55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

  Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie,
  Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the
  following committee action taken on May 15, 2013:
  recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor
  Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1044, Floor Amendment #1 to
  Senate Bill 1226, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1843,
  Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1921."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Major Richard Herivel who is the Secretary General of the Midland Division of the Salvation Army in St. Louis, Missouri. The Major is a guest of Representative Leitch. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Major."
- Major Herivel: "Shall we pray. Our Heavenly Father, we come to You today with hearts of thanksgiving. And first, I want to ask Your special blessing upon the men and women who represent the people of Illinois, who work hard day in and day out to make life better for the people of this great state. I just pray that as this Session goes on today that You will work, that You give people the strength and the wisdom and the courage to make decisions that are needed to go forward so that people of this great state can live in even better fashion in the days to come. And I pray this in Your name, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in prayer... in the Pledge today by Representative Meier."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Meier et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Soto."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Tryon and Rosenthal are excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 115 Members present and we do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Yesterday, the Auditor General had a report to Members of the House of Representatives. I'm sure you've read this report on the Road Fund. A large chunk, one out of... at least one out of every \$4 that should be going to roads in the State of Illinois are going for other things. Just reemphasizes the decade of incompetence that this state has been under. One, and I know not just downstaters for people in the suburbs or up north in the city, our roads are lousy, folks. They're in bad shape. So, when you tell the people that we represent that one out of every \$4 is being diverted, why? The unemployment figures will be out next... tomorrow, I believe, but we know from

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

last month we had nine and a half percent unemployment, two percentage points higher than the nation average. Where I'm from, we have the highest in the state, nearly 14 percent unemployment in the City of Decatur. The money in the Road Fund should be going for roads, bridges and work for people who are hurting, who are out of work that need the jobs to build the infrastructure in this state. That's what we should be about, folks. Helping people and making sure that the State of Illinois does its job and builds roads and bridges. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney. Representative Mayfield. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could just continue... for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Bost: "And if I could continue on the point that was brought up by the previous speaker. It has... it has been the... the primary concern of a majority of the Members of the General Assembly, for all the years I've been here, to have specific protection of those Road Funds, and there's a reason for that. By diverting those Road Funds and not using them for the moneys that they are allocated... directed towards, what we end up doing is we end up losing jobs. We endanger the lives of those people traveling up and down our highways and that's why we, on both sides of the aisle, prior to apparently just recently, have been arguing at a lot stronger rate to make sure that the Road Funds are not diverted, that they are put in roads, resurfacing, replenishing, maintaining, and bridges that we know we have

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

failures and possible failures all over the state. Ladies and Gentlemen, we got to get this directed the right way. I stand in total support of what the previous speaker said."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

"You know, I... I see some grins and ginners over there. This isn't the first time the Road Funds have happened, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, those of you who have been here for longer than six or seven years, the General Assembly, back in the early Blagojevich years, granted the Governor the authority to divert Road Funds to create new programs that we couldn't afford and then we got behind on our roads. And it doesn't matter if you live in downstate or in the city or in the suburbs, everyone's roads got pushed back. They became crumbled and potholes and you complain about it and your constituents complain about it, but that happened because the General Assembly gave the Governor the authority to do that. Most of you may or may not be aware but the Road Fund is a flat tax that hasn't increased since 1990. So, here we are trying to do 2013 repairs on 1990 dollars. And then to have Road Fund diversions coupled with that and then to find out what we knew last year in the appropriation process that even more money for health insurance premiums and workers' comp was being diverted out of the Road Fund. Now, those of you that are in Public Policy Appropriations with me said, you know, you've done raided the pensions, you've done created a backlog of unpaid bills that the only pot of gold left in

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

this town is the Road Fund, the Corporate Personal Property Replacement Tax and the Local Distributor Fund. This just goes to show you that we have too many programs, we can't pay for it and we're diverting money from those important programs to try to pay for it all. And I bring this up more importantly because I know what's going on in the Public Safety Committee again this year, trying to shift those Road Funds to pay for things other than roads and bridges and repairs. Folks, this has got to stop. This affects our constituents, it affects our business, it affects the travel through this state. Road Funds are for the roads and bridges. That's where they need to stay."

Speaker Lang: "On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1197, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege, if I may?"

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Franks: "I'd like to introduce the Body to my cousins who are down Paging today from Northbrook; Claire, Gabriel and Max Gruenberg. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1775. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports the following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Senate Bill 105. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from Financial Institutions reports Committee on following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1674. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from the Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2136. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 14, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1207, Senate Bill 1898; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1192; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 299; do not pass pursuant to Rule 22(g) is Senate Bill 1867. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 925, Senate Bill 1294; recommends be adopted is House Resolution 247. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1354; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1718. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 15, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Senate Bill 1221. Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 38, offered by Representative Flowers, is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Flowers. Excuse me. Chair recognizes Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point or two of personal privilege. First of all, I would like to welcome back to the chamber, Karen May, who's... Thank you. We're delighted to see her and perhaps we'll see her in a little cameo performance tonight. Also, a group of nurses representing four Vanguard hospitals are visiting us today. They work at MacNeal, West Sub, Weiss, which is in my district, Westlake, and are visiting the Capitol. Last week was Nurses Week. It was a time of year where we reflect on the important contributions nurses make to society and all of us to provide safe, high quality health care. I'd like all of us to give them a big warm of welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Happy you're here. The Chair recognizes Mr. Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Unes: "I'd like to introduce two very special Pages with me today. We have from East Peoria, Jerelyn Joos and also from East Peoria, my daughter, Meghan Unes, is with me today. Please welcome them to Springfield. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here. Mr. Franks. Your light was on, Sir. Now, it's off. Senate Bill 1310, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1310, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1310 is identical to a Bill we passed earlier in the spring that deals with watercraft and it's an initiative of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. It simply cleans up some enforcement actions. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Turner. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1379, Mr. Unes. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Unes."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1379 is a Bill that will maintain a current utility tax exemption for Keystone Steel and Wire in the Peoria area, one of the few remaining steel companies in the State of Illinois. This Bill passed unanimously out of the Senate and out of committee. I know of no opponents. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Franks: "Representative, could you be more descriptive on what this Bill does? I understand that you want to keep a tax break for a... for an employer. Is this for a specific employer?"
- Unes: "Yes. Representative, this would be for an employer in the Peoria area, Keystone Steel, which is one of the few remaining steel companies in the State of Illinois. They have this already. This will be an existing... existence to continue to maintain this tax exemption. And they have it because it does reside in an enterprise zone."
- Franks: "Okay. Let me ask you this. Right... As I'm looking at this, and the Majority Leader's helping me understand this, I understand that the tax break was based on a certain number of employees being employed. Correct?"

Unes: "Correct."

- Franks: "And one of those markers was that they had to have a thousand full-time employees by 2012, correct?"
- Unes: "Correct. And in fact, they... they did at one point, yes."
- Franks: "But now, what this legislation would do is to allow them to be down to 750 employees and still get a tax break?"
- Unes: "This would allow the exemption to continue at 750 employees. Correct."
- Franks: "Why would we change the definition of retention here?

  Isn't the idea of the economic incentives to create jobs?

  And I'm wondering why we would incentivize the removal of jobs?"
- Unes: "Representative, the... and I understand where you're coming from and you ask a very good question. The American

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

steel industry has been in decline for quite some time. This, again, is... is... will be no additional cost to the State of Illinois because this is currently a credit that does already exist. Because Keystone has been affected by the decline of... of manufacturing jobs, as many in the steel industry has, this will allow Keystone to continue to rebound following that dramatic decline and..."

Franks: "I... I understand what you're trying to do, but this would cost the locals then, if not the state, the locals will be foregoing over a million and a half dollars a year in revenue for the utility tax, correct, if this should be extended?"

Unes: "Actually, I look at this as allowing Keystone to continue to generate, which it has just in state tax dollars alone, will continue to generate the over \$5 million per year for state revenues."

Franks: "But they're not leaving the state. I mean, right now we had a... we had a hearing last week on the EDGE credit program in the State of Illinois, which seems to be the only way you can get a tax credit in this state, is if you threaten to leave. But here, what you're saying is even if you're staying and you're going to have less workers, you're still going to receive the same tax credit. Aren't tax credits supposed to be to incentivize job creation? This is a disincentive for job creation. What we're saying is, you can fire 25 percent of your workforce and as a reward we're going to give you a million and a half dollars."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Unes: "Representative, I understand where you're coming from and your line of questioning and the reason for your ask... you're asking it, I would... I would only say that, again, one of the few remaining steel companies that we have in the State of Illinois, who has dramatically been affected by the decline in the American steel industry, being able to maintain an exemption that's already currently in place, I would argue that could ultimately save jobs."

Franks: "How many employees do they have now?"

Unes: "Currently, they have 862 employees."

Franks: "Well, don't we want to incentivize them? Because you're allowing them with this Bill, if they have 862, to allow them to fire 112 workers and to still maintain this tax break, correct?"

Unes: "In fact, that is not their intention. In fact, they have... they have continued to add more jobs and I'm very hopeful that they will be back over that 1 thousand job level threshold. And that's my intention to... to have them continue to grow, which is the... which is the trend that they are currently on. But... but... but it's unarguable that they are still in that rebound trend."

Franks: "And we want them to."

Unes: "Absolutely."

Franks: "But instead of going down to 750, wouldn't it make more sense to say, okay, you have 862 employees and we hope to God you go over a thousand in the next year, but as long as you maintain 862, we will give you the additional three years. But I've got a problem to give them the additional three years if we're also allowing them to fire taxpaying

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Illinoisans and getting tax breaks from those same folks who they just fired. Now, would... would you agree that it would make more sense to say as long as you kept 862 that we should then be able to give you the additional 3 years? I think this Bill would sail out of here unanimously."

Unes: "Sure. Well, Mr. Speaker... or Representative..."

Franks: "Representative, yeah."

Unes: "Representative, this was a Bill that was drafted in the... in the other Body, it was..."

Franks: "We... we have time."

Unes: "...done by the... my Senator, Senator Koehler. It did pass out of that Body unanimously. And I think it's because they understand that it's not incurring an additional exemption or not incurring any additional cost to the State of Illinois, but in fact, hopefully, saving jobs and will continue the trend that... that Keystone's on in growing jobs."

Franks: "Well, would you consider amending it? I think they'd probably agree. If Keystone says they're going to... they're at 862 and their trend is up and they plan on being over a thousand next year, I don't see how anyone then could argue that it wouldn't make sense then to require that they keep at least that. Would you be willing to amend this Bill, take it to Second? I'm sure it'll pass then, unanimously, in both Houses. But otherwise, what we're saying is a policy is we're going to give tax breaks to those companies that can fire people, which I don't think anybody here agrees with."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Unes: "I know that there's some time sensitivity and this is very important to... to them and the fact that this did sail out, again, out of committee unanimously and out of the Senate Floor unanimously. It's a... it's my intention and preference to continue this moving along. But I do understand where you're coming from."

"Well, I appreciate it. To the Bill. I appreciate what Franks: the Gentleman's trying to do and if I was in his situation I'd probably be do ... trying to do something similar, but I think I would have amended the Bill because I think it sends a very bad message to say that we're going to give special tax breaks to companies that are going to fire folks. If they really believe what they were talking about and they were going to be growing, they'd have no problem maintaining the same level. But to do this I... I think is ... is corrupting to the process because we need... if we're going to be giving tax incentives, they have to be given to be creating jobs and to retaining jobs, but this doesn't require retention. It allows for firing and I don't think that's what we ought to be doing. I think it's poor public policy and I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "So, Representative, let me understand this. We've given them a... a tax incentive to create new jobs and what did they do with that tax incentive? They created new jobs, didn't they?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Unes: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Right. So, they have more jobs there now than they did at the time of a tax incentive, right?"

