is the last thing that you should be doing. This is ... There are local governments that are running close to bankruptcy, and this would allow them the little bit of breathing room to retain that teacher in that classroom, that would keep one more police officer on the street. This is something... This is not that government that Mr. Franks speaks of. This is our government; these are our communities, and we need this one little bit. These are not huge tax increases. You're talking about a couple of percent, if even that, for Consumer Price Index, and the time that it's needed most is when property values are declining. I urge an 'aye' vote... a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Members, I understand this is a very important Bill, and we have many other people re... requesting to speak, could you please keep your comments as brief as

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

possible. We have a lot of Bills to get through on Third Reading today. Representative David Harris. Thank you."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor." Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Yes. I do have a question, but before I begin my question, Representative, I do want to make statement as the Republican spokesperson on the Revenue Committee. If you notice the synopsis says this came out of committee on a 10 'yes', no... 0 'no' vote which, indeed, it did. I cannot say, though, that that was the real expression of the committee because this Bill was placed on an Agreed Bill list to move it out of committee, but I'm sure a number of committee Members had concerns about the Bill. To the questions, Representative, if I may. Help me understand a little bit about PTELL, what you talked about previously. So, as I understand it, as you said, the limitation is 5 percent or CPI whichever they choose, correct?"

Franks: "No, whichever is less."

Harris, D.: "Whichever is less. Okay."

Franks: "'Cause they'd always choose the most."

Harris, D.: "Well, I was about to say, they always levy to the max, correct?"

Franks: "Right."

Harris, D.: "They'll always levy to the max. So, if a district as in... let's just use an example. If a district says... let's say, whatever district it might be, needs \$10 million what they consider to operate their district for the next year. And let's assume their... their equalized assessed valuation is 500 million, so they levy on that 500 million, right?

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

They'll have \$10 million. Let's say the next year it's... they say we need the same 10 million, but the equalized assessed valuation, let's say, falls to \$400 million. That 10 million is now spread over a lesser equalized assessed valuation, correct? Which means that the taxpayer is going to pay more, correct, in terms of the value of their house. And I... and I understand that. The problem, it seems to me, is that the districts, the taxing districts, have an insatiable appetite for dollars. They never lower their budgets. Can you give me an example of a district that has actually lowered its budget over the years?"

Franks: "Avon Township. That's very few."

Harris, D.: "Very few."

Franks: "Very few."

Harris, D.: "Very few."

Franks: "Mr. Ying... Mr. Yingling did that. I think that's why he's in the General Assembly now because he was a good steward of the money."

Harris, D.: "There may..."

Franks: "But... but no. I agree with you."

Harris, D.: "And... and..."

Franks: "You typically never underestimate the greed of government."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Franks: "Never enough."

Harris, D.: "And..."

Franks: "Never enough of other people's money."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Harris, D.: "And... and one other question. Assuming the equalized assessed valuation decreases, even by one dollar, that's the trigger that... that kicks this Bill in, correct?"

Franks: "You need... you need a redline. Yes."

Harris, D.: "Do you think that's too harsh?"

Franks: "No."

Harris, D.: "And that question was asked last year. Do you think that's too harsh?"

Franks: "No, because you need to have a redline. You need to have... Listen, when this Bill originally passed, no one ever thought, meaning PTELL when it was instituted, no one ever contemplated falling property values. If they would have, I guarantee you they'd be passing... they would've put this provision in that we're about to pass today."

Harris, D.: "Right. And... and let... Last year, I voted against your Bill because of that hair... hair trigger... trigger of one dollar. But to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, in my humble opinion, the property tax system in this state is broken. It is absolutely broken. You try to explain to a constituent who walks into your office and says, my tax bill just went up 10 percent and the value of my house went down 5 percent. Now, you and I probably can sit there in a very complicated way because we understand the system better than others might, we can try to explain to them why this occurs. But after half an hour, they look at you with their eyes glazed over and say, it still doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense that the value of your house goes down and your property taxes go up. It doesn't make sense. Does this Bill make sense? The Sponsor would say

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

yes. The problem I have is... is my concern about that... that hairpin trigger that a simple even one dollar decrease in the assessed... equalized assessed valuation of the district means that they're limited in terms of what they can do. Quite frankly, this is a tough one. I want to be with the constituents, but I understand where my... my school districts and others that are limited by PTELL, I understand where they're coming from. And I would tell them, hey, go back and look at your budget. You don't automatically get budget increases year after year after year. People don't get salary increases year after year after year after year. Sometimes you have to cut back and maybe that's a message that this Bill sends to them. So, I voted against last time. I'm with you this time."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Ives: "Jack, I understand what you're trying to get at here.
 I'm just going to ask, would you consider providing an
 Amendment that would get... provide some unfunded mandate
 relief?"

Franks: "You and I talked about that yesterday, and I don't think it's appropriate on this Bill. But I'd certainly work with you on... we have way too many unfunded mandates, and I'd be happy to work with you on that. But I don't think it's appropriate for this Bill because that seems more dealing with schools typically. And this is... this is for all taxing bodies."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Ives: "Well, I would actually argue that we mandate a lot from our chair here sitting in Springfield. We mandate what... what pensions need to be provide for... for police, fire, teachers. We give no local control in those areas. We mandate what life safety measures they have to take. We mandate a lot on our local government. The next question I want to know is would you be willing to consider an Amendment that exempts districts that already have this type of limiting factor in a PTELL? Would you exempt them from your Bill?"

Franks: "I'm not sure I understand what... I'm not sure what... what..."

Ives: "Well, I... I don't believe that every county, every
municipality, every school district is subject to PTELL. Is
that correct?"

Franks: "No."

Ives: "So, in that... those cases if you are subject to PTELL which already limits what you can do in terms of increasing your revenue, would you exempt those districts that are already under a PTELL?"

Franks: "No. This is exactly to fix that problem. Because right now, those that have... who are under PTELL are getting automatic increases when the property values fall. This Bill is drafted just to fix that problem."

Ives: "Okay."

Franks: "So, exempting them would nullify..."

Ives: "Well..."

Franks: "...the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Ives: "...I kind of disagree with you because PTELL still limits the amount that they can get through CPI or 5 percent."

Franks: "Correct."

Ives: "And we... we've made a contract with our locals on this. We've contracted with them said, look, you're only ever going to get, no matter what your increases are, whatever other... no matter what mandates we put on you, you're only ever going to get CPI or 5 percent."

Franks: "We drafted a bad Bill 23... 22 years ago that never anticipated falling property values. Nobody in this room with a straight face can argue that government should automatically get more when their citizens have less."

Ives: "And..."

Franks: "That is the fundamental, axiomatic principle, here, that when our government should have to live within its means when its citizens have less. And when citizens have more, the government gets more; when citizens have less, the government shouldn't automatically get more. We got to stop feeding..."

Ives: "Jack."

Franks: "...the beasts."

Ives: "Okay, Jack. I understand your argument; however, just because your EAV falls doesn't mean that your income actually fell. The next thing I was wondering is, I believe it's a little premature. I mean, we are in a critical environment here in the State of Illinois. We are going through a tremendous budget cut to our local school districts, LGDF, we don't know what that's going to look

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

like and it's kind of premature, and the idea... the idea of a pension shift has already talk... been talked about."

Franks: "But that's a different issue. Let's focus on this issue."

Ives: "Well, the issue is tho..."

Franks: "Let's... let's look at real numbers."

Ives: "Those could be additional mandates..."

Franks: "They could..."

Ives: "...for which we cannot compensate them for."

Franks: "We could speculate 'til the cows come home, but the fact is, let's use a real number. Let's assume a taxing body got a million bucks last year and then they were going to get the CPI. Okay. The CPI at one and a half percent, they'd get an extra \$15 thousand. So, you're telling me, with a straight face, that they're somehow go out of business 'cause they're still going to get the million dollars from last year, but they just can't figure out because they didn't get that extra 15 grand that they're going to have to close up shop. If they're that incompetent, they shouldn't be in office."

Ives: "Oh... Well, that's a very valid point. If you would allow us, you know, them the ability to open up union contracts which make up the majority cost of their things then let's do that, then let's talk about that. But what I'm saying is, the state will never allow that to happen nor will the unions. On top of it, I... you know, just listening from my superintendents, you know, they've had increasing interest costs with health care. We're looking at expanding health care here, and we don't know what that's... how that's going

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

to impact our local governments as well. Additionally, we could... we could do a lot from this state to help out our local governments. Why don't we do this? Why don't we pass some of Dwight Kay's really good workers' comp Bills that got stuck in subcommittee and two Democrats in the entire State of Illinois can decide to stop workers' comp reform."

Franks: "Dwight Kay is supporting..."

Ives: "That's the problem. We are mandating things..."

Franks: "Dwight Kay is supporting this Bill."