Unes: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Right. So, they have basically done what we have asked them to do. However, because of economic conditions in the marketplace, they have not been able to get to that level that they initially thought that they were... that they initially thought they were going to get at, correct?"

Unes: "Absolutely."

Harris, D.: "All right. So, rather than try to micromanage what happens in the marketplace, we are saying, hey, you've... you've come a long way to achieving the success that we have asked you to achieve with the incentives that we have given you. So, what we're saying is... or what you're asking is, let's keep incentivizing them. They're doing what we've asked them to do. This is going to help them create more jobs, right?"

Unes: "That's correct. And I..."

Harris, D.: "That's exactly what we want in the State of Illinois. Yes, you have to sometimes put a stick or a carrot out there for people to shoot for, we do this regularly. This is not a... as the Sponsor has said, this is nothing new. This is... this is not going to have a... this is not going to have an impact on revenues that are there now. It is a reasonable approach that the... that the Sponsor has put out there. And I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Unes: "And... and, in fact, the..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is kind of the wrong Bill to be demagoguing against. Indeed, Keystone Steel and Wire and its survival was one of the great stories and one of the great achievements of this very General Assembly. About 14 years ago, when every other steel company in the United States was going bankrupt or falling apart, Keystone came to the General Assembly and asked not for a bailout, not for a grant, but for a loan. A loan to help them stay alive and to help them recover through the most turbulent times in that company... in our period of time, and they were successful. And they have repaid to Peoria County every dime of the \$10 billion... million dollars that we worked together to provide. And it wasn't a Republican/Democrat issue, it was one where we all worked together, every Leader. Speaker Madigan instrumental in this. At the time, Pate Phillip instrumental in this. All of the Leaders worked together with Governor Ryan and we put together this loan, not a grant. And as a consequence of that loan, Keystone did survive and they did thrive sufficiently enough to pay all of that loan, which was in the hands of Peoria County. I can't emphasize enough the impact of that loan. It saved, at the time, thousands of jobs in our community, not just at Keystone but other survivor... suppliers and it was a marvelous example of what we can actually accomplish when we work together around here. So, I would urge the Body to vote unanimously in favor of this Bill. Keystone is a very outstanding corporate citizen and it's a Bill that makes tremendous common sense for the economic future of not just

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

our community but for all of Illinois. So, I would request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Yeah, I'm just... I'm just curious. Representative Unes, do you remember two years ago when we doled out free money to two companies in Illinois because they were complaining about leaving?"

Unes: "I... I remember the Bill that you're speaking of."

Kay: "Well, Sears and CME seemed to think that Illinois wasn't a very friendly place to do business and so, we ponied up a lot of money for them. Do you recall that?"

Unes: "I... I do remember that Bill very well, yes."

Kay: "Yeah. And you probably don't remember the exact amount but I do and it was several millions of dollars that we simply said, here take it and run, do what you want with it but stop complaining. Representative Unes, do you... in fact, I think you know that there's a number of growth and jobs Bills that have been put forward this year in this General Assembly to get this state up and running again. Are you familiar with that?"

Unes: "I am very familiar with those, yes."

Kay: "Yeah. It... really, there's probably 40 some separate Bills to incentivize people to come to Illinois or encourage them to stay in Illinois and not one of those Bills has moved anywhere, not one. Now, as I understand it, Illinois has the second highest out-migration of any state in the union. That means people are sick and tired of Illinois politics

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

and what we do in this General Assembly. They're sick of it and they're leaving. And the simple truth is, they're leaving because they can't find jobs or they can't afford to live here. So, what Representative Unes was really trying to say to us today is, don't give them a break, give them a chance. And I'm saying today, give business a chance. Let them create jobs. We have done everything we can for everybody else except for the job creators and we have done everything we can to make the environment for them stink. So, let's get behind Mr. Unes's Bill, recognize that we have repaid a loan... or they have repaid a loan, they have done it right, just as we asked them to do, and face the fact that the last hope we have for the State of Illinois is in creating a job environment that keeps people here and really invites others to come. To say this is anything but a good Bill is simply nonsense. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Ives: "Representative Unes, are you familiar with the Sears Bill that we passed a couple of years ago giving them a tax incentive to stay here?"

Unes: "I think that was the same Bill that Representative Kay was referring to. I... I am familiar with that Bill."

Ives: "I just wanted to give some additional context to that.

Because two months after giving Sears a \$150 million tax

credit to stay here, two months later, they laid off 100

employees. And even according to the tax credit that we

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

gave them, they actually could have received that entire tax credit and laid off an additional 1,850 employees with no consequences whatsoever for the 150 million dollars we handed them to stay here. Now, if this Body, including Representative Franks, is interested in doing comprehensive tax reform in the State of Illinois, I'm all in on that proposal. But in the meantime, we need to Representative Unes's Bill that actually allows companies to stay here in Illinois and keep employees in place. And if you want to... if you don't ... if we can't do comprehensive tax reform, then we're going to continue to piece meal out incentives just to keep people employed in Illinois. So, I... I would love it if Representative Franks wants to get together over the summer and work on a comprehensive tax reform project, that would be great. But in the meantime, we can't be handing out millions and millions of dollars to tax credit to big, large corporations who then can fire 2 thousand employees and still receive those and not allow smaller companies in our smaller... our smaller our communities to stay here as well. Thank you. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon."

Gordon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This particular industry is a very important industry to the central Illinois region. I'd like to commend the Sponsor for bringing forth this very important piece of legislation for the central Illinois region. One thing that I'd like to add is this, as we all know, not just in Illinois but across the country, we are having a very difficult time keeping

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

manufacturing jobs in this country. And what I'd like to say about this particular industry is that they have been very diligent about keeping wages at a very strong middle-class wage and they are also a very diverse employer. They're probably one of the most well paid, diverse employers that we have in the central Illinois region. And when you have many steel companies going offshore, I would like to commend, again, the Sponsor and this company for remaining committed to the central Illinois region and to this state. And I, please, kindly ask for your 'aye' vote on this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Unes to close."

Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And first, let me thank the Body and the very spirited debate and... and the good questions that... that we have had. And if I could just reiterate a couple of points that came up in debate. Representative Harris was absolutely right. When this was initiated originally in January of 2010, both the House and the Senate unanimously approved this legislation. And the minimum threshold at the time was 500 jobs. And so, I just want to reiterate to the Body that the number of jobs has ... is above what the minimum threshold originally was. So, this is, again, an exemption that we are just maintaining. It's not anything new. It's something that is going to be maintained for the State of Illinois. It's a.m. they are above the threshold, the minimum threshold, when it was first started and it will be no additional cost to the state. I want to repeat that. There will be no additional cost to the state to maintain this exemption. This... this

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Bill, again, did pass the Senate unanimously and came out of committee unanimously. I appreciate the debate and all of the comments. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1379 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 106 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1379, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1399, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1399, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill makes a simple but profound change to the civil... Code of Civil Procedure and eliminates the statute of limitations for victims of childhood sexual abuse. This Bill would apply only to actions filed after January 1, 2014, which are not currently time barred. Under the current statute of limitation for childhood sexual abuse, you have 20 years to bring an action or 20 years from the time... or from the time the victim discovers the abuse or resulting injury. The reality is that it is difficult to determine when a victim may have discovered abuse and injury. Therefore, this Bill gives people impacted by childhood sexual abuse every opportunity to seek redress for the injuries they have suffered. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, I think this is very similar to Bills that have come before the floor before and I guess more importantly, came before committee before that never made it out of committee. Is your Bill changed in any way with regards to what was introduced before?"

Williams: "I'm not sure what you're referring to? There have been several Bills introduced to eliminate and modify the statute of limitations for criminal actions. This pertains only to the Code of Civil Procedure and only to civil actions."

Reis: "Yes. You know, and all of us here, regardless of where we live or what Party affiliation we are, think this... this is a deplorable thing that could... that could happen and affect the minds of young children for... for years to come. But having previously served on a Judiciary Committee, it was always that, what are we opening up here? That if... if... if criminals' suit couldn't be brought against someone before the statute of limitations expired, what makes it... the case is so cold, it's so old, people grow up, emotions change, people move from different parts of the country. It was just that, would you be able to have a fair hearing, what if there was revenge involved? There's a whole host of things that was brought up every year in committee and I'm just wondering how your Bill addressed that and why those still wouldn't be concerns?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Williams: "Well, again, this is... it deals with civil legal actions. And I think the issue of childhood sexual abuse is unique, unfortunately, in that, many victims don't realize the full impact of what has happened to them until many years later. The current law provides for you to bring an action from 20 years after the age of majority, which the age of majority is 18 plus 20, that's 38. The average age for victims that were abused in childhood to fully realize and understand what they've been dealing with, unfortunately, is 42 years old. So, many of them miss that opportunity and miss that window. It's a unfortunately, crime all too common and eliminating the statute of limitations would just open up opportunities for victims to seek the redress that they deserve."

Reis: "I'm going to listen to the debate, Representative. I just know that we're going in a different direction here and opening up... we could be opening up a lot of things here. So, I have... continue to have my same concerns that I've had before that revenge, retribution, a whole host of things could creep in. And I just want to reiterate that we all think this is a deplorable action and you know, it shouldn't have happened, but I would hope that criminal prosecution could take place before the statute of limitations came about and that we would continue the way we are."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Again, this Bill simply addresses the civil statute of limitations, it does not impact the criminal statute in any way. And again, it is the plaintiff's burden to prove

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

their case. They must prove the abuse occurred by a preponderance of an evidence. This is fair, this is right and this is the time to remove the statute of limitations. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1399 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1399, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1410, Representative Welch. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1410, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch."

Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1410, this Bill is an initiative of the Illinois Association of Park Districts. The association believes that revenue which was not anticipated at the beginning of a fiscal year, such as a grant that comes in after the budget has been approved, is not included in that annual appropriation ordinance. If the park district then receives that revenue, it does not have authority to spend the funds until the next fiscal year. This Bill would allow a park district to adopt a supplemental ordinance approving the expenditure of such funds without having to proceed through the time consuming and expensive process of amending the original

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

appropriation ordinance. I'm asking the Body to approve Senate Bill 1410."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, walk me through the process of how this might happen. So, I... you get a grant or... or ... or you pass a budget and then there's a supplemental appropriation afterwards?"

Welch: "Yes."

Reboletti: "And where's the supplemental appropriation coming from? Where's the moneys coming from?"

Welch: "Well, you can receive a grant from any of our state agencies for instance. Let's say they receive an OSLAD grant and that was not in the budget that was approved. They can do a supplemental appropriation and spend that money right away rather than wait 'til the next fiscal year."

Reboletti: "How long would they have to wait to... if we leave... if we do nothing, how long would they have to wait to spend that grant?"

Welch: "They would have to wait 'til their next budget cycle."

Reboletti: "To the next fiscal year? Next budget meeting? Would it be two weeks or is it next year?"

Welch: "The next year."

Reboletti: "How many park districts have been affected by this?

I see the Rockford Park District is a proponent, I mean,
and I know the Park District Association is. Is this
something that is happening regularly where the money

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

hasn't... is basically sitting around and in an account and can't be used?"