Ives: "To the Bill. We're mandating things at the state level for which our locals have no control over. And I'd like to see some mandate relief before I vote on a Bill like this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "Representative Franks, you and I, obviously, have had many conversations over the last two years regarding this Bill. And while we share the same concern about property taxes, one of my problems with the PTELL Bill is it doesn't require any kind of truth-in-taxation hearing..."

Franks: "Right."

Tryon: "...at the time that the levy's adopted unless the levy increases by 5 percent. And I believe, under the spirit of the tax cap, it was designed to provide for transparency. People would know that their government wasn't going to grow beyond the rate of inflation, and you and I agree on that. If this were to go to the Senate, and your Senate Sponsor amended it to require a hearing anytime the rate

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

increased when you had declining, would you support a truth-in-taxation approach to this same problem?"

Franks: "I think it's in conjunction with. Sure. I think... I think when the... when the property values are rising and they're looking to do that as well, but I certainly want to have this as a component that when the property values are falling it doesn't go up. And I know our Senate Sponsor is... is with us on the floor, and I'm happy to work with her on that. But I've always liked that idea because what you see when the property values are increasing that there isn't any... there isn't any real discussion on it. The locals automatically do it."

"But... but that would be a place of a referendum. You Tryon: would saying... you would be putting the terms in statute that exists if the levy were to increase by more than 5 percent. You would be lowering that threshold to zero if the rate were to go up. If you have declining home values, rates have to go up to even get what you got last year. Even to get the amount that you have that you're saying they can do, they still don't have to have a truth-intaxation hearing. And my tax... we have a taxing district in McHenry County that in order to get 2 percent more money, had to raise my tax rate 15 percent. I would have liked to had a truth-in-taxation hearing that they were going to vote to raise tax rates 15 percent. So, what I'm saying, I think a... as good have approach this could get the public involved in the setting of the rates that support the levy. So, if the rate is actually going to go up, they have to have a truth-in-taxation hearing..."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "I think that's a good idea, Mike."

Tryon: "...in ...in place of a referendum."

Franks: "I think it's a good idea to have that, and I'll work with the Senate Sponsor and I think working in conjunction.

And you and I have talked a lot about this, as the Senator..."

Tryon: "Well, based on that then I would support that, but having a situation that would potentially force a mandated cut I couldn't support. But having the opportunity to treat an increase in the rate like an increase in the levy, I would support that."

Franks: "But let me... let me make something perfectly clear, there is not a mandated cut here. The local governments will still get the same they got the previous year; that's not a cut in my book. They just don't get an automatic increase..."

Tryon: "It could be..."

Franks: "...automatically."

Tryon: "...if... if you had increase in bargaining contracts and you had obligations that were beyond your control. No further questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Representative Franks, I appreciate you carrying this Bill. I don't know that it's a good Bill or a bad Bill, but I got on the Bill because it's a fair Bill. The fact of the matter is, that PTELL is set in place by the people to do one thing, and that one thing is to allow them to control

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

their destiny. And your Bill is basically correcting a flaw, which you found, that doesn't allow the law to function as it's supposed to be. Now, we can debate philosophies about what drives a tax, what doesn't, this will affect that or... we could have that debate all day long, but the truth of the matter is, this Bill is about fairness, am I not correct?"

Franks: "You explained it very well, Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Okay. And the... and the simple truth is, the real purpose is to be fair to the taxpayers who really drive the state when it comes to revenues."

Franks: "Correct."

Kay: "Yeah. To a big part, that and sales tax. So, to carry this one step further, if we don't treat them right, we can't expect them to help us where we need help the most and that's revenue. Is that not true?"

Franks: "That's... that's a good point."

Kay: "I... Well, I think it is too. So, the bottom line here is, separate philosophies about how... how taxes come to be and amounts come to be, but we have PTELL in place, it's not worked properly. You're not suggesting we penalize anybody."

Franks: "Right."

Kay: "I know there's a lot of people that are upset about this Bill. You're not trying to penalize anybody. You're just trying to do the right thing, as established by law, and do it now so that they're not penalized for being a PTELL district."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "Correct. And I'm just trying to fix a flaw that no one ever anticipated that... that reared its ugly head a few years and hopefully it will never come up again."

Kay: "I... and I agree with you. I... I would say this, I think our tax system, and I'm going to... obviously, I'm a Sponsor on this Bill, I've enjoyed working with you because you've done a yeoman's task on this. I think our tax system in this state is broken. I think it's broken on the personal side, the individual side and the corporate side, but this is one small step to fixing something today. To wait is just simply the wrong thing to do for the people of Illinois. Thank you for what you've done."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Yingling: "Excellent. Well, Jack, thank you so much for bringing up this Bill. This a hugely important piece of legislation especially for everyone across the state. Lake County, Illinois, which I represent, has the 15th highest property taxes in the country according to Forbes. To the Bill. I'd like to say that I think that all of my colleagues should closely look at this and consider voting 'yes'. The people of my district, their number one issue is property tax relief, property tax relief, property tax relief. And this is a small component that can provide them with that necessary property tax relief. And the notion that this is somehow going to cap local governments from being able to raise desperately needed funds, I think, is a

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

weak argument. Coming from local government in my township, I was a supervisor of a township, we were able to cut our levies by over 22 percent and reduce spending by about 20 percent by increasing efficiencies and streamlining operations. And I do not believe that there is a single unit of local government that cannot find ways to increase efficiency and streamline their operations to be able to handle any loss of potential revenue. So, thank you, Representative Franks. I'll be voting for this Bill. I'm happy to be a cosponsor. And I encourage my colleagues to vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."

Reboletti: "Does this preempt Home Rule? Does it need 71 votes?"

Speaker Turner: "One moment, Sir. Representative, we'll get an answer for you and get right back to you."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... I talked to my assessor a couple days ago, and he anticipates, in Addison Township, home values will go down another 7 percent. So, it's about..."

Franks: "What... did what? I couldn't hear you."

Reboletti: "I talked to my assessor regarding what the property values in my home township will be for next year. I know for the last four years they have declined. And they overall will decline another seven... seven percent. He

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

doesn't see the future looking any brighter for property tax..."

Franks: "Well, that's... that's..."

Reboletti: "...the home values."

Franks: "...exactly opposite of what the statistical analysis is that we have here. In DuPage County, for instance, according to the Chicago area, The Chicago Tribune, on March 23, the market continues improving in DuPage. The homes sold in February were... there was 670 of them sold. The median price in February was 178,500 which was 5.9 percent..."

Reboletti: "You know... you know what that is Representative Franks?"

Franks: "...hi ...higher than the previous February."

Reboletti: "Those are all short sales and bankruptcies..."

Franks: "I'm not..."

Reboletti: "...and foreclosures."

Franks: "...questioning that."

Reboletti: "Right."

Franks: "I'm just looking at the real numbers. They've actually increased."

Reboletti: "No. And I appreciate those real numbers. I'm telling you I talked to my assessor. My home value has probably dropped 35 percent in the last four years. So, the assessor says another seven percent for the next year. And he doesn't see that the turning the corner where home values are going to start going up. You may see an update in home sales but not..."

Franks: "And prices."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Reboletti: "...not home... those values are way down."

Franks: "Oh. They're certainly down from the peak."

Reboletti: "Right."

Franks: "I'm looking at year to year and there was an increase."

Reboletti: "Does... would you... do you think that this Bill, if it became law, would more negatively impact non-Home Rule communities and... and entities that it would Home Rule?"

Franks: "I'm sorry. I'm having trouble hearing you. Would it affect it how?"

Reboletti: "Would it more negatively impact or affect non-Home Rule..."

Franks: "It's not going..."

Reboletti: "...units of government?"

Franks: "...to have any negative affect whatsoever. This is a Bill that's designed, as Mr. Kay was explaining, to fix a problem in the original drafting that never anticipated home values falling. I'm not sure why you're saying it would negatively impact people if we're trying not to automatically raise property taxes on..."

Reboletti: "Representative, what I'm... what I'm saying..."

Franks: "...people when their home values fall."

Reboletti: "...Representative, is that I'm assuming Home Rule communities will not have to go to referendum. They'll simply go over..."

Franks: "Well, that's how PTELL is. PTELL only applies to non-Home Rule communities."