Welch: "Representative, we don't have that information other than the Rockford Park District."

Reboletti: "And... and this would also be without any type of meeting. So, obviously, you could have a budget meeting, you passed a budget, three weeks later the OSLAD grant comes in and you're saying you wouldn't... would there be... there would not be any additional meeting by the park board to spend that money, right?"

Welch: "Actually, let... let me be clear. In order to approve a budget, you have to go through the public hearing process."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I'm... I'm having trouble hearing. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "I'm having trouble hearing the Sponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Members. Can we please bring the noise level down in the chamber? Having a tough time hearing the Sponsor speak. Thank you."

Welch: "In order for the original appropriation to be approved, it has to go through a public hearing first. After the public hearing, which is published in the newspaper, then it... it's approved at a regular meeting of the park board. This... this Bill here would take away the need for an additional public hearing. It still has to be put on an agenda, meet the requirements of the Open Meetings Act, be... the public has to be allowed to speak freely and public comment at that board meeting. And they can still address the supplemental appropriation."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Reboletti: "So, this is not like the money's going to come in, it'll be spent when nobody's paying any attention, nobody will know where it's going? The public and anybody else can come in to make comment to the board before they appropriate the funds?"

Welch: "Absolutely."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Welch: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, if you could go to your Bill on page 3, line 20, it starts by saying, the provisions of this Section regarding publication notice and public hearings shall not apply to the supplemental ordinance or to the budget document forming the basis of the ordinance. Can you explain that provision in regard to your previous testimony just a minute ago?"

Welch: "Yes, Representative. That's regarding the public hearing. That does not take away the... the requirements as they are spelled out in the Open Meetings Act. You still have to specifically put the item on an agenda, still have to publish it with at least 48 hours' notice and you still have to allow the public an opportunity to comment at that special or regular board meeting. But this does not... the park district would not be required to go through the public hearing process, that's completely different."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Sullivan: "Right now, the public hearing for a budget requires a month notice so it can be reviewed by the public prior to the adoption of the ordinance. Is that correct?"

Welch: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "Does this supplemental appropriation go through that month hearing process prior to the adoption of the supplemental appropriation?"

Welch: "It does not."

Sullivan: "So, you're going away from the normal process by which you would like to do an appropriation specifically for this item?"

Welch: "What we're asking for in this particular Bill is already done in school districts across the state, it's already done in municipalities across the state. We're... we're... we're trying to bring park districts level to other governmental entities across the state. And there's nothing wrong with this process."

Sullivan: "You know, my... my colleague here just brought up a very good point, that we don't give it a month notice when we do a supplemental appropriation as well. I have one last question, if you had additional... this would not relate to additional tax levies that potentially would come in above what you ask for before?"

Welch: "Has nothing to do with tax levies."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you for your answers."

Welch: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Welch to close."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is important legislation for the park districts across our state. I'm asking the Body to vote 'aye' on this issue."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1410 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1410, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bellock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bellock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."
- Bellock: "We have visiting with us today a group from Seton Montessori School in Clarendon Hills, Illinois, in my district. They're going to learn all about Springfield today. They've already been up to the Governor's Office and they're going all around Springfield. I'd like to ask everybody to welcome them today."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Sacia."
- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Sir."
- Sacia: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body, those of you, maybe with the exception of the freshmen, will remember retired Representative Ron Stephens. Ron was an infantry man in Vietnam, was critically wounded, and went

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

on to become a pharmacist and that's what he's doing to this day. But he has a passion for the Wounded Warriors Program. And last year this Body was very, very helpful in supporting him. I'm advocating on his behalf again this year. He's going to walk 125 miles June 22, 23 and 24. And if any of you are so inclined to make a contribution to Wounded Warriors, if you'd be good enough to give me a check, I'll see that he gets it. I will bring around a... a letter tomorrow and lay one on each of your desks just so you can see what... what the cause is all about. But it's for those men and women who have given so much for all of us. So, I appreciate that and on behalf of former Sergeant Stephens, former Representative Stephens, thank you for your support."

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

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

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

Hays: "Please welcome behind me, and please stand, we have a contingent of teachers from Champaign and Vermilion County here today. Please give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 1417, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1417, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1417 is an initiative of the fire districts and numerous fire departments around the state,

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

passed the Senate unanimously. And it... what it does is allows a fire district to be reimbursed for their cost in responding to a fire that causes damages that was lit illegally. It violated local ordinance or violated regulations preventing the burning that they did. And so, it just allows them to recoup the costs when they are violating the law or ordinances that are in place. We already have provisions for what that can be, but they've... they've set... someone starts a fire and causes damage. So, this would help keep your fire districts whole when they're responding to very un... you know, fires that there was no reason for them to even been set. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis and it indicates that the Countryside Fire Protection District is opposed? Could you please let us know if that's correct and if so, why?"

Moffitt: "We'll check on that. I didn't think that was the case but the… if we don't get that answered then I would pull it from the record until we can get an answer."

Franks: "I think Representative Sente just told me that it's not correct. So I'll check with staff and we'll get back to you in a moment. I don't want you to have to take it out of the record."

Moffitt: "Okay."

Franks: "Yet, there may be other questions."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Moffitt: "But I certainly would want to get an answer."

Franks: "Let me just check with staff."

Moffitt: "I would also like to point out that at first, when the Bill was first introduced, it had some language in it that Farm Bureau raised a question. That's been addressed and so Farm Bureau, I think they're listed as neutral now. They definitely are not opposed. So, that they..."

Franks: "Representative, I... I just talked to the staffer and he indicated that there was a form filled out, but no one came to committee and nor have they responded to any questions. So, I think it may be... may have been a mistake."

Moffitt: "Okay. Thank you."

Franks: "All right. So... so, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did want to answer Representative Franks' question. Countryside is in my district. I just talked to the chief and he said he checked the wrong box. So, all the fire protection districts are unanimous behind this. It passed out of the Senate unanimously and I wholly support this measure."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt to close."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote.

And what this simply does is allow your fire department to
be reimbursed for costs by a fire that was started against
local policy. And it was... was restricted and it shouldn't
have ever been started. Appreciate a 'yes' vote. Thank
you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1417 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative s... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1417, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1430, Representative Cabello. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1430, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Cabello."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1430 provides that the county board of a county may borrow money from county purposes from one fund to the other to use in their fund as long as it is repaid within the current fiscal year. This also provides that the county boards are going to be able to have a revolving loan fund. We give this opportunity to the municipalities and we're just trying to add this to the counties. And it will actually help taxpayers save some money. Respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote and I'll take any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1430 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? Representative Lang, Mitchell, Unes, Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 88 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1430, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

declared passed. Senate Bill 1475, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1475, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1475 amends the Water Reclamation Act to be consistent with Federal Law, adds requirements for persons employed with the water reclamation contracts to include not only citizens but U.S. nationals, aliens, lawfully admitted as permanent residents and individuals who have not... who have been granted asylum. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm looking at my... the executive summary of my analysis and it says, this Bill will allow the Metropolitan Water and Reclamation Districts to employ certain individuals who are not citizens of the United States. Is this common?"

Acevedo: "No, that's ... that's not true."

Dunkin: "So, the analysis in incorrect?"

Acevedo: "It says it include citizens, with U.S. national, aliens lawfully admitted as permanent residents. And individuals who have been granted asylum."

Dunkin: "So, if that's the case, why would we need this legislation if they're admitted... if they're an alien

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

lawfully admitted for permanent residence or if they've been granted asylums here in this country?"

Acevedo: "We're just duplicating what they have under Federal Law, Representative."

Dunkin: "Is this necessary, if that's the case? Hello?"

Acevedo: "Basically, it's just clarification to make sure that the individuals that are employed have to be here legally."

Dunkin: "But the only... isn't that the case already?"

Acevedo: "No, it's not."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, I just want some clarification here. So, right now, the Water Reclamation District can hire non-U.S. citizens?"

Acevedo: "They could hire somebody who makes it clear that they're intentions are to stay in the United States and become a citizen."

Dunkin: "If... so, how... how do they verify that... verify intentions?"

Acevedo: "Well, the... that's exactly why we need this Bill, Representative."

Dunkin: "I... I'm still scratching my head. Maybe I'm not articulating it well enough. If I am a... if I am a U.S. citizen... if I'm not a U.S. citizen, the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District will allow me to work for them or not work for them?"

Acevedo: "Under... under current law, if your intentions are to become a U.S. citizen, you are allowed to work there."

Dunkin: "So, how do you... again, clarify me. How do you... how do you define intentions?"

Acevedo: "It's not clear. This is..."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Dunkin: "When I play baseball, I intend to hit a homerun."

Acevedo: "And what do you do, strikeout?"

Dunkin: "Sometimes. So, help me understand the intention of this... this Bill?"

Acevedo: "We're just... we're just..."

Dunkin: "Oh. Oh, I see. Okay. Well, I've just been informed that... Thanks for the clarification."

Acevedo: "I was just trying to tell you. This way you can stop scratching your head, Representative."

Dunkin: "Well, thank God for a good legal counsel. Thanks for the clarification, Representative... What's your name, Representative... Heather Wier? Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill provides that persons employed by the sanitary district must be a United States citizen, a national of the United States, an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence or an individual who has been granted asylum. What a great idea. Maybe this is a trend that we can apply to all state programs? Let's vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo to close."

Acevedo: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1475 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? Members, please record yourselves. Representative Cassidy, Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 109 voting 'yes', 4

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1475, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAuliffe, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McAuliffe: "Point of personal privilege."

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

McAuliffe: "I'd like the whole chamber to welcome the great mayor of the Village of Rosemont, Brad Stephens, he's standing up behind us. He also supplied food, which is still in the back. So, welcome to Springfield and great to see you here again, Brad. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to the Capitol. Senate Bill 1479, Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Representative, you have a Floor Amendment. Would you like to move this back to Second and move the Amendment?"

Drury: "I would like to move it back to Second. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please move Senate Bill 1479 back to the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill for a second time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1479, the Bill was read for a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Drury."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."

Drury: "Floor Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment to Senate Bill 1479, which is a Bill introduced by Senator Morrison after the tragic death of her 10-year-old nephew in a boating accident. This merely clarifies some language that DNR and the Secretary of State have requested to make sure

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- that the Amendment doesn't conflict with other provisions of the law. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1479. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1493, Representative Sullivan. Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1499, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1499, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Kelly Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1499 would allow the Forest Preserve District of Cook County to acquire land in fee simple or by easement. Currently, there is no language in the Forest Preserve Act regarding land acquisition by easement for the Forest Preserve District of Cook County, although that is granted to all other forest preserve districts in the state. I know of no opposition. It's an initiative of the Cook County Forest Preserve District. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1499 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

1499, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1550, Representative Sandack. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1568, Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1585, Representative Gabel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1598, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1598, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1598 is an initiative of the Illinois Racial and Ethnic Impact Research Task Force. What the Bill simply does is improves the collection of race and ethnicity during the point of arrest or at any involvement with the criminal system. I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1598... or the passage."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, it's a little loud in the chamber, so I... I... I couldn't hear your explanation. If you could briefly... I don't..."

Ford: "I'll do it again."

Reboletti: "I saw this is committee, but if you don't, might?"

Ford: "I'll do it again."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me, Representative. Members, will you please bring the noise level down in the chamber and take

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

all conversations to the rear. We're having a tough time hearing the Sponsor. Thank you. Representative Ford."