Reboletti: "And I understand that."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Franks: "We're just fixing that problem with PTELL communities."
- Reboletti: "Representative, when do you think that the market will come back where home values will start going up? I just..."
- Franks: "Gosh, if I knew that, you think I'd be here?"
- Reboletti: "Well, I thought maybe you'd be in the Lieutenant Governor's Office by then. I'm not sure. Representative, I... I asked you this question last year, and you... you like to ask a lot of the Members to take their Bill out of the record, would you take this Bill out of the record and draft an Amendment or would you put one on in the Senate that would say that, if it passes the Senate, that you'll take the mandates away, our unfunded mandates that we place on all these Bodies of government to save them some money?"
- Franks: "That's a totally different Bill. I'm happy to work with you. Mrs. Ives had mentioned that as well. I'm happy to work with you on that. That's a different Bill."
- Reboletti: "I don't know if it's..."
- Franks: "And when ask people to take Bills out of the record,

 I'm actually working with them to get them better. You can
 ask Mr. Dunkin, we did one yesterday, so..."
- Reboletti: "Would this... I think this would help make it better, too, Jack. So, you're saying something differently then, but..."
- Franks: "Well, no. I think it's a different Bill. It's a different Bill. Which I agree with you on the mandates."
- Reboletti: "And that's what I'm saying is we have all these unfunded mandates maybe people wouldn't be looking to raise

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

local taxes if they didn't have unfunded mandates that they had to cover."

Franks: "Listen. Our State Government's a big part of the problem because of our mismanagement and our... and what we've done to our locals; I'm not shying away from that. But the fact remains the same that our local taxpayers are being penalized unintentionally. This Bill was... PTELL was never created to harm them when property values fell. This is only to fix that problem and to stop penalizing our homeowners. And I think we ought to be encouraging homeownership instead of stripping people of that... that dream."

"Representative, I'm not looking to penalize any Reboletti: property taxpayer. I filed 20... House Bill 2049 last year which basically contemplates what you're also trying to accomplish. I've filed it for five years. I wish I could get a hearing on it, but House Bill 2049 said let's look at the last three years of your property values and either you would take the average of that in a incline year when property values are going up, you pay that value or in down years, you would pay the lowest val... that last... that last year's value because you know how the average goes up and down for the three years. And I think that might be a more fair way to deal with the property value home by home 'cause I have the same constituents' concerns your... your constituents have which is my home value went down and my property taxes just went up \$1,000 and I'm not getting more services. I'm not getting anything else. So, I understand what you're trying to do, and I appreciate that. I just

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

don't know if this is the right mechanism in which to do that."

Franks: "I think that your approach is valid as well. But this is something we need to do right now because the PTELL Bill was drafted incorrectly, and we didn't know that until it started to penalize people. We need to fix this problem now. I'm happy to work with you on other ways as well, but that is a separate issue than this. PTELL needs to be fixed. It's broken. It is not working as it was designed. It was designed so that it would limit the increases when property values went up. But when we're doing now when property values go... go down, it was never designed, never designed, to increase taxes when those values went down and that's all we're fixing."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, to answer your question. This does not preempt Home Rule and will require 60 votes to pass. Thank you. Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We've obviously seen this before, and I've spoken against it before. I just want to reiterate some points that were made earlier. This Bill is... is not a measured Bill. It provides no flexibility, no balance. If the EAV goes down by a dollar, then you don't get to take advantage of any increases. If your EAV goes up by a dollar, then you can take advantage of the full PTELL. There's nothing balanced or... or measured about that. And if this were truly about protecting those that where... where values are declining and... and having it be measured, if the EAV went down by 5 percent then let's

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

decline the revenues by 5 percent. If the EAV goes down, as it did in one of the previous speaker's districts by 35 percent, then maybe we should... we should reduce this by 35 percent. This is just... this doesn't give any flexibility to districts or to... to homeowners to be able to manage anything. And second is, at a time when we are... we're decreasing general state aid, we are decreasing the transportation line funding, we're decreasing grants, we are increasing mandates and we are talking about a cost shift, how much more are we going to ask school districts to do? How much more are we going to ask our governments to do? And... and especially coming from this Body that's had such a struggle managing its own finances, I think that that's a little… a little harsh for us to be doing that. So, I think for ... for us, again, to ... to say that that... that we are the Body to impose responsibility on local districts when we're the Body that's cutting all these things, when we're the entity that's... that's forcing them to do more with less, and then imposing even more fiscal discipline because we feel that they can't possibly manage it by themselves. This is really not a message, I think, and not a time when this General Assembly ought to be delivering that message. Yes, we've done a better job of managing our finances. But we... you know, this is... we... we can't hold ourselves out as the model, right now, to say we know better than you do local districts about how to manage our... our taxpayer dollars and our finances. We need to give them this flexibility. The PTELL law is not ideal by any imagination, but you know, stretch of the but

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

something that we all know and that everybody can manage because they're familiar with it. So, I think this is the wrong Bill at the wrong time. And I would urge a 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks to close."

"Wow. Thanks for the spirited discussion. I appreciate it. I want to clear up a couple of misconceptions. The previous speaker said that, you know, we should... if they fell... EAV fell by 5 percent perhaps local governments should reduce their... their moneys by 5 percent as well; I don't think that's fair. I... This Bill does not take a penny away from local governments. They will get exactly the same amount as they did the year before. All this says is they won't get an automatic increase. If they feel they need an increase, they can run a referendum if necessary. This also exempts TIF districts. It also exempts new growth. It also exempts additional properties annexed. The PTELL... Listen, we have big problems in this state, but the thing that probably affects most of our constituents every day, that we probably hear more about in our district offices on a continual basis is property taxes; that's what people care about. And they're right. There is no justifiable reason for government to automatically charge more and to increase property taxes when people's home values fall. It is not fair. It is not right. We... we need to fix this problem. If we... without fixing this problem, I tell you, you are going to see additional foreclosures. You are going to see continual... continually people losing their homes. You are going to see continually devalued homes because people

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- can't afford to stay there. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 89 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Representative Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
 On a count of 43 voting 'yes', 65 voting 'no', 1 voting
 'present', House Bill 89, having failed to receive the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declaw... declared lost.
 Representative Bill Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. In the gallery, on the Republican side, if Colin Sanders would stand up and the Illinois House give him a warm welcome. He's a young gentleman from Heyworth, Illinois, McLean County. So, welcome to the Illinois House."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your House. House Bill 1854, Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1854, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill does is, as we know, emergency medical service crew members are essential to the safety of our residents just are... as military, as firemen, as policemen. And what this Bill does is, it requires the Department of Public Health to notify the Governor of the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

death in the line of duty of a resident EMS crew member and to have the flags fly at half-staff in honor of them. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1854 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1854, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2591, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2591, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2591 is a Bill that addresses jobs for persons with disabilities. In the... about 2008, I actually carried a Bill that actually put together a task force. That task force, of course, has been working to make sure that we start integrated settings and that's what this Bill is about. It is about helping individuals' fairness and equity in regards to job placement. So, in this Bill, we talk about state agencies. Persons with disabilities will establish measurable goals and objectives to secure implementation. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is important that this group of individuals begin to move into better settings in order for them to be employed. So, I ask for a favorable vote in regards to House Bill 2591."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is 'Shall House Bill 2591 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2591, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 140, Representative Franks. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 140, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "The Floor Amendment that we passed yesterday took away the opposition and Pace is now a proponent. This Bill would eliminate health insurance and pension benefits for RTA, CTA, Pace, and Metra. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Dunkin: "Representative, did... where did this Bill come from? Is this sort of a good government policy or Jack... Jack Frank...?"

Franks: "Well, I think other peo... we just passed a Bill earlier today with other boards and commissions. I think a lot of people have had these ideas. These are part-time boards and commissions. And the people will still be... be remunerated for their work on them, but they will not be able to get pensions and health care going forward."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Dunkin: "So, what happens to those current members who serve or those previous members who serve?"

Franks: "Oh. They still have that. It's just going forward for new members."

Dunkin: "And starting when?"

Franks: "When their... when their terms are up. When... when they expire, before the new terms."

Dunkin: "What's the estimated cost?"

Franks: "I'm not sure because it's for each of the individual groups, so I'm not sure what they'd cost us. But I think it's a question of, do people who work very part-time in a public service job where many would do as volunteer and many of these folks are put on because of their political connections, they'll still be receiving payment but will not get health care or pensions."

Dunkin: "So, any estimate of how much this is going to cost 'cause I'm looking at... according to my detailed analysis annual salary of \$25 thousand set by statute. So, they keep the salary."

Franks: "No. They're still going to receive... they... yes."

Dunkin: "So, they'll keep the salary?"

Franks: "Right. So, we're taking away the health care and the pensions."

Dunkin: "So, how much... they were getting a pension as well?"

Franks: "They get... I was shocked to learn that people who serve and go to a meeting a month maybe get a pension. I hope you were shocked by that. And this would take away that perk that no one... nobody else would ever get except for being a

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

connected insider. That's... that's the bottom line. So, it's a perk that's indefensible and can no longer be justified."

Dunkin: "Okay. And so, Pace... so Pace is no longer opposed to this?"

Franks: "They're... they're a proponent of the Bill."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, who was paying for this, that agency or the state?"

Franks: "Well, if you look at it both ways. The state gives the agencies money and how they spend them."

Dunkin: "Okay. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Just out of curiosity, what pension system are these folks a part of? Is it IMRF or..."