Ford: "Senate Bill 1598... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1598 is an initiative from the Illinois Racial and Ethnic Impact Research Task Force that we had. And the goal of the Bill is to improve the collection of race and ethnicity data with regard to people who are arrested and involved in criminal... in the criminal system. That's all the Bill does."

Reboletti: "And how does that depart from what we do now? How...
how does this change, if it becomes law?"

Ford: "Well, right now, there is no indication for... it would require that a Hispanic or Latino field be included in the list of race categories used to... by the law enforcement and the Department of Corrections and the Department of Juvenile Justice. So, it really adds the Latino field."

Reboletti: "It... and this would be through self-identification?

Is there a... a list of questions that law enforcement would ask..."

Ford: "Well, the goal would be..."

Reboletti: "...a suspect?"

Ford: "Yeah, the goal would be for the law enforcement to deduce the information. But they... it's self-reporting and if they can't get the information from the person that's in front of them, then it'd be their job to make the best judgment."

Reboletti: "So, there... there still would be some subjectivity, too, if a Latino might be classified as Caucasian. There still... that... that happens now, but you're saying that they...

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

law enforcement would do their best to try to identify the race of the individual and if not, then make their best quess? That's..."

Ford: "That's right."

Reboletti: "Is this going to change our uniform traffic citations? So, will there be a checkmark on our... on the traffic tickets? Or is this only for, like, police reports and..."

Ford: "Police reports."

Reboletti: "... for booking information?"

Ford: "Booking, yes."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Ford: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "I just ask for a favorable vote for Senate Bill 1598.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1598 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1598, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1599, Representative Drury. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1599, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1599 amends the Children and Family Services Act as well as the Child Care

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Act to expressly allow for criminal background checks of DCFS employees and applicants as well as background checks for non-licensed service providers and their volunteers. An audit that was conducted by the FBI found that DCFS was already doing this but disseminating the information in a way they weren't allowed to. This law clarifies it and allows us to do the criminal background checks and actually use them. Passed out of Judiciary unanimously. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1599 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', O voting 'no' and O voting 'present', Senate Bill 1599, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1606, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1606, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1606 is a simple cleanup on the Condominium Property Act to clarify some confusion in the language about the number... the appropriate number of votes from unit owners to settle disputes. The Bill does not change the substantive nature of the Act nor does it disturb any mortgagee rights related to amending the condominium instruments. It is... I know of no opposition. It passed the

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Senate unanimously and is just a helpful tool to condominium associations. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1606 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1606, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1609, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1609, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1609 is a follow up to last year's Social Work Safety Act. During the course of debate on the Bill, we... we discovered that we had inadvertently neglected to cover many folks who... who act in the capacity of state employees, social workers, and put themselves into... into dangerous situations but they actually work under contract. So this Bill simply takes care of that omission and adds the people who... who work on behalf of our state in social work contract capacities to that... those protections. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1609 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

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1609, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1640, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1640, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply creates a Multiple Sclerosis Task Force in the Illinois Department of Public Health. We've passed the nearly identical Bill already out of this chamber. This is actually the version we will move forward, makes a few quick fixes at the request of the Department of Public Health. It's really designed to make some inroads into what we need to do for people afflicted with this disease and other people with disabilities. And it will be disbanded in about three years when a report is issued. So, I urge an 'aye' vote. And I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1640 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1640, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1657, Representative Zalewski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1657 cures a couple of different deficiencies within the Property Tax Code. Namely, dealing with an instance of a border review that has a partisanship requirement, ensuring that them them the parties the spirit of them of the statute is reinforced. It also deals with instances to ensure that during the procedure of property tax appeals that them the client, for lack of a better word, the taxpayer, is properly represented and that attorneys aren't going out and and appealing on behalf of a of a taxpayer without them knowing about it and some other procedural requirements. I'd... I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1657 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 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1657, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1670, Representative Brauer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1670, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that amends the Illinois Transparency

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

and Accountability Portal. It just facilitates the collection of data on the state's annual workforce, their characteristics of the workforce, the compensation, the employee mobility. I'll answer all questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1670 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 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1670, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1688, Representative Jakobsson. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1688 removes an antiquated, problematic provision with the Public Community College Act. And that Act required a portion of a community college district base operating grant to be allocated based on the gross non-residential square footage. This simply this changes it, and I shouldn't say simply, because it's really important state appropriations currently assigned to those... to be allocated on the basis of enrolled credit hours. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1688 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? Mr.

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1688, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1667, Representative Berrios. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1704, Representative Roth. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1704, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Roth."

Roth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1704 amends the Environmental Protection Act to provide that if a permittee has submitted a timely and completed application for renewal of an air permit, all of the terms and conditions of the previously issued permit will remain in effect during the pending of review of the renewal application."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1704 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 Reboletti. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1704, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1735, Representative Scherer. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1735, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today, I'm presenting Senate Bill 1735. The Bill is intended to help keep our roads safe

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

and crack down on reckless drivers who have clearly shown that they will not follow the law. Under this Bill, a driver who causes serious injury or death of another person while driving on a suspended or revoked license could be charged with a Class 4 felony. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Representative... Representative Scherer, I just was looking on the board and I said you have some excellent cosponsors on this Bill. Excellent. So I request the Body to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, I mean... I'm sorry. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1735 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? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1735, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1737, Representative Brown. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1737 amends the Property Tax Code, provides that if a taxpayer owes an arrearage, those taxes can be... that tax bill can be sent out before October 1 by the county assessor. Happy to take any questions. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Franks."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "So, Representative... where are you?"

Brown: "Over here."

Franks: "There you are, thank you. Thanks. Thank you. Next to that excellent cosponsor for the last Bill, I see."

Brown: "Thank you."

Franks: "What you're saying is if the... if there's an administrative error, meaning that the government somehow screwed up, that we will allow folks to be able to pay the arrearages without penalty, correct?"

Brown: "That's correct."

Franks: "Why would we limit it to a certain date, to October 1?

And the reason I say that is, if it's the government's error, why should we be held liable for their error to an arbitrary date?"

Brown: "This would allow the county assessor to send out the bill by October 1. It... under current statute, they have... they would have to wait until the following tax year to re-mail these... these tax statements. Therefore, it would allow our local taxing bodies to receive the money... money this year rather than having to wait another full calendar year. This actually comes... it stems from Edgar County where we had this exact situation pop up. The taxpayers owe a certain amount of money, the body, unfortunately, made a mistake and sent out the previous year's tax statement to all residents rather than this year's tax statement. And... and they need to make up for that."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Franks: "There... would there be a waiver of any penalties owed by the taxpayer for the mistake of the government?"

Brown: "You know the same amount would be charged, there would be no tacked on additional fees though."

Franks: "Yeah. 'Cause what I'm concerned about is if you're a day late for the proper amount, they charge you an interest fee. As long as... I want to make sure that the folks who didn't do anything wrong are not getting charged interest because of the government's mistake."

Brown: "I think that's a fair... fair statement and a fair assessment, Representative. They would not be. And furthermore, this tax bill says they would have a minimum of 30 days to get the money together to pay this... this fee, of course, that... that they do owe."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you. I think it makes sense and I appreciate you bringing this forward."

Brown: "Absolutely. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, my understanding, though, is you still... the county still has the option to go and use the previous way they did it. So, they may do the 30 days and they may also continue the practice that they have today?"

Brown: "That's correct. This, by no means, is a mandate on the county."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, they... they have the choice one way or the other. This is not a mandate and it's just trying to

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

simplify an error that happened in a very remote, simplified case in your jurisdiction?"

Brown: "That's correct. Furthermore, there are no opponents to this Bill."

Sullivan: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1737 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 113 voting 'yes', O voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1737, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 7... Senate Bill 1693, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1693, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1693 amends Illinois Identification Card Act and the Illinois Vehicle Code allowing peace officers to provide their work address instead of their home address when applying for an Illinois identification card, driver's license or instruction permit. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Franks: "Representative, I appreciate you bringing this Bill forward. We had a discussion in committee and I think there was a couple of issues that I wanted to make sure that were clarified. Number one, one of the issues that came up in committee was the issue of voting, for early voting, primarily when you have to show your information. Has there been something done here in the Bill to make sure that these folks who are using a business address instead of a home address will be able to still early vote?"

Acevedo: "Well, I would... I would think, Representative, that if they have a voting card and they have a utility bill that should be enough identification to show where they live."

Franks: "'Cause I think we're going to need to educate the Election Boards on this as well. Because it..."

Acevedo: "I... I agree with you 100 percent."

Franks: "I want to make sure we do that. And the second issue is, were we able to define what peace officers were? 'Cause there were some..."

Acevedo: "I got this..."

Franks: "...there was some question... I think you might have had a list that you were putting together."

Acevedo: "Right. I... I got that for you right now. A peace officer means any person who by virtue of his office or public employment is vested by law with the duty to maintain public order to make arrests for offenses whether their duty extends to all offenses or is limited to specific offenses. Any person, who by statute, is granted and authorized to exercise powers similar to those

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

conferred upon any peace officer employed by a law enforcement agency of this state."

Franks: "Do you have a list of any of those... who those individuals might be?"

Acevedo: "Yeah. Right. There... there's really never been a list put together, Representative. Yes, the courts have ruled out, like, security guards and prison guards."

Franks: "Yeah. I just want to be clear for legislative intent..."

Acevedo: "Yes."

Franks: "...that those folks aren't included and we're... and we're getting the folks that you want to include?"

Acevedo: "Yes."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "Is... is... Representative, is the reason for the change for the safety of the officer? Is that where we're going with this?"

Acevedo: "Yes. That... that's exactly what it's about."

Bost: "Okay. That... that was all I would need to confirm. Thank you."

Acevedo: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo to close."

Acevedo: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is very clear that sometimes an individual will find out where the police officer or law enforcement officer lives and try to... try to take revenge on that individual, so this is just for safety purposes. I'm sure the individual is not going to walk into

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

a police department or any other law enforcement facility to take an act of revenge. So, this is just for exactly as Representative Bost said, for the safety of the police officers. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1693 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1693, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1757, Representative Walsh. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1757, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1757 is an initiative of the Secretary of State's Office. This Bill implements federal rules regarding commercial learner permits and testing standards. And all states are required to come into compliance no later than July 8 of 2014 or face the loss of federal highway moneys. I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1757 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 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1757, having received the

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1686, Representative Gordon. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1686, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1686 simply puts a Gordon: cap of a 9-month period of time during which a parent, in an effort to avoiding being found unfit as defined in the Adoption Act, can make reasonable efforts. Essentially, what this Bill is doing is looking to make a simple change to the Adoption Reform Act. In laymen's terms, the ... upon adjudication you have 9 months to the day from which a parent can be found unfit. If measures have not been set forth before that date, then an individual would have to make... to wait an additional 9 months which creates a lag time about 18 months. There is no opponent to this legislation. I know that our screens reads that the Chicago Legal Advocacy of Incarcerated Mothers who is also called CLAIM and Chicago Coalition for the Homeless is opposition to the Bill, but they are not in opposition to this Bill. We worked together on this particular piece of legislation and this Bill came out of the Adoption Reform Committee unanimously. I am open for any and all questions.

I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Flowers: "Representative, just as a point of clarification, because it seemed like I've seen this Bill before, you're giving the parent 9 months in order to avoid being found unfit?"

Gordon: "Well, the... the Adoption Act already allows a 9-month period of time before any sort of procedures could take place beyond that time."

Flowers: "And so, what exactly is your Bill doing?"

Gordon: "So, the Bill... what the Bill would do is the Bill would not take any time away from a parent for the procedure to begin for them being found unfit. Based on the Adoption Reform Act, one... a State's Attorney's Office would have to wait 9 months, nothing about that changes. But what this Bill simply does, it allows any 9-month period of time to be used. So, let's say, for example, if... if... if motions don't take place at that ninth month, an additional 9 months has to lapse before any measures could be taken. What this Bill would do is this Bill would then allow procedures to take place maybe at the twelfth month or the fifteenth month. There would be no unnecessary lag in time. But what this Bill doesn't do is... is it doesn't take anything away from a parent. It doesn't take any of that time away."

Flowers: "According to the analysis, it says the legislation is intended to shorten the time line for making a finding of unfitness and supporters argue that this will cure the chronic delays in the court cases. It would address the delays in the court cases. But what I'm trying to figure out is it says a parent must make reasonable progress

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

toward the return of her child. And if this is to be done in a time certain and if the purpose of this Bill is to unclog the court, what process is in place to guarantee that that parent is getting the services in which the court has required he or she to get..."

Gordon: "Sure."

Flowers: "...in order to get their children back."

"Certainly. I think it's... I'm going to answer that in Gordon: two... in two parts. Yes, the legislation does say that and essentially, that is exactly what it does. Based on the way that the law is interpreted currently, one must wait 18 months before any sort of actions could be taken place because if, say, a State's Attorney's Office did not move forward on the day of that ninth month... the ninth month to the date after adjudication, then one would have to wait an additional 9 months. Thereby, displacing a child and not allowing them to seek some level of permanency before that eighteenth month. As it relates to the services, agencies ... and that's one of the issues that I'm going to be working on with CLAIM and some of the other organizations that were opponents... right now, we called a number of agencies around the state, central Illinois, Chicago, downstate Illinois, and what happens, anytime... we ... we know with many of the state budget cuts there are parents that, you know, may need to seek addiction services and may need to get a bed and we all know that there are delays on beds. But as long as... and there's... that is why we use reasonable progress, that language is used specifically because of that. If ... if a sick parent makes an... any sort of attempt, the... the idea

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

would be to always give that parent the opportunity. So as long as the attempt is being made to seek some sort of services, reasonable progress would be made and that would be documented."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, with all due respect, understand what your intentions are, but I don't see that language and what you're talking about in the Bill. And you know with the cuts that we've had in this state to these different agencies, so there are fewer agencies now than there has ever been. And so, this to me is another way and means whereas it that mother will not be able to get her child back in a time certain because the court is not mandating that she be put in front of the line because there are so few, as you stated yourself, there are so few organizations out there that can offer these services at a time certain. So, with all due respect, I will be voting 'no' on your Bill. Once, again, this... this is unfair to the children. It's unfair to the parents. And the only people that's going to benefit this is the courts and other people who have a... a conflict of interest, quite frankly, in this legislation. So, respectfully, I will be voting 'no'."

Gordon: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. This leg... this legislation is in... and... and I completely respect your concerns about this particular piece of legislation. And I will say and I will tell you quite honestly that upon talking about this legislation with our local state's attorney as well as DCFS, I had a bit of trepidation about this Bill instinctively as well. And as we have continued to go through the Adoption Reform Act and other pieces of

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

it relates to this issue, I became legislation as comfortable in a sense that there is no time that is ever going to be taken away from a mother as it relates to when she's found unfit. Because upon the ninth... upon the day in which that ninth month occurs after adjudication, if a State's Attorney's Office wanted to work to then begin to find that mother unfit, that day they could do ... they still can do that. That doesn't change. So, essentially, right now, a parent has 9 months. That time... that time frame does not change. The only thing that we're looking to change is when 9 months can be counted. So, 9 months would never be... would never be counted before adjudication. What this does is it takes an arbitrary date off the books that probably wasn't intended anyways, so that if there is a need, a child can then begin to find some level of permanency so that they can begin to try to live a happy and healthy life. But the intent is always to keep a child with their... with their biological family."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to applaud Representative Gordon-Booth for bringing this issue to the Adoption Reform Committee. Like many pieces of legislation, this is a very complex nuance in the law that she's trying to rectify to address some of the issues that the previous speaker had. This is really an arbitrary date that if something doesn't happen on an exact date prevents the birth family and the biological family from actually having any kind of reunification because of lack of opportunity. This takes the arbitrary nature of that, it

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

removes it to make it fit with real time and real life here in the State of Illinois. I applaud her for taking this issue on and I strongly urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "I yield my time to Representative Flowers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

"Thank you, Representative Davis. I just want to bring to everyone's attention who the opponents of this Bill is. is the Chicago Legal Advocacy for opponents Incarcerated Mother, CLAIMS, the Chicago Coalition for the Homeless, the Family Defense Center. These are the people who are in opposition to this Bill. We all know that DCFS budget has been cut. We all know that more children are being harmed the longer they stay in the system. We all know because of the budget cuts the services that the state is required to give to the parents is not being given. So, the ultimate person and people whom we are going to continue to harm will be the children. Once again, I respectfully ask for a 'no' vote because this Bill is not in the best interest of the state. This Bill is not in the best interest of the child. If it was, these opponents would not be in opposition to this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gordon to close."

Gordon: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the previous speaker's comments. I stated before that the opponents on this legislation are no longer opponents. I'm working with those individuals. This particular woman, her name happens to be Gail Smith, she represents each of these agencies.

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

She and I are working together on this Bill. She understands that this is an issue. And she and I are also going to work on additional legislation because we both care about this issue very much. I also agree with the previous speaker in that the longer you keep a child in the system with no level of permanency, it is a problem, which is exactly why we're bringing this Bill forward. Harming children is the absolute last thing that any of us in this... in this Body want to do. And I think that this Bill and other pieces of legislation that we can work on throughout this budget process, we can do all that we can to help make sure the children in the State of Illinois have an opportunity to live happy, healthy lives. I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1686 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 112 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1686, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sosnowski, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask my fellow Members of the General Assembly... we have a very special guest from the northern part of the state, South Beloit. We've got the eighth-grade class of Willowbrook Middle School that are up in the balcony to my left. If you could all join me in a round of applause."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 1792, Representative Schmitz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1792, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Schmitz."
- Schmitz: "Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 90... 1792 is identical to a House Bill that we passed out here earlier. It simply extends the deadline on which the architectural students that take seven exams to become an architect, extends the deadline to January 1 of 2016. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1792 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1792, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1817, Representative Tracy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1824, Representative Sosnowski. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1824, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sosnowski."
- Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Veterans' Affairs. A year or two ago, a special commission was formulated in order to look at the condition of veterans' memorials throughout the

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

state that have been erected in... in different ways. And the commission was charged with looking at different ways or methods by which to ensure that these memorial, to those veterans who have served us, end up lasting through time. Essentially, this legislation comes from the recommendation of that committee and this will allow for future memorials that are created to have, essentially, funds set aside for the preservation and upkeep and maintenance of these particular things. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1824 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 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1824, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1826, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1826, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a clarification for using e-signatures. It's an initiative of the City of Chicago. Like I said, it's just a clarification to... to put what can and what cannot be used."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1826 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

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 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1826, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1790, Representative Golar. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1404, Representative Evans. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1404, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 1404 makes a small change. It takes the scavenger sale eligibility for a property that is delinquent and the taxes from 2 years to 3 years. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Franks: "Representative, what's the genesis of this Bill?"

Evans: "Well, Sir, when property taxes aren't paid for a year, they're eligible for the annual tax sale. Beyond 2 years, they're eligible for the scavenger tax sale. And what I'm saying in this Bill is that we want to make it 3 years to kind of clean up a few issues that come with these... with the scavenger tax sale. Generally, no one picks up the property after 2 years anyway and in a lot of cases, the taxes are sold in the next tax sale which... because they happen so close together... if we make it that it's 3 years,

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- it'll give a little bit more time to clean up some issues that they've had with selling these properties."
- Franks: "How would it work effectively? So, let's assume someone did not... let's... let's start this year because our taxes are 1 year in arrears. So, right now, we're paying taxes for 2012. So, let's assume someone does not pay their 2012 taxes in, you know, June of 2013, then they don't pay again next year in June of 2014 for the 2013 taxes. Are you saying then they have to go 1 more year before they're delinquent, before a sale can be scheduled?"
- Evans: "Well, I'm saying that for the scavenger sale, but they're going to be eligible for the... the annual sale after that first year of non-payment. Do you have an answer for that?"
- Franks: "Well, the… well, the annual sale is just an investor, typically, purchasing the interest rate for the taxes, as I understand it. And then the scavenger sale is if it hasn't… if they have not been redeemed for a couple of years, then the property would be sold to redeem those… the investor's money, basically."
- Evans: "Yeah. My understanding is that there's been a lot of issues with the… with the taxes being bought at subsequent sales after the first scavenger sale. An additional… an additional year would just help clean up some of those issues."
- Franks: "I'm just concerned... my only concern is I hate to add more costs to the homeowner."
- Evans: "Generally, once the property is in the scavenger sale, it's rare that it's redeemed anyway. So, generally, most of

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

these properties in a scavenger tax sale many of them have been in that particular sale for, you know, 10, 12 years at that point."

Franks: "Really?"

Evans: "Yes."

Franks: "'Cause I thought they were able... I thought you had to sell them. What I've seen... here's... here's what I'm concerned about. I don't care about the vacant lot that nobody pays taxes on; I don't care about that going to sale. What I'm worried about, and I had this happen yesterday in my district office, I had a lady call me and she owned her home outright but she couldn't pay her property taxes and she was worried that she was going to lose her house. And I just want to make sure that we don't increase costs for someone like my constituent, that lady, who owned her house outright but just couldn't afford her taxes. By extending the time frame, would this be more costly? I just... that's my only concern."

Evans: "No, it was my understanding that it won't."

Franks: "Okay. All right. I'll study more on it, but thank you."

Evans: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, I... I kind of want to follow up on the previous speaker. By extending this out 1 year, are you trying to, in essence, give the homeowner more time to regain the underlying taxes before it could go to scavenger

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

sale? 'Cause it goes to scavenger sale on the date, right now, 2 years, so it's on the date of publication. Is... is that the intent here or..."

Evans: "No, I think the intent of... my understanding, the intent was to clear up property being purchased in that subsequent year. So, you have, for example, if you don't pay it in 2001 and 2002, the tax sale will be in 2003. And then... it's... it's a great example in the analysis. And in 2005, someone could purchase previous years 'cause, generally, when a property is on a scavenger tax list, it's... hasn't just been 2 years or it's not as simple as someone just lost their property. Generally, it's... it's been passed over and that first annual tax sale, most of the good properties go on that annual tax sale. This is a piece of property that's been on the list for a few years. It's rare that a property makes a scavenger tax list if it's a great piece of property or if it's just been lost by a homeowner."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you for your explanation."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, why is it only for the counties with inhabitants over 3 million?"

Evans: "If you look closely, it says additional tax recorders all over, whether it's Sangamon County or any other county, they have the option to do it. It's my understanding that some do. But they have the option."

Reboletti: "Every other county has the same option or just a few other counties?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Evans: "If it's less than 3 million... I think Chicago is the only one that's over 3 million. If it's less than 3 million, then you have an option to do that."

Reboletti: "But we're making this mandatory for Cook County?"