Franks: "No, it's not. They've got their own. They've got... they do them through..."

Harris, D.: "You... you don't know which one it is?"

Franks: "Yeah. They've got different ones."

Harris, D.: "It's one of the state's then?"

Franks: "Yeah, but they fund them... they fund them differently."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Franks: "And they fund them through their agencies."

Harris, D.: "And I'm a cosponsor of the Bill."

Franks: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "And I... I applaud your... your effort here. But remind me, you said there... the Metra is not opposed now. And tell me what the Amendment..."

Franks: "No, what... no, what... Pace."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Harris, D.: "Pace. Excuse me."

Franks: "Pace was originally opposed. And what the Amendment...

when I originally filed the Bill and we passed it through

Mass Transit, it took away all benefits..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Franks: "...health care, as well as pay. The committee indicated they'd like to have some pay for these individuals, so I came with another Amendment and some thought it was too much and some thought it wasn't enough. So, the compromise was to keep the pay as it is for all of these and just take away the health care and the pensions."

Harris, D.: "And this only applies to..."

Franks: "The..."

Harris, D.: "...members. It does not apply to members who are on the board or, excuse me, it applies to members who are on the board on or after the effective date. So, it doesn't apply to anyone currently serving."

Franks: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Franks: "But when their term is up, should they be reappointed, then they would no longer accrue pensions."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Wheeler."

Wheeler: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler: "Thank you. Representative Franks, I... I'm on this Bill, and I support this Bill. But I'm curious, as a new Member, how did you get this to committee and out of committee 'cause I, also, have a similar Bill?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Franks: "Well, I lost it last year. I guess... How do you get to Carnegie Hall? Practice, practice, practice. So, I've been working on it for a few years. Representative Tryon and I have gone around on this for a while. But I appreciate you being a cosponsor of this Bill."
- Wheeler: "Absolutely. I have one question for you. Why did you not expand it to the other boards and commissions regarding the health benefits?"
- Franks: "This is where I thought made most sense to start. I'm happy to go farther. But I wanted to get this Bill passed, and I'll run another Bill with you, if you'd like, on the others because I think it's... it's indefensible."
- Wheeler: "That's... that's wonderful. And... and I would like that,

 Representative. Thank you. To the Bill. I urge a strong

 'yes' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Rita: "Representative Franks, in committee, there was a couple questions that I had asked that you said you were going to get back to me and it pertains to the... which pension funds does this affect? Is it... and how much of a savings to the state is this going to be?"

Franks: "I'm not sure there's much to the state at all because what the state does is they give... often federal dollars are done as a conduit through the state and the state also gives money."

Rita: "So... so, to clarify that..."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Franks: "But it would save... it would save... it would save the individual RTA, CTA, Pace, et cetera, will save them money because they're the ones who are obligated to be paying into these pension funds."
- Rita: "Yeah. But... we needed some clarification, which pension funds are these? And you said you were going to get back to us. And..."
- Franks: "And I... and I talked to the folks and I forgot. Bob, I apologize."
- Rita: "Because I don't believe this... this is... is tied to any of the five state pensions that there are."
- Franks: "No, I don't think it is either. I don't think it is either."
- Rita: "And I don't want to be misled in... in..."
- Franks: "Oh. I agree with you on that. It's not."
- Rita: "And then in terms of the group health insurance, is that through the state group health insurance or..."
- Franks: "No. They have their own and what they pay for for their employees. They're treated... they're treated as though they're full-time employees though they're very part-time people who show up for a meeting or two a month."
- Rita: "And then, in terms of their revenues, they get federal revenue, state revenue. What makes up of the state on their revenue section?"
- Franks: "I don't know. But I do know, for instance, that Metra just raised fares. And when they're raising fares but giving an indefensible perk like this, it's... I don't understand. Perhaps, they should be cutting where they can't defend in giving people pensions for very part-time

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

service is not something they ought to be paying for when they're raising fares or cutting service."

Rita: "Well, I was hoping to have some clarification after that committee meeting and an explanation of... so I knew exactly what I was voting on. But thank you."

Franks: "I apologize."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks to close."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for an 'aye' vote here to stop... to help change the culture. Yeah, to help change the culture and to make it right. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 140 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady, Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 140, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1345, Representative Manley. Sorry. Excuse me, excuse me. One second. Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request.

Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the previous Bill, that I'm a cosponsor of, my button wasn't working. If I had an accurate button, I would've voted 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 1345, Representative Manley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1345, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation, which may be referred to as Adam's Law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have our honorary Page for a day standing next to me, this is Jake Vile. He is the guest of Scott Drury, and he wanted to see what it was like to present your first Bill. Today, I'm presenting House Bill 1345 which amended will reenact the Fatal Accident Memorial Marker Program that was passed previous General Assembly. The goal legislation is to provide families with a formal and safe venue for honoring their loved ones while raising awareness about the dangers of distracted and reckless driving. On November 15, 2008, John Miller parked his vehicle on the right-hand side of Plainfield/Naperville Road because he had gotten a flat tire. The four-lane road did not have a shoulder, but he turned on the emergency lights and called his wife to tell her about the situation. Not long after, a man who was attempting to light a cigar while driving plowed into the back of Mr. Miller's vehicle ultimately killing 5-year-old Adam Miller. After Adam's tragic death, his parents did what any loving parents would do and began searching for ways to remember their son and help prevent other lives from being lost due to distracted driving. Working in conjunction with their local Representatives at the time, the Fatal Accident Memorial Marker Program was passed unanimously by both chambers and signed into law by Governor Quinn. To that end, the original Bill included a

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

sunset date of December 31, 2012, because lawmakers were worried that there would be too much demand to keep up with. But after meeting with IDOT, I can now report the demand has not been an issue and IDOT ... and IDOT is now in support of extending the program and removing the sunset provision. The original Bill required IDOT to provide the General Assembly with a report, but I have removed that requirement as well. The Act allows families to honor victims of distracted or reckless driving by placing markers along our roadways. The markers must be ordered through IDOT, and the individual or group who places the order is responsible for all costs associated with placing it; therefore, there is no cost to the taxpayers. Once placed, the signs will stay up for two years, and local governments will have the authority over where the signs are placed in their municipality. I've explained this to my local mayors and they have no opposition to this. My state Senator Jennifer Bertino-Tarrant, who is also the State Senator of my constituents Cheryl and John Miller, has prefiled to carry this legislation in the Senate to keep this moving along. With that said, I'm available for questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, a few months back you asked me to take a look at the Bill. I had some suggestions for you and I just want to make sure that the implementation of this will be appropriate. Now, in the Bill, it states that a fatal

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

accident memorial means a marker commemorating one or more persons who died as a proximate result of a crash caused by a driver who committed an act of reckless homicide. Now, IDOT would be responsible for designating that marker, correct?"

Manley: "I'm sorry."

Durkin: "IDOT is responsible for designating that marker.

They're the ones who the request is made to, right?"

Manley: "When... when the request is made, they'll fabricate it and then work with the local municipality to place it."

Durkin: "Now, proximate result of a crash by a driver who committed an act of reckless homicide, are we stating that there must be a conviction for the crime of reckless homicide?"

Manley: "Yes."

Durkin: "It doesn't say that in the Bill though. That's... and when I... we talked about that before. And that's why we're going to have somebody at IDOT... if there... let's say there is an accident which resulted in death and the person is killed and that there is a case that's brought and the case is tried and there's a finding of not guilty. Would that, in that case, warrant the implementation of this Bill... of this law?"

Manley: "No."

Durkin: "Okay. I think it would just be clearer 'cause I think it's just a matter of being consistent and just making it very precise that when we talk about proximate causation about reckless homicide, when we specifically mentioned the Section in the statute, I think it would be wise maybe, if

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

you pass this out through here today, that we state that it's upon a conviction for reckless homicide in this type of situation, just to be consistent. So, if you would take that... will you take that under consideration?"

Manley: "I will take that under consideration."

Durkin: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Bost: "Just... just some clarity. Other states, and I... I'm trying to remember when this passed the first time when it had the sunset in it, what other states have this type of language?"

Manley: "I'm not aware of any other states, but I know that we passed it out of here in a pres... previous General Assembly.

It's identical."

Bost: "Okay. But you don't ... you don't know what other states..."

Manley: "I don't."

Bost: "...might have it? But it is only where reckless homicide has occurred, is that what..."

Manley: "Yes."

Bost: "So, in other words... so, in other words, if there's another death or something like that that would occur, we're not... I mean, I... as we drive up and down highways all the across the nation, you see markers that are... that are placed out. And I don't know what the rules are on those. I don't know whether families just go out and place them. Do you know what IDOT's rule is on those that families just place?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Manley: "I do... I don't think I understand your question."

Bost: "Okay."

Manley: "Could you repeat that?"