Evans: "Yes, it is looking in the Bill."

Reboletti: "Why would we make it mandatory then? If everybody else is optional, why wouldn't we just leave Cook County as optional?"

Evans: "Well, just the... the sheer number of properties in Cook County, but it's always been. I'm not changing that part of the law, just extending it an additional year."

Reboletti: "How many properties would this impact in Cook? Are... do you know?"

Evans: "I don't have an exact number. It's in the thousands, a lot of properties. I've seen a list before. It's generally thousands of pieces of properties on these had lists also."

Reboletti: "And... and how many properties had... would this actually apply to? How many of these scavenger sales are actually in arrears, do you know?"

Evans: "A very small percentage."

Reboletti: "And what does the extra year do for them?"

Evans: "With the extra year, as I explained earlier, that that extra year prevents individuals from... it's the hope that it would prevent individuals from purchasing the same piece of property, regarding that some of the old taxes. And also, it just gives an additional year to clear up issues that will come if... if the property is purchased in 2003. Potentially, that same... old taxes from that same piece of property could be purchased in 2 years. So, it kind of

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

gives more for time of... to redeem and it for some clarity purposes, kind of cleans up the process."

Reboletti: "Does this apply to all, excuse me, all properties or just certain properties?"

Evans: "Just properties... all those properties that would be on the scavenger sale."

Reboletti: "So, if I..."

Evans: "If a county has a scavenger sale."

Reboletti: "Right. So, if I'm... if I'm in arrears on my property taxes, would this apply?"

Evans: "Could you repeat the question, I'm sorry?"

Reboletti: "If... if I'm in arrears in my... on my property taxes, over 2 years, would this be applicable?"

Evans: "If you're in arrears 2 years and you got through the annual tax sale of your... your tax was not purchased at an annual tax sale, it will go to this scavenger tax sale. Normally, that's what the law says. I'm only extending it 3 years, an additional year. So, whatever is the law now, which is you will go to a scavenger tax sale if that's applicable in your county."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members. First of all, there's always been a date certain for scavenger sales in Cook County. I don't know why. I do know that it used to be 10 years, then it was 5 years, today it is 2 years. A recent Circuit Court decision, however, said that at the 2-year period, the buyer of taxes at a scavenger sale couldn't merge the old taxes that were due. So, 2 years later, which

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

is usually a lot shorter a period of time than when the person who bought the taxes at the scavenger sale is actually awarded the deed. Two years later, somebody else buys the other taxes and now the person to get the deed is going to have to deal with the fact that the old taxes are no longer merged. So, you're going to discourage people from participating in scavenger sales. These are not regular delinquency sales. These are properties that have been pretty much abandoned. There is certainly a redemption period if an owner wants to come forward and redeem, that is possible under the law, and there is plenty of time available to do that. But the difficulty is that under this court ruling, and given the timetable, there'd be very little reason to want to participate in a scavenger sale. Since the point for the county is to get rid of abandoned and ill-kept properties, it makes sense to make sure that haven't reversed the incentives for people who participate in the scavenger sale. And if we move to a 3year timetable, I think we create the right incentive. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "So, Representative, as we discussed in committee, all we're doing is changing the time period from 2 years to 3 years. Is that correct?"

Evans: "The only thing that's been struck out in the Bill, you can see the text, from 2 to 3 years. That's it, Sir. Yes."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Harris, D.: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Evans to close."

Evans: "I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1404 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 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1404, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Burke, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

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

Burke, D.: "I'd like to take a moment to introduce a group of...

fine young people from my district attending the UNO
Charter Schools. They're up in the gallery on our left.

Please give them a warm, Springfield welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Senate Bill 1216, Representative Acevedo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1216, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Acevedo."

Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1216 adds that the Fraternal Order of Police license plate is subject to appropriations by the General Assembly and distribution... distribution by the Secretary of State. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1216 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? Representative Gabel, Franks. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 111 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1216, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1226?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1226 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Can you move that to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill, please?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1226, a Bill for an Act concerning health. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative D'Amico, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment 1 is just technical in nature. I wish we adopt it."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1. And on that, we have a question from Representative Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor of the technical Amendment yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, what does that mean?"

D'Amico: "All the Amendment does is give the Bill a name."

Reboletti: "Oh, thank you."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1226. All in favor say 'aye'; all 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 Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."
- Bellock: "I just wanted to make an announcement that the people in Capital Capers, if they could come at 5:00 tonight, and those that are just enjoying the show, if they would come at 6:00. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you. On the Order of House Bills on Third Reading, we have House Bill 2991. Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2991, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2991 creates the Lion Meat Act, provides that them that it is unlawful for any person to slaughter a lion for any possession or personal possession to breed, to import or export from the State of Illinois, buy or sell lion for the purpose of slaughtering, provides that it is unlawful for commercializing lion meat. The authorization of the Department of Agriculture to adopt and enforce any rules necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act, provides that wherever violations or any provision of the Act shall

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. Mr. Speaker, I won't... I don't want to take no... no answers or no questions, if you don't mind, please."
- Speaker Turner: "Members, there are many people wishing to speak. So, please, you know, keep that in mind.

  Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... just a few questions of the Sponsor, if he'll yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- Franks: "Excellent. Representative, what does lion meat taste like?"
- Arroyo: "Well, Franks, I'm glad... I'm glad you asked that question, but I think there's only one Legislator that's tried lion meat. I think Mike Tryon was the only one that ate... has eaten it. Is Mike Tryon over there? So, see he left... he... I think he got a little sick when he ate the lion meat, so that's why he's not here today."
- Franks: "I'm just... I'm just wondering if it tastes like condor or a bald eagle or... or anything like that. I'm just... I'm just trying to figure out the texture and the taste."
- Arroyo: "I haven't... I haven't had the privilege to do that. But I think that at this time and age we shouldn't be consuming lion meat or any kind of exotic... exotic pet. You know, where are we going to stop? Are we going to start eating cat and dog in Illinois?"
- Franks: "Well... well, actually many cultures do. I was in Vietnam recently..."
- Arroyo: "Could you name... could you name a couple, Jack?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Franks: "Well, I'm just thinking, I was in Vietnam and you had a choice of dogs, whether you wanted to have them for pets or for meat. So, some cultures actually do eat more exotic animals than we have. And I know in Illinois, until recently, we were exporting horse meat to Belgium. There was a... a plant in Belgium. So, I... I just... I was wondering, is this a big problem? Are there a lot of folks... since only Mr. Tryon had... had tried the lion, is there a lot of folks that are munching on... on lion meat?"

Arroyo: "Well, there... there was one... one business at Homer Glen was eating it or selling it and making money out of it. So, they got into a problem with that and that's what the reason... one of the reasons. We're also... I've been talking to U.S. Fish and Wildlife in D.C. They did a study for 3 months and now they said that there's enough evidence to try... to try to put them in the Endangered Species list. So now, they're doing the year... the year's finding to see... they... they say there's enough evidence to put them on the Endangered Species list."

Franks: "Do we know what the lion population is in Illinois?"

Arroyo: "I'll have to get back to you on that. But I... I have a question for you if you don't mind, Jack?"

Franks: "Sure, of course."

Arroyo: "You said that you went to Vietnam and... and you ate dog?"

Franks: "No, I didn't... I didn't part... and I don't think I did,
I may have. But I... I don't think I did."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Arroyo: "Because I wanted to talk about maybe that's the reason why you... you vote the way you vote. Probably the little dog."

Franks: "Yeah, my parents question... well, my dad questions my lineage sometimes too. So, as you're well aware."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Jack."

Franks: "All right. Thank you. I'm going to listen to this debate, Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "I think you're the last speaker, Jack."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Farnham."

Farnham: "Representative Arroyo, I... I notice there's a certain similarity, your name, there's some relationship there. Is this the reason you're bringing this Bill forward?"

Arroyo: "I think because of the consumption and we weren't trying to save the lion. You know, there's a lot of people that like animals and don't want to see people consume this lion meat. But as far as my name, no I'm not going to change my name and put all the r's or roll the r's like you mentioned. I think that you started bringing that up, Keith, and I think that that sounds good but in reality, no, I think I'm going to keep it with just two r's."

Farnham: "So, it's not a self-preservation Bill?"

Arroyo: "No, no. But probably after today, maybe I might consider it."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Reis: "I know there's a lot of people poking fun at this and you've got your own little mascot there, but really, how many lions are produced in Illinois, raised?"

Arroyo: "Well, I believe that there is a company that... that raises them in Illinois. I don't have the name but..."

Reis: "And they slaughter them for... they raise them for zoos or they slaughter them?"

Arroyo: "They... they raise them... they raise them for zoos to mate with the zoos and they... they rent them out, I guess, to mate with... with the lioness and stuff like that. But the problem is they... that when the lion gets old and can't mate no more and can't produce or whatever you might well, what they want to do is they don't want to kill them and bury them; they want to sell them to consume to make whatever they make with it. Because... but the lion meat is, when you have lions cut up, it's all red and pink. So, you can't really tell what you're eating. They could sell that to anybody and you really probably won't know what you're eating."

Reis: "You know, Representative..."

Arroyo: "And... and Representative..."

Reis: "...we worked together on a lot of things and... and I've brought this Bill up a lot of times this spring when I'm back home when they're talking..."

Arroyo: "Well, I wish you would have told me this earlier."

Reis: "Yeah, you could have come down. To the Bill. I speak of this Bill because people are saying, when are you going to get your act together up there? When are you going to pass conceal carry? When are you going to take care of the

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

budget? When are you going to take care of the deficit and everything else that we have going on in this state? And I say, well, we are taking care of things. We're trying to ban lion meat. We're trying to ban shark fin. You know, we do all these silly things and people look at us and they're like, really? That's all you guys have to talk about up there. In all due respect to you, Representative, we got a... we're looking for a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. We got better things to do than this. And I know you've got a mascot there and... and you're... everybody makes fun of this, but someone needs to go dust off the trophy. This deserves everyone's 'no' vote. Let's move on to the things that really are important to the voters of Illinois."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Representative Arroyo, I'm familiar with the… with the store that you were talking about. They did get in trouble. One of the things that they got in trouble for was selling animals that were clearly on the Endangered Species and you know, other byproducts of… of those animals. And so, it was something that… that was extremely important. But do you have any information about not… there's been questions asked about the production of… of lions and all of that type of thing. I think the issue is more of trafficking in these exotic meats. Is that… is that the case?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Riley: "And by the way, just so you know, anything that consumes meat... any carnivore by its nature doesn't taste very good. So, you wanted to know about it. Actually, there's two people in this House who know something about that. To the Bill. Often, there are measures that we all might think are frivolous. For me, any Bill that's brought up by a Member is extremely important. All one needs to do is look at the proponents. I'm sure that the proponents of this piece of legislation would not deem it as being frivolous. All of the issues that we're dealing with that are deemed to be extremely important, well, we're going to get to them sooner or later. And so, to denigrate one's Bill, you wouldn't want anyone necessarily criticizing something that you thought was important to you. So, I am going to support this Bill, Representative Arroyo."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Hays: "Representative, about a month ago, I believe, you asked this Body for recommendations for a nickname of your mascot. Did you... did you land on a nickname?"

Arroyo: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear. I was getting..."

Hays: "Did you... about..."

Arroyo: "...interrupted here..."

Hays: "...a few weeks ago..."

Arroyo: "...with this trophy."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Hays: "...a few weeks ago, you asked the Body for a recommendation for a nickname of your mascot and I was wondering did you, in fact, land on a nickname?"