Bost: "Right now, as we drive up and down the roads, not only in the State of Illinois but all over the United States, you see markers for where there may be a fatality has occurred or obviously, there has a been a fatality occur."

Manley: "That were placed by families, you're saying?"

Bost: "That were placed by families. Do we have any standing rule on that, specifically, that you know of?"

Manley: "I do not know that. But I do know that IDOT was very supportive in the fact that this would give a safe and formal way to memorialize people lost to reckless..."

Bost: "Okay. I didn't know if they were having problems with those, you know, because those are obviously not based on a charge and a conviction."

Manley: "Right. They didn't indicate that to me."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Manley: "That that was a problem for them."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Manley to close."

Manley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Jake Vile. I'd like to also thank over the 65 Members that cosigned on this Bill. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1345 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present',
House Bill 1345, is hereby declared passed. Representative

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Smith, for what reason do you rise? House Bill 2363, Representative Sacia. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2363, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2363 is an initiative of the Comptroller and part of it is cleanup language and it does a couple of very important things, and I would like the Body to be aware that after several discussions back and forth, this is an agreed Bill with the Press Association. What it does it removes the names of persons employed by Department of Corrections, Department of Children Family Services, Department of State Police and their spouses and their addresses included in the Comptroller's yearly report. It does another thing that's relatively important. It has been learned and some of you may see, you'll look down at your... at your analysis, and it'll say this could cost as much as a \$100 thousand a year. And the reason for that is, is it allows a state check that was issued by the State of Illinois but that was not cashed in a timely manner to be cashed for a period up to 10 years. A fellow Member, on this side of the aisle, Representative Pihos had a mem... or a constituent in her district who... when the person became deceased, the family found several state checks and they were old checks and accordingly, they could not be cashed. This would clean that up and the Comptroller does not necessarily feel it would cost that much, but they wanted that buffer put in there. But again, I want to

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

stress that this an agreed Bill and it's an initiative of, again, of the Comptroller. So, I would appreciate your support, and I stand ready to answer your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2363 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2363, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2585, Representative Manley. Out of the record. House Bill 1460, Representative Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1460, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1460 amends the Service Contract Act to add a definition for rose... road hazard. This is... this creates a situation where the Service Contract Act is amended to allow for certain vehicle ancillary product coverages which is services for ancillary products to the purchase of a vehicle. These could be things for contracts which provide for repair or replacement of tires and wheels, removal of dents, dings, chips, replacement for vehicle key or key fobs or other services approved by the director. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1460 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish?

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 104 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1460, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2656, Representative Senger. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2656, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2656 amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. It requires that police chiefs pay the full cost of transfer into the IMF... IMRF fund. What this is doing is basically saying an actuary will come out to determine what that cost is and they will pay the actuarial cost. I ask for your approval."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2656 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2656, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2356, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 1443, Representative Moylan. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1443, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1443 is in response to a local hazing issue that took place in my district and strengthens penalties for school officials that fail to report the act of haze... of hazing. I ask for your 'yes' vote, and I'm open to questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Hi, mayor. So, here on this floor, we decided not to haze people on their first Bill."

Moylan: "Cor... correct."

Bost: "Did you have this Bill and move... moving with this Bill prior to us stopping that?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Bost: "So, it wasn't in response to try to move forward with not allowing the first Bill..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Bost: "...debate."

Moylan: "Correct."

Bost: "But this is your first Bill?"

Moylan: "Yes. Correct."

Bost: "And we have, you know, not ask a lot of questions and what... we've not moved down that path, but you are a very... very special to us..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Bost: "...on this side of the aisle. You... you are."

Moylan: "But you know..."

Bost: "And... and I think... and I need to know something, and... and we'll get back to your Bill in just a minute. You know, when I first came into the General Assembly, one of the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Members of my freshmen class was a mayor. Now, he only las... lasted about six months. And his position was that he actually got more respect as a mayor than he did State Rep. And so, he is still mayor to this day. Do you feel like you need to go back to being mayor or do you feel like you're being... receive enough respect as a State Representative?"

Moylan: "No. I feel that we have 118 mayors in this... in this building right now. And we are all part of one team to better this... our community."

Bost: "One hundred and eighteen mayors."

Moylan: "We are doing the work of our constituents. And I feel that all these questions make our Bills stronger, and I appreciate your concern and your questions, Sir."

Bost: "I... I am concerned. I am concerned, Sir."

Moylan: "No matter how tough they are, I will be there."

Bost: "Okay. Now... now... now to... really to the Bill."

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Bost: "The situation that occurred, and the way the language says is dealing with this, does it... what does it force... force the principal or who does it force at the schools and what does it force them to do?"

Moylan: "I'm going to give you a brief, little rundown, if that's okay? A school, listen, an official or an employee that is they're responsible to report hazing, and if they don't, they're just... they're... are going to be held just as responsible as the hazers. So, if it's in their job description that they are to report hazing and they don't, they will be held just as responsible as the hazers."

Bost: "What... what is the charge level?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "It's a... the first charge would be a misdemeanor."

Bost: "A misdemeanor. Okay."

Moylan: "If their... if the hazing incident results in bodil... bodily harm or death, it could be moved up to a felony."

Bost: "Okay. Okay. Thank you very much."

Moylan: "A Class I felonies."

Bost: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Indicates that he will."

Reboletti: "Mr. mayor, I saw that you had a shirt with you that appeared to be red in nature."

Moylan: "Correct. That was going to be with my attire under my sport jacket today. But I decided in the... to be more mayor-like that I was not going to wear it, but I had it just in case."

Reboletti: "That's very mayoral of you. Do you think since we're 118 mayors that just because Lieutenant Governor Franks doesn't think that we should haze that... that we should all as mayors of our own communities."

Moylan: "I think that tough questioning makes a Bill stronger."

Reboletti: "You think so?"

Moylan: "And I think that, you know, I really appreciate the bipartisan, I don't call it bantering, but the give and take, you know, it will make us, not only a stronger Assembly, but will make us have... we will put better Bills on the street."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Reboletti: "On the street. Representative, I've seen you actually give points of personal privilege from other positions at your desk."

Moylan: "Right."

Reboletti: "Are you comfortable? Are you going to go present from somewhere else?"

Moylan: "No. I'm going to show you. This is my normal position of presenting a Bill. This is called..."

Reboletti: "You can't... you can't use my signature lean like that..."

Moylan: "Well, I... I... but..."

Reboletti: "...Representative."

Moylan: "I know you... but this is a copyright position. This is called the Reboletti Lean. Now, if you do this, if you switch your arms to this way that is the Bost imitation. Okay. The Reboletti is this way and it's a higher one."

Reboletti: "You see, Representative, I mean, mayor, we use our own hand signals over here to let people know how to vote on Bills. It's actually very subconscious so people know. It's like, you know, like baseball coaches use."

Moylan: "Right."

Reboletti: "So, are you trying to steal our signals? Is that what you're trying to do then?"

Moylan: "Well, sometimes it's rather difficult, but sometimes I get there's a little cloud of which way the Membership is going to go."

Reboletti: "Are you going to keep going around and maybe use Representative Thapedi's or DeLuca's mic as your present this Bill?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Moylan: "Well, you know, the first vote's kind of like a team, and I really feel that their input and we support each other. You know, sometimes when..."
- Reboletti: "That's not what Representative DeLuca told me, Representative. What's the position of the Italian Caucus on this Bill? Oh, I forgot you're not a Member yet. Next question. I do have a serious question, Representative. There was opposition from the Cook County State's Attorney's Office. Can you talk about that opposition or did your Amendment take care of that opposition?"
- Moylan: "I... I'm under the impression that the Cook Count... that they support our position."
- Reboletti: "'Cause I... I show in our... in our analysis that they opposed the legislation, and I'm trying to find out here."
- Moylan: "It may be a misprint, but I'm under the impression they don't oppose our Bill. We tried to reach out to everybody that... all agencies that were involved in this, and we've received bipartisan support. And I think, especially with you leading the way and on our side of the aisle, that this will be a good Bill."
- Reboletti: "Representative, when we talk about what hazing is, and I asked you this question in committee, what it... what actually is hazing 'cause we talked about, and obviously the situation that happened in your district is very serious, very egregious, the concern I'm... was some of us were concerned about if it's... if the hazing is just kids pushing each other around in the hallway or calling each other names, but is this more part of... of a team thing than

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- it's not the actual... what makes it from screwing around or horseplay up to hazing?"
- Moylan: "I have a definition of hazing in the Bill, if you'd be okay if you'd like me to read that?"
- Reboletti: "Yes, I would... actually, I would like you to read that."
- Moylan: "Okay. An... an individual commits hazing when he or she knowingly requires the performance of any act by a student for the purpose of induction or admission into any group, organization, or society associated or connected with the institution, if that act is not sanctioned or authorized by that educational institution and results in bodily harm to any person. Currently, there is no law that requires school employees to notify law enforcement officials about hazing incidents that occur on or off grounds."
- Reboletti: "Representative, and the individuals from the school, any employee would have to report hazing? Is it anybody? Is it janitors all the way up to the school administrator or what employees would have to be mandated reporters on this?"
- Moylan: "If in their job description that they are required to report hazing if that's reported to them."
- Reboletti: "So, if you are just a clerk you don't have to report if you saw something, under your legislation."
- Moylan: "Well, if..."
- Reboletti: "Obviously, were not wor... We'd want... we would want obviously, it to be reported, but this isn't mandating them to report anything."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Moylan: "No. It's on... it's mandated, if in your job description or duties, that if someone reports hazing to you, you are then required to report it up the chain."
- Reboletti: "And it's a... it's a misdemeanor... what is it... there's a misdemeanor level and a felony level. What would the differences between the misdemeanor and a felony?"
- Moylan: "It's under my impression that death or severe bodily harm moves it up to a felony, a Class IV felony."
- Reboletti: "But what makes it a misdemeanor then? What would the misdemeanor charge look like? Or is there a misdemeanor charge?"
- Moylan: "Class A misdemeanor charge, if there's no bodily harm."
- Reboletti: "So... so bodily harm would be then."