Arroyo: "Yes, yes. I think the majority, they wanted to name him, Tasty. I don't know why, I mean... So, I think Tasty won."

Hays: "No further questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cavaletto: "I believe in born free."

Arroyo: "Well, you know, the majority rules. If that's what you would like, well, I'll call him born free if you vote for the Bill."

Cavaletto: "I... I have... Representative, I... I do know a little bit about this because this... this man..."

Arroyo: "I need help. Can you help me out here?"

Cavaletto: "...this man has... is in my district who has sold these lions and who's put them to sleep. And he's only put the... he's only put to death about 6 to 7 lions. And the meat he uses and it's... he sells for about \$25 a pound. And the people in Chicago are buying this and eating it. So, it's... it's being served up in your... your city, and people are paying for it and they say it tastes very well. I've never tasted it. But it is USDA checked and he only does this and puts them down when the lions become bad, when they can't control them. And he uses these lions for the circuses to show to small kids and this around the State of Illinois. It's kind of part of a summertime deal. But when the lions

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

go bad, then he puts them down and then be butchers them and sells the meat. But this man is not concerned about you putting him out of business because the lions are expensive and he doesn't really raise lions to kill them, but he only does it when he can't control them anymore. So, but... but, you know, I... I think I have a good point here. And it's been serious with this Gentleman down in this... in my district for several years and it's been going on. So, just to enlighten you upon what's happening there. So, I really don't know if I can vote one way or another for your Bill, but there is some seriousness to it also. Thank you very much."

Arroyo: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bost: "You know, I'm... I'm going to try not to get... I know that you're... you're serious about this Bill. I... I... I hope that the general population votes against it or general..."

Arroyo: "Thanks a lot."

Bost: "...that... that I, you know, I... I would agree with you on many, many Bills but I see all kinds of problems with this. Now, I'm not going to claim that you're lying, but one concern I do have, where... where does this stop? I know this is one Bill dealing with this particular exotic meat. Some of them have camels, for instance. And I'm not drawing a pun here, but you know, it's like letting the camel's nose under the tent in the fact that there are many things that many people might consider exotic animals and/or animals

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

that maybe shouldn't be consumed because they don't like that particular... they think that that's a beautiful animal and many of them are. I shoot, and many do here in the State of Illinois, wild turkey. Many people love the way they look. I like the way they look and I like the way they taste. And the ... the reality is, is that if we start down this path, it would never stop. We have, in this case, an opportunity. People... or it's not being sold in mass quantities, but folks, this is not a good precedence. I believe that a 'no' vote is a right vote, and with all due respect for the Sponsor, I would love nothing more than to see his name on the... on the trophy for, you know, I... I... this one... probably the one Bill that has received more comments in my district about what, why, is this particular Bill. Respect the Sponsor tremendously. I think the choice for the mascot being Tasty is a perfect name. But I do believe that we... we need to be focusing on something else. I believe that this gets the ... should get as many 'no' votes as possible. Respect the Sponsor but not only because of the other issues we have to deal with but the danger that I can see with starting on a path of deciding, oh, this meat's in and this meat's out. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the lion king yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He will."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reboletti: "Representative, how many other states ban lion meat like this Bill does?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Arroyo: "Well, I don't know how many other states banned it.

But I know that in Florida they have a restaurant, they had
a special the other day on TV where Fusion... the restaurant
Fusion is selling tacos in Florida for \$35 a taco. So, we
want... we don't want those tacos to come here to Chicago to
sell and to consume tacos for \$35."

Reboletti: "So..."

Arroyo: "So, I just want to make sure that... that... that trend doesn't come to Illinois. But yeah, I know that there's other, but I don't have that right now."

Reboletti: "What... what trend, Representative? What is the trend? I ask... here's a simple question. Does any other state ban the possession or consumption of lion meat?"

Arroyo: "I said I think there are a few, but I don't have the names with me right now."

Reboletti: "Okay."

Arroyo: "And there's nothing simple about this, Reboletti."

Reboletti: "So, Representative, my question is, do it... if I possess lion meat now and this were to become law, do I have to turn it back into the state authorities 'cause now it's contraband?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "I would not?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "Are you sure about that?"

Arroyo: "No."

Reboletti: "I... you know, we're the only state that doesn't have concealed carry so maybe we can be the only state that bans lion meat. But, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Sponsor, to the Bill. Since I've been here in 2007, let me read a list of some of things either we've banned or tried to ban. Hand washing in schools, trans fats, cell phones, animals in cars, shark fins, energy drinks, colleges, tanning beds... what else? Oh, that's right, Frogra, because we don't want frog legs in Chicago either. Frogra. I'm sorry. Representative, I think your energy drink Bill would have been a better Bill but we spend a lot of time here banning things. I didn't realize lion meat was such a terrible problem here in the state. It certainly is not in DuPage County. I don't think it is in the City of Chicago. Being a leader of banning things, being the number one nanny state in the nation is not the direction we should be going in. I know that you're serious about this, but with all due respect, I cannot support this. We did not cut shark fins off in the State of Illinois. That didn't stop the killing of sharks. People want to eat lion meat, they have the right to do that here. If they want to raise ostriches, which people do here, maybe that's next because some people don't think that we should kill them. So, with all due respect, Representative, I'll be voting 'no'. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, within the definition Section of your Bill, page 1, line 14, you define a person within your Bill. Can you explain me... to me what that means? Who do you

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

think should be listed as a person under legislation in the State of Illinois?"

Arroyo: "It says, a person meaning any individual, partnership or corporation assisted in a firm or cooperating with the purchase or selling the lion meat."

Sullivan: "You, then, want to legalize the term corporation..."

Arroyo: "I don't want to legalize..."

Sullivan: "...as a person?"

Arroyo: "I don't want to legalize... I don't want to legalize anything."

Sullivan: "But in your Bill, you're defining a person as a corporation, is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Under the Act."

Sullivan: "Under this Act. So, you want to set a precedent in the State of Illinois that we want to define the corporation as a person?"

Arroyo: "No. No."

Sullivan: "Then why is that in your Bill?"

Arroyo: "I'll have to get back to you with that, too, Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Well, maybe you should... Okay. So, you don't want to define a corporation as a person in Illinois, but you have it in your Bill. I do have one request, Representative Mautino wanted to be added as a cosponsor 'cause he told me personally he's never been on a Bill that got the century club vote. And for verification, can you tell me the exact spelling of your name 'cause they're washing the trophy in the back, two r's in Louie or Luis?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Arroyo: "I think it's... it's got a bunch of r's right now, but I..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...I don't want to give you the correct spelling be... if
I'm going to spell it, I'm going to spell it wrong."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Arroyo: "So, it could be determined to be somebody else."

Sullivan: "I don't think you have too many r's on this side of the aisle, but we'll see."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the question is put. Representative Arroyo to close."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you Members of the House. Since I see that everybody has an issue and has a problem with my lion meat, could you put it back on Second? Could you put it back on Second?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative, we will move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading."

Arroyo: "Thank you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Members, on the Order of House Bills on Second Read... Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry, Sir."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Reboletti: "Did the Representative remove his Bill in time since a... a Motion was made to... previous question was called. I don't believe he can remove it from the record."
- Speaker Turner: "We'll look into your inquiry right now, Sir."
- Reboletti: "And if... Mr. Speaker, and I... if not, I may have some Motions to move that Bill from Second back to Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "The parliamentarian is saying that you can take the Bill out of the record after the previous question has been moved. Representative Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of information.

  Representative Luis Arroyo, I've known you for a number of years. Now listen, are you acting like a scary cat or a lion? Just want to know. I was really looking forward to this vote. The trophy is nice and shiny, as tall as you are. Your name would look so nice emblazoned on that trophy. So, which one? You're a lion or a scary cat?"
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Kenny, I'm not going to take the title from you. That title belongs to you, brother. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of personal privilege. Following up on the previous speaker, we have the award, the century club that some of our Members have won multiple times, I understand, but I think I would like to propose a new award after seeing the events of the day. And I'd like... think we should have it for those that pull it out of the record when it's probably pretty sure that

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

they'd be members of the century club. I think the new award should be named the cowardly lion award. It'd just show that you would need a heart, that's all, to go forward into bravery, bravely taking on the century club. So, I'd... I'd like to create that new award today."

Speaker Turner: "Your request will be considered.

Representative Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, I did have a question of the Chair, but I'm going to defer that, respecting the Chair's opinion. But I... I'd like to ask the Representative if him pulling his Bill after Representative Brady asked for the question to be called, whether he considers that to be fowl play? I... I mean we're talking about lions, so would this be fowl play?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I... as I look at House Rule 55, it says when a question is under debate, no Motion may be entertained except, and as I look at moving the previous question is #6, it does take precedence. I'm going to move to overrule the Chair. I believe that the Chair is mistaken in their interpretation of the rule. The question was called and I don't believe the Sponsor can take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti, please review House Rule 59. Representative Reis. Your Motion is out of order, Representative. Members, moving to the Order of Second... House Bills on the Order of Second Reading, we have House Bill 62, Representative Ford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 was adopted, previously. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I'm... I'm sorry, Representative Ford. As I read House Rule 59, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, the effect of the main question being ordered is to put an end to all debate and bring the House to a direct vote on the immediate pending Motion. After a Motion for the previous question has been approved, it is not in order to move for adjournment or to make any other Motion before a decision on the main question."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti, would you like the parliamentarian to come and consult with you personally about this?"

Reboletti: "I like... I like speaking with you, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 62, Representative Ford. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 62, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Can we please move the Bill to Third? Oh, it's on Third? All right. I see two and then there's three. So, I just simply want to do something that's been started, I think, with the previous Leader, Turner, he tried to pass this Bill, sometime. I think it's now time to pass this Bill, and all it's simply does is count the prisoners at their

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

last known address. And I move for the adoption of... or the passage of House Bill 62."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I'm a little concerned with the other issues we're moving around. Maybe this Bill probably does need to be listened closely to. Could... Representative, could you explain one more time what it is exactly the language you're trying to pass does?"

Ford: "Okay, I will explain it. Okay. House Bill 62 does the following..."

Bost: "Hold on just a minute. Mr Speaker, could we ask for some silence so that we can actually hear what the Bill does?"

Speaker Turner: "Members, we have a very important Bill that we are addressing. Can we keep the noise down in the chamber? Thank you."

Ford: "House Bill 62, as amended, this is what it does. It requires the Department of Corrections, that's IDOC, to maintain an electronic record of the legal resident and the demographics that's... the date of each person entering into custody after January 2014. It also requires IDOC to submit a report to... a prisoner's data to the Secretary of State by May 1 of each year. It also requires Secretary of State to request the same report from the federal correction facilities in Illinois. And it requires the Secretary of State to prepare the redistricting population for the general districts to reflect incarcerated persons at their last known residential address prior to incarceration. And that's what the Bill does."

Bost: "Okay."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Ford: "It's one person, one vote. We... this... what can happen, we could come up with a lot of different things, but this Bill is basically about territory and philosophy."

Bost: "So... so here's my question, is it just reports or... originally, the Bill did more than that, correct? It... it... originally, the proposal for the Bill was to move that point of residency back for census purposes. But that does... this doesn't do this?"

Ford: "There's still one person, one vote."

Bost: "Now, I'm... I'm not... one ... one person, one vote?"

Ford: "Right."

Bost: "They're not going to vote from the prison cell?"