Movlan: "Correct."

- Reboletti: "So, if there's hazing involved, hitting them with sticks or punching or that would be a regular misdemeanor?"
- Moylan: "Correct. Now, Mr. Representative, sometimes certain parts of this would be up to the law officials investigating the complaint, and that would be up to, generally, a state's attorney if they would like to move it up considering the level of the bodily harm."
- Reboletti: "Did you want to do any calisthenics, Representative, while you're..."
- Moylan: "No. Is it okay if I present from back here, Mr. Reboletti?"
- Reboletti: "I'd just talk to the Speaker. I don't know what his position is on..."

Moylan: "Mr. Speaker."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "Proceed."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Reboletti: "I... I think it's a pretty good Bill. And I'll be out here in the aisle. And I will probably vote for it. So, I would urge the support of the Body."

Moylan: "Thank you very much, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, even though it's your first Bill, I certainly think you're doing an excellent job. I do have a few questions and I... serious questions. Just... nothing's been said about cost. Do you expect this to involve any significant cost?"

Moylan: "No, Sir. And also, I would like you to con... or the House to consider the cost of what... what cost do we put on a child's safety?"

Moffitt: "Sure."

Moylan: "Especially when they're, generally, these are freshmen being hazed by seniors and you know, sometimes this travels with them for the rest of their... their lives. So, in... in terms of cost, I would like you to please consider what it means to the individuals."

Moffitt: "I think it's a good point. I just wanted... I don't really think it would bring much more cost, but I just wanted to raise that question with you. And there is a cost if we do nothing in terms of the impact on the child, I agree."

Moylan: "Correct."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moffitt: "That penalty that you've got in here up to a year it could be... could involve prison time and probation. I assume that's discretionary and obviously, a judge can take that into account and whether or not it's a first offense and how serious it was. Would that be discretionary?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Moffitt: "And you define bullying or I mean, hazing has a different definition than bullying, right? This is more specific requirement or treatment for joining an organization."

Moylan: "Correct. And that's why we put a definition in the Bill."

Moffitt: "We hear a lot about bullying and I think... I think that is a problem."

Moylan: "Right."

Moffitt: "But this... this is a different issue. We're calling hazing as a different problem than just bullying in general."

Moylan: "Correct, Sir."

Moffitt: "Which also should be reported, and some of the tragedies that have occurred in our schools we'd hear later that there may have been mental health issues, there may have been bullying issues earlier in their life and as you just said, on... even on hazing can have an impact for years to come. So, you're really dealing with a very serious issue that needs to be addressed, but failure to report when a problem, to the right officials when you know it's there, is something we do need to make sure the reporting takes place and that we consider that a serious obligation

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

and our concern for the safety of the children. So, I think this is needed, but I... I hope we, and it's a separate issue then the way you defined this, we do need to talk about making sure bullying is reported. I've... I've heard allegations of maybe some bullying not being reported in some places. I don't have enough details, but I'll try to follow up on that too. So, I... I think you're addressing a very important and serious issue here. And I think it deserves a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, this is... does this apply to all schools including non-public schools in Illinois?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Durkin: "K-12 through college?"

Moylan: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir."

Durkin: "Okay. I guess I just have a few questions regarding whether or not schools may have some exposure. Now, we are placing... making this a crime that if they do not report hazing. Is there currently a rule or law in place which... which requires the schools to identify or instruct employees, teachers on what is hazing?"

Moylan: "There is a mandated reporting law but no criminal...

there is a mandated reporting law but not a criminal part

of it."

Durkin: "I can... I... the reason I raise that question is, I think, that there is a... there are crafty attorneys in the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

State of Illinois and I'm sure you know a few of them. There are going to be cases where there is going to be hazing and the school is... someone will be penalized, and then somebody will be looking at the bigger picture that there will be civil action that will come against the school. One, is the school immune under the Tort Immunity Act?"

Moylan: "Not that I'm aware of."

Durkin: "Ooh."

Moylan: "If they're... if there's immunity, Sir, there might."

Durkin: "If there's a loss... if... let me... maybe I should just be more specific with the question."

Moylan: "Okay."

Durkin: "If an employee's charged with failing to report and there is a crime, and there is a, perhaps, you know, the family member or the student brings suit against law... against the institution, would they be immune under the Tort Immunity Act for failing to properly supervise?"

Moylan: "I would just give you what is happening in our school district. I'm just going to not answer that part. I'm going to give what's happening in a school in our district. The school and the... some of the former teachers are being sued."

Durkin: "I... here... here's what I... what I believe is the... a scenario that we need to be mindful of is now the replacing, you know, this is a good law. I'm going to support your law, but we need to be careful about what the ulterior situations which may occur. I can see a situation where there is going to be violation. Someone's charged a

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

student, they go to their parent, and why wasn't that employee properly instructed, and the fact is it does create a tort there is a vi... there is a civil action. I want to make sure that our schools are not going to be subject that there's some type of hold harmless under the Tort Immunity Act which I think they are. But playing lawyer again, there's a Section in the Tort Immunity Act that... it's under the 'willful and wanton' conduct which states that you cannot use the defense of the Tort Immunity Act if... if someone shows an utter indifference to or conscious disregard for the safety of others. So, when I raised my first question as whether or not there's a program in place in which schools are required to instruct and to identify hazing and also to require a direct action for them to... instructed them that they need to report. I do think that we... it's something we need to be considered because I... I've seen them. I've defended local governments in these types of actions, and I want to make sure that we're not going to have a situation where there is going to be exposure which is going to be unintended from what you're trying to do. I'm not sure... I guess it's more of a rhetorical question. I'm not looking for a response. But I think it's just something I'm going to think about more and I will raise that to you. But I... I... but I just want to make sure we're not going to set up a situation which is we now creating a duty upon these... these employees to report but for the failure to report, it's a school have exposure for not instructing them properly of what the law is."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "It's under our impression that the school has tort immunity, but if the individual sues, it is not."

Durkin: "Right. But there are exceptions under tort immunity."

Moylan: "Okay."

Durkin: "And I just made with that Section that's under 'willful and wanton' and the standard's not that difficult to meet. So, I appreciate what you're doing. I'm going to support you, but this is something we need to be mindful of. And I will, actually, I'm going to talk over the weekend, I'm going to do some of my own diligence and I'll bring you my findings next week. Thank you."

Moylan: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, I know you're new here and you'll hear me from time to time say I'm a farmer not a lawyer, so in your language of your Bill it says 'commits hazing', the teacher or the superintendent or the guidance counselor or the volunteer commits hazing. Is hazing a crime currently in Illinois statute?"

Moylan: "Well, I... listen, my view, hazing is a crime."

Reis: "No."

Moylan: "I'm not..."

Reis: "But it says in your language that he or she commits hazing when he or she fails to report to law enforcement authorities, so I'm wanting to make sure that you're calling the crime the right thing in your language."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "Correct. What... what I'm saying is that a person that doesn't report hazing is just as guilty as the hazers if they do not report the crime. And it's their duty to report the crime."

Reis: "Okay."

Moylan: "Thank you."

Reis: "Now, it also says all school officials, so does that mean the guidance counselor or the coach and the principal and the superintendent all have to commit... or report this?"

Moylan: "If it's... if it's their duty and in their job description that if hazing is reported to them, yes, if that's in their job duty. I'm going to give you a Floor Amendment that was approved. Teachers, guidance counselors, support staff, coaches, and volunteer coaches employed by a school, college, university or other educational institution. Now, the Amendment was the result of some teachers' organizations that were involved in the process."

Reis: "Back to my question, Representative. Do all of them have to report or just one of the three or one of the two?"

Moylan: "Currently, they're required to report abuse, and this Bill goes to hazing, specifically."

Reis: "I understand that, and I'm in agreement with you on your Bill. I just want to make sure it's... it's crafted right. Do all three of them have to report this? I mean, this is a Class A misdemeanor they could go to jail on."

Moylan: "Well..."

Reis: "That, in itself, I think is a little harsh, but do all three of them have to report it?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "Well, here, the person that has the information is required to report it."

Reis: "Okay."

Moylan: "If it's the counselor, he has to report it. If it's the principal, he has to report it."

Reis: "Is there anything in your Bill that says 'knowingly'?

So, what if something gets... what if something isn't reported and there's a lawsuit or an investigation and..."

Moylan: "Right. Here..."

Reis: "You see what I'm saying."

Moylan: "Yes."

Reis: "Is there is there 'knowingly' in this Bill?"

Moylan: "Can I try and answer? If they have any knowledge of an incident, then they're required to report it."

Reis: "But does that say that in your Bill?"

Moylan: "It says he or she 'knowingly'. I'm almost sure. Yes. It's in the Bill, Sir."

Reis: "Where, in the Bill, does it say 'knowingly'?"

Moylan: "Okay. We're... we are checking, Sir."

Reis: "Okay. And I agree with where you're going, Representative."

Moylan: "Line 8, line 8(a). Thank you. I'm sure it says otherwise has knowledge."

Reis: "Okay. I'm sure some other people will take a look at this because, you know, sometimes people may not know."

Moylan: "Correct."

Reis: "And someone could come back and say we're going to sue you or you're... you're going to be arrested because you should've known and you really didn't. And my last question

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

for you, and thank you for you indulgence, is this first time offense or is this second time?"

Moylan: "It's first. It really... it doesn't address that in the Bill."

Reis: "Huh?"

Moylan: "It doesn't address that in the Bill, first time or second offense. I think any offense of hazing is an offense. And I'm not..."

Reis: "We're talking about the reporting. I agree with you on the hazing. But is this... if a school teacher is accused of this, first offense these penalties could go into effect which is \$2500 and jail time."

Moylan: "It doesn't say that in the Bill, Sir."

Reis: "But what's a sentence for a Class A misdemeanor?

According to our analysis, a Class A misdemeanor is up to a year in prison..."

Moylan: "Correct."

Reis: "...two years' probation, and a maximum fine of \$2500."

Moylan: "Correct."

Reis: "So, if someone was accused of this the first time, they could face those sentence..."

Moylan: "Yes, Sir."

Reis: "...charges."

Moylan: "And it's just, as you know, it's discretionary upon the investigating bodies."

Reis: "I know. I know. I just... I think we got to make sure that we got 'knowingly' right in there, so..."

Moylan: "Right."

Reis: "...I appreciate your answers, Representative."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Moylan: "And I appreciate your questions. We are here to work together to get a good Bill, and I certainly appreciate."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, under your... under existing law, if someone hazes somebody and they die, they're going to get a Class IV Felony. What you're trying to say is if someone was told about it and didn't report it, they're going to be now under this hazing aspect. Do you believe that they will get the Class IV Felony for failing to report or will they just get the subsection (a)5 in your Bill where they'll just be treated with a misdemeanor?"

Moylan: "Here, I believe under our Bill, if they're... if the hazing results in death or severe bodily harm, they could be held as accountable as the commit... the person that commits the crime."

Sullivan: "Okay. If that's your intent that's not what your Bill does."

Moylan: "Okay."

Sullivan: "Because under... on page 2 of your Bill, it says, 'hazing under subsection (a)5 of this sub... of this Section is a Class A misdemeanor'. Subsection (a)5 is the body of your language that says if you fail to report this because you had knowledge, you're going to be treated with hazing, so they don't match up."

Moylan: "Okay."

Sullivan: "Is... is the problem. I just wanted to point that out to you. So, if someone would die as a react of hazing, the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

person that did the act would get a Class IV Felony or could get a Class IV felony, but your Bill only addresses (a)5 which is the not reporting aspect, and it specifically points that's a Class A misdemeanor. So, what you're, maybe, intending and what you're... what the Bill says that they don't act up or they don't... they don't match, so you might want to look at that going over to the Senate."

Moylan: "And I assure you we will. Thank you."

Sullivan: "You bet."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, Representative Moylan, I'm glad you thought to bring this important piece of legislation to this Body. Some people may not be aware, but people, young children have died because of hazing. In one instance, they were forced to drink alcohol from room to room. In other instances, they may have been beaten. In another instance, they were put into a... into a pond of water when they could not swim. When we send our children to school, be it a university or a high school, we expect that they're going to be protected. Administrators should do what they are responsible for doing and that's make sure that children are protected when they're in college, when they're in high school or elementary school. Hazing should be illegal. It should be a criminal offense for you, as an adult, to know about it and to turn your back. For those of us who respect children and who want the safety of our children when we send them to school, you will certainly vote 'yes' on this

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Bill. Thank you, Representative, for bringing this, and I have asked to put my name on it as a cosponsor. Thank you."

 Speaker Turner: "Representative Moylan to close."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I really appreciate the give and take on this Bill. I'm asking you for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1443 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Arroyo, Leitch. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 104 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1443, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Repre... Representative Schmitz could be excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. The record will reflect your request. House Bill 1277, Representative Senger. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Senger."
- Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1277 changes the way we calculate normal cost for a pension. It changes it from, basically, an actuarial method called 'projected unit credit' to actuarial (sic-entry) age normal'. This is something that Moody's and GASB will be asking us to do in the future. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1277 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1277, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1568, Representative Nekritz. Out of the record. House Bill 13... Excuse me. House Bill 1919, Representative Tracy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1919, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A constituent brought... well, actually it was a state's attorney and a county sheriff brought to me a proposal that when a criminal defendant receives a disposition of court supervision, the court 'may', in its discretion and in addition to conditions, require that the person contribute a reasonable sum of money not to exceed the amount of the fine authorized for the offense for which the defendant was sentenced to a local after-prom committee. This would just be within the total discretion of the judge. The judge has authority in these situations to discretionally... discretionarily provide for other things. For instance, in a DNR offense, they can require the defendant to make restitution of sorts to conservation efforts and the like. So, anyway, they... they thought that this would be a very positive, healthy use of funds and maybe appropriate in

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

certain circum... circumstances, so they wanted the judges to have this type of authority. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm not sure I understand what the Bill does. Does it... could you please explain? I'm... I'm reading our analysis and something about a local high school after-prom program. But I'm not sure I understand what your Bill's intending to do."

Tracy: "Right. When... in the sentencing code, they're allowed to discretionarily award certain sums of money, not to exceed the amount of the fine, for purposes that relate, perhaps, to the crime. And the state's attorneys and the sheriffs felt that it would be appropriate because so many schools offer healthy alternatives, positive alternatives and have all night after-prom committees that are... are put on by the schools. And they thought that this would be an option to..."

Franks: "For who? I mean, is this for the judge to require an additional fine?"

Tracy: "Not an additional fine. They... they already have that authority. But this would just be a not... a clarification of another type of activity or area that a judge... for instance, as I mentioned, in a conservation offense, the judge, in awarding supervision, could say, you know, you... you can, you know, part of your fine or whatever will go to some conservation effort. So, in an appropriate

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

circumstance, a judge would have the ability to allot an amount to an after-prom activity."

Franks: "For a social function."

Tracy: "Well, it's... it is a social function, but it's a school-sponsored activity. It... it's like a... a diversion to promote healthy alternative."

Franks: "I know. But a lot of kids can't afford to go to prom. Some kids don't go because they can't afford it. It's an expensive night. A lot of..."

Tracy: "That's true. But this would, I mean, you don't have to go to prom to go to after-prom and that's quite true.

Downstate that happens a lot, they will go to the after-prom."

Franks: "Well, it depends if you're violating curfew or not, I presume. We have curfews..."

Tracy: "Well, no, I mean..."

Franks: "...in some of the local areas."

Tracy: "...it's a school... you know, perhaps in your area they don't have after-prom sponsored activities as they do..."

Franks: "Oh, they do. They do."

Tracy: "...that are totally sponsored by the school. The parents are involved. They provide a lot of alternative fun activities and..."

Franks: "Oh, I know, and I've contributed to it many times."

Tracy: "...and like I say, I mean, a person doesn't have to do this. A judge just has... it's just clarifying that this could be an option. And I'm not so sure that they don't do this already, but we want to make sure that this is a clarification that this would be within the realm."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Franks: "Is there a list of other... other acceptable things? I'm just trying to see..."

Tracy: "There are."

Franks: "...how this fits in."

Tracy: "There are. To a local anti-crime program as defined in Section 7 of the Anti-Crime Advisory Council Act or for offenses under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Resources to the fund established by the Nat... the Department of Natural Resources for the purchase of evidence or investigation purposes to conduct investigations as outlined in Section 805-105. So, there are specific things that a judge... it depends on the circumstances, of course, in every court case. This is just a minor addition."

Franks: "No. I... I understand. I'm just wondering if that should be our public policy, though, to be having fine dollars used to pay for a party when they could be used to pay for evidentiary issues or as you said, you know, a DARE program, for instance, or something that everyone is involved in. This just seems that some people may benefit and not all. And on those other diversions where judges could put moneys, it's for the benefit all not the benefit of some."

Tracy: "Totally within the judge's discretion."

Franks: "Yeah. I just think it's a... it's a departure from where we've been with these kinds of funds. And I certainly support the after-prom programs. I've personally donated to many of them, but I think it's probably better if their

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

personal donations than a government... government money being used for a party."

Tracy: "Well, I think the idea by the state's attorney and the county sheriff was that schools are cutting back on so many of the extracurricular activities and that they, themselves, are losing funding for so many things that they don't have any money to put into this."

Franks: "I get it."

Tracy: "Counties and cities are finding that they can't contribute because of the lack of funding, so this is another option."

Franks: "Well, to the Bill. And I appreciate the Sponsor's intent, but I think school functions should be, you know, kids can do bake sales or they can wash cars or they can do things to help pay for it. I don't think that fine money ought to be used for a party. I know it's well-intentioned, but I think it's poor public policy. I think fine moneys paid by those who are given supervision, who have pled or been found guilty ought to be used for more law enforcement issues that are more appropriate and that would benefit all instead of just some. I think it's a noble gesture, but I think it's a misguided policy. I'll be voting 'no'. And I'll ask you to join me in voting 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what was the genesis of the Bill?"

Tracy: "A loc..."

Reboletti: "...Who asked you to sponsor the legislation?"

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Tracy: "The state's attorney and the county sheriff in Hancock County."

Reboletti: "Of what county?"

Tracy: "Hancock."

Reboletti: "I had to share with you, Representative, that I have some concerns about the ability of a judge to sentence somebody to make them give a contribution to any type of after-school program or prom or any type 501(c)(3) program. I'm not sure if it will... would pass constitutional muster because you... I don't think you can force somebody through criminal sentencing 'cause you're... you're saying this is for any disposition? Could it be a speeding ticket all the way up to a felony case?"

Tracy: "It's a disposition under supervision."

Reboletti: "Right. But it... is it for a speeding ticket? Could it be for a misdemeanor? Can it be for a felony because there's actually felony supervision on some non... on some drug cases?"

Tracy: "Right. And... and I'm looking here. I think the answer to your question was it would be... it... it's possible. And there, again, the circumstances would fit the case. I mean, I don't think this is going to be used all that often. I... I share your... when I first approached this, I... I shared your concern about would it be constitutional that... but since it would be a defendant rather than a local government or the like and that... that's kind of how all this arose is that local governments and counties used to contribute to these type of things. Lack of funding is... is hurting them and also, they felt like they couldn't contribute to this type

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

of activity any longer, but these aren't really 501(c)(3)s. They're actually a school. It would... the money goes to the school for this... this activity."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

Tracy: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy to close."

Tracy: "I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1919 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Davidsmeyer, Demmer. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 76 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1919, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "A point of personal privilege."

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

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In a couple of weeks, we're going to be having the House/Senate softball game. And I just wanted to announce that we're going to be having practice next week. So, anybody with... bring their equipment down next week, and we'll hit the ball around a little bit and get ready for that House/Senate softball game. Keep the trophy here in the House. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative
Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Demmer will be excused for the rest of the day. We're losing them fast. We're losing them fast."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request.

 Representative Golar."
- Golar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like the record to reflect that on House Bill 1919 I would like to... I was recorded as a 'yes'; I would like to be recorded as a 'no'."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request. Thank you. Representative Jackson."
- Jackson: "I would like for my vote to reflect 'no' on 1919 as well. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will also reflect your request.

 Thank you. House Bill 58, Representative Sosnowski. Mr.

 Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 58, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Essentially, this Bill is technical cleanup in regards to electrical co-ops. Any member that is a paying customer of an electrical co-op is allowed to be on that particular board and serve on that board in the capacity. According to state statute, right now, there's some gray area as far as whether or not elected officials, even though they are paying members of a co-op, could sit on that board, so this clarifies that. I'm available for any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 58 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 90 voting 'yes', 15

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 58, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2802, Representative Sims. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2802, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2802 amends the Public Aid Code by making a change to the medical services Section of the Code relative to the nursing home prescreening project. The... House Bill 2802 requires the Departments of Healthcare and Family Services, Human Services, and Aging to create a process or establish procedures to permit providers access to determination of need scores for indivi... individual with admission dates who are... or are seeking or receiving services from the providers by October 1 of 2013. I know of no opposition. And the Amendment that was adopted yesterday removed all opposition. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2802 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 103 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2802, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1042, Representative Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tryon."

Tryon: "Yeah. House Bill 1042 will allow a downstate patrolman to receive prior service credit that was earned while they were employees at the Chicago Police Department as long as all of the pension credit that's transferred into their pension system and all the actuarial costs are paid for by the member of the downstate pension system. There's no objection to this. Both pension systems are supportive of it. And the window would be for 60 days for them to do this. This passed out of committee unanimously."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1042 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Berrios, Daniel Burke, Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 103 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 1042, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2726, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2726, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the licensing sunset extension to extend the

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

sunset on the CPAs and the Accountants Professional Act. It's an agreed Bill, no known opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is this one of the best Bills out on the streets right now?"

Rita: "That's what I'm being told."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Reis: "Does this have anything to do with roofing licenses?"

Rita: "The what?"

Reis: "Roofing licenses."

Rita: "No. Just CPAs."

Reis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita to close."

Rita: "Just ask for a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2726 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', House Bill 2726, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2723, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2723, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this a... another extension of a sunset of the Private Detectives Professional Act.

This is an agreed Bill. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2723 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2723, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2992, Representative Harms. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2992, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harms."

Harms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 992 maximizes the amount of time children and parents can spend together after the divorce. It gives the court the ability to allow the parties to enter into an agreement of right of first refusal which allows the parent who does not have custody of the child the first opportunity to care for his or her child when the other parent is not available. It is an agreed Bill. I worked with the State Bar Association on an Amendment to make it an agreed Bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2992 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 104 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2992, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2721, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2721, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Again, another sunset Act. I think if we keep doing these, we'll be here when the sun sets. This is the Court Reporters Licensing Act. It's an agreed Bill. I'd be happy to answer and questions or ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, have you reached out to the department and filled out an application to be the department chairman?"

Rita: "What's that?"

Sullivan: "Have you put in an application to be the chairman of the Department of Professional Regulations?"

Rita: "Um, no, not yet."

Sullivan: "You certainly carry a lot of their water right now."

Rita: "Well, I'm taking over the committee as they've asked me to carry a few Bills and you know."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2721 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kay. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 105 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Bill 2721, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1552. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. House Bill 2991. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2991, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third. House Bill... House Bill 2977, Representative Lilly. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2977, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lilly, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This... this Amendment simply adds language stating, 'subject to appropriation', which means that the Department of Human Services is only designated an ambassador at time of appropriation."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2977. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, the status of House Bill 2856."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2856 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Please move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, the status of House Bill 827."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 827 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Can you, also, move that Bill back to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 235, offered by Representative Welch. House Resolution 236, offered by Representative Jakobsson. House Resolution 237, offered by Representative Osmond. And House Resolution 238, offered by Representative Sente."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Reminder, Members, substantive Amendments are to be filed by 3 p.m. today. It's the final day. Substantive Amendments are to be filed by 3 p.m. today. And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House adjourn to Monday, April 15 at the hour of 2 p.m. All those in favor... Seeing no objection, the House is adjourned."

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 47, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Senate Bill 1256, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1280, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act Senate Bill 1287, offered by concerning civil law. Representative Wheeler, a Bill for an Act concerning civil Senate Bill 1322, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1329, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1430, offered Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1493, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 1495, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1496, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1524, offered by Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1541, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1603, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for concerning finance. Senate Bill 1620, offered Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning Senate Bill 1637, offered by Representative wildlife. Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 1691, offered by Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1693,

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1715, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1730, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1748, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Senate Bill 1758, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1826, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1828, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Senate Bill 1829, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1830, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1859, offered by Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1862, offered by Representative Brown, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal Senate Bill 1869, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1882, offered by Representative Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1884, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 1937, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1953, offered by Representative Sullivan, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2163, offered Representative Brown, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 2230, offered by Representative

39th Legislative Day

4/12/2013

Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2234, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 2281, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Senate Bill 2332, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Senate Bill 2378, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. These were referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."