Ford: "Only for redistricting purposes, only."

Bost: "For redistricting purposes..."

Ford: "Yes."

Bost: "...it will then divide up."

Ford: "Right."

Bost: "So, basically, what you could have is, you could have Representative Costello's district which, and I'm trying to remember the exact population of Menard, which actually has a zip code in itself, and all of a sudden his district has to change tremendously and he has to have more sections of the state added to his district to make up for the population loss that would be taken out of his district, am I correct? Or anyone else that might have a facility in their..."

Ford: "I would disagree."

Bost: "Okay. Tell me why, please."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Ford: "I mean, the... in Illinois, there's approximately about 47 thousand people incarcerated in Illinois' prisons and the majority of the people that's counted..."

Bost: "Do... do you know what the population is in Menard at this time?"

Ford: "I could get it to you after the vote."

Bost: "Okay. Well, I... I don't... I want to have it before the vote because I think that's an important number. And... and the other thing, in this reporting, and I know because I've worked with Department of Corrections for many, many years and the people that served there and I respect them tremendously, many of the inmates when entering when they ask them their residence, three stars left of the moon or the moon. That's how they fill it out. Where would their residency be?"

Ford: "Well, if there's no last known address, then it would be at the prison."

Bost: "It would be at the prison if there's no last known address?"

Ford: "Right. Yes."

Bost: "Okay. Okay. I think that... that we're going down a very wrong path here. We have always, and I know that's what we do, we... we change law. That's why we... I can't really say, you know, you never should change the always. But in this case, there are... and you're saying for... for district purposes only, but I believe that in the long run the goal and intent would be that there are many other financial incentives for roads, bridges, highways, sewer, water. All of these things based on the fact of what the population of

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

an area is. And where these places are located, it does affect those populations. Now, your Bill right now might not, but the original Bill had all intentions of doing that."

Ford: "Right."

Bost: "And I have a problem with this based on that principle because I think those people who do have correctional facilities in their districts, their district boundaries will have to change to make up for the difference. And once again, you're going to spread these areas out even further in the south when... when, right now, where you might represent a couple of blocks by so many other blocks, I got Brandon Phelps representing 10 counties and got Jerry Costello representing 5, I'm representing 5. You know, I mean... and... and all this will do is once again put us in a place where our districts are even getting bigger when the... the population is actually there. I stand in opposition to your Bill with all due respect and I would encourage everyone to vote 'no'. I don't think it's a good policy to start."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "I know you've had a similar Bill to this in previous General Assemblies. I know we've had some debate on it. I would like for the benefit of the current General Assembly to maybe revisit a few of those questions. One of the issues is to what address would we assign an inmate should this Bill become law? How would that be determined?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Ford: "Written in the Bill, it's the last known address of the incarcerated person."
- Fortner: "How do we get that last known? What's... when we say known, how do we get that last known address?"
- Ford: "From the intake upon entering the prison."
- Fortner: "So, that's really up to the inmate to report whatever address they see fit at the time of intake. Is that correct?"
- Ford: "It's important for them to give the best address because they may want to be released for parole and go back to the home district from which they came from, where their family and friends are, for the support after being incarcerated. So, you're going to find that people will do a very good job of reporting a... a very close to accurate, if not an accurate, address for reporting purposes."
- Fortner: "I would agree that it's in their interest to do so, but that is not always the case. There are certainly cases where inmates would report that their last address was, say, the county jail in which they were residing. What would happen if that were the intake address given, 'cause that is the case sometimes on the intake records?"
- Ford: "Well, that... that... we know that the county jail is a facility and it's not a home; therefore, it cannot be counted as a home address."
- Fortner: "And what would happen for those inmates in that case?

  Let's say we had an inmate who gave the county address on their intake register, where would they be counted for this purpose?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Ford: "Well, in... in that case, you know, right now what happens in Cook County jail, they count the prisoners there in Cook County because that's where they're coming from. So, the question... I'm sorry I can't answer where and how the reporting will take place for that one individual that just may happen..."

Ford: "You know, it's going to be few and far between."

Fortner: "Well, it's not just... this happens... this happens a bit. What if..."

Ford: "I understand you're doing hypotheticals here and..."

Fortner: "Well, I'm just..."

Ford: "...but we have to look at the underlying purpose."

Fortner: "What if... what if the... what if the person's homeless?

What if it's a homeless person? What is... what... where would that person be assigned?"

Ford: "They would be excluded."

Fortner: "What's that?"

Ford: "If there's no known address, they would be excluded."

Fortner: "But if they gave a county jail... they say Cook County jail as their previous address, you're saying they would not be excluded?"

Ford: "I have no answer... I have no answer for you when it comes to if they report that the last known address. I believe what I had said before was that the Cook County jail cannot be counted as a home because it's a facility when it comes to the census for when the intake takes place in state penitentiaries or federal penitentiaries."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Fortner: "Next, what if... there's no limitation, so regardless of whether an inmate is incarcerated 1 year or 20 years this would still be applicable. Is that correct?"

Ford: "That's correct."

Fortner: "So, that previous address, let's say that was the address with their family and their family relocated to another part of the state or even to another state entirely. In that case, we would still, as I understand the language of this Bill, assign them to the address where their family had once lived?"

Ford: "Well, once again, you're doing a hypotheticals here. "

Fortner: "Well, this... this happens..."

Ford: "But the fact... the fact... the..."

Fortner: "...this happens quite a lot."

Ford: "I'll tell you what the facts are. The facts are 60 percent of the people that enter the state penitentiaries return to Cook County, to the City of Chicago, to the west side and the south side. Those are facts. You're giving hypotheticals, what if."

Fortner: "Well... Well, I'm just saying, for instance, I... I have had in my district, families that have incarcerated family members, they have relocated. In fact, sometimes that has involved them with my office to understand things. So, I know this is not hypothetical, this happens. And the question I would have then is, or the concern I would raise is, in that case, you have a person who's been incarcerated a period of time, the family has relocated, a new family has moved in and in fact, you would know have excess counting at that location because, in some ways, not

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

dissimilar for the problem that I think the Bill is trying to address of excess counting at the incarcerated location in prison."

Ford: "Well, Professor, I've got to tell you, no Bill is perfect but this addresses a major problem. And what about those... let's do another hypothetical. What happens if the person that decides... that's in prison, they decide after the census count to move to a district that the prison is in and they were counted at the home district? And now, what happens in that case? The family has moved and now they're living in the new district. So, it could balance out."

Fortner: "Well, I... I understand and let me... the other line... the other question I want to ask is, and I know as I say we've discussed this in previous years but I think it's important for the General Assembly to revisit this since this is an important Bill, and that is the question of, are you aware what... how we do apportionment of the military population at the federal level? Because we have to deal with military population that are at bases and away from their home addresses? How do we..."

Ford: "You know... you know, I've worked with you and I understand, thanks to you, how it's done. And we... once again, this is a Bill that will address some concerns, address issues that's in Illinois. It would be the best Bill that we have at this time for Illinois. And we understand that... that on the federal level, as you have instructed, that they're not counted at all."

Fortner: "That's correct."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Ford: "And so, I don't want to disenfranchise. See, I wish that I could do a Bill to say that they should be counted."

Fortner: "Well, I... I think that's right and I... I just... to the Bill. As I was saying, in the case of the military population in the United States, when we do apportionment, a constitutionally required task in order to determine the congressional representation, there are military personnel, obviously, from every state. They're at bases around the country and around the world. And what we do in the United States in order to treat it fairly and impartially, and recognize that people will relocate, families will relocate, and how do you know what address to which you should assign them. What's done in that case is they simply say, for the purposes of apportionment, they don't count. They still count for funding at their local... at their local state level, we get state funds, basically, but we don't get congressional representation, basically. So, there are other, and I think, better, ways to accomplish this in a way that's fair to do the redistricting process. But the other thing I want to bring up, which is new since the last time this Bill came out, was at one of the... I was at a conference covering topics of redistricting during that ... the years leading up to redistricting and one of the things that was a very interesting talk was by one of the officials at the New York Department of Corrections. And what she talked about was New York's implementation of this Bill, and I came away just really shocked at how truly difficult this proved to be 'cause there turned out to be ... and this is... and none of this is hypothetical, this was all

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

real from the State of New York, any number of... and she was going through all sorts of problem cases, case after case, difficulty after difficulty, of trying to comply with this type of law, the type of law that's embodied here in House Bill 62. I think we should be taking to heart the lessons of states that have tried to do this and had difficulty. And we should be thinking, and having learned from those lessons, do this in a better way. If we're going to do this at all, do this in a way that makes sense. This is not the right way to do it. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, this, of course, you would, under your Bill, you're going to try to determine where the… the population that's in a correctional facility, where they came from. Will there be any actual verification? Because I've heard stories of… right now, they just take whatever the person says and they even, I think, a prior speaker said, some of them say from the moon, or you know, places that don't even exist or girlfriend's house, no address, no… no indication. Would there be a verification?"

Ford: "No."

Moffitt: "There would not?"

Ford: "No."

Moffitt: "So..."

Ford: "I mean, there's already a form of verifying a person, where they come from, from the intake process and their... their... if they have a rap sheet, if they have a driver's

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

license, if they have things like that... then that's going to be some form of verification. But in the Bill, the answer's no."

Moffitt: "I believe they just... the DOC, it's my understanding, just puts down whatever they say and... and some... they're... you know, know that it's from the community they came from, but they accept what the person says. Do you have a list of what districts will lose population with your plan and which ones will gain?"

Ford: "Do... I'm sorry, I didn't hear you?"

Moffitt: "Pardon?"

Ford: "I didn't hear you?"

Moffitt: "What... do you have a list or can you tell us what districts will lose population if your Bill was to become law?"

Ford: "No, I don't have a list of who would lose populations, but I do tell you this, that every district and the… every House Member will continue to maintain 108,730 people in their district. It's not about losing people; it's about making sure that we have one person, one vote. So, the way the General Assembly is set up, we all have to have the same number of… the same population count in order to represent in the State of Illinois. So…"

Moffitt: "But would this, if it became law, would it have any impact on that? Wouldn't that change the population within an area?"

Ford: "It should not change the population. We're all going to have an equal number of people to represent in the State of Illinois if this Bill passes."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Moffitt: "The number would stay the same, but the districts themselves would change in population?"

Ford: "The... the number will stay the same, but the districts will do what?"

Moffitt: "The census tracts would change with your Bill."

Ford: "Okay."

Moffitt: "If this were to become law, would our current maps, perhaps, be determined to be invalid or null and void?"

Ford: "No."

Moffitt: "Or subject to a constitutional challenge?"

Ford: "No."

Moffitt: "Why not?"

Ford: "Because this is not until 2020, the next census."

Moffitt: "It's what?"

Ford: "This is not until 2020, the next census count."

Moffitt: "Well, no... no change until 2020 population census? Yeah."

Ford: "And... and it's not a Constitutional Amendment; therefore, the answer is no."

Moffitt: "You don't think it opens up our current map to a constitutional challenge?"

Ford: "No. We... we have proof that that's not happening because it has passed in four other states and not one state has repealed it, and I know the previous speaker spoke about having difficulties of doing it in one of the states. And that's like any other initiative that starts out, you get started and things get better. And we have enough time under this measure, until 2020, to get it right. So, this

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

is the right time, it's early enough and it's the right thing to do."

Moffitt: "Representative, where do... where do federal... where are federal inmates counted?"

Ford: "The Secretary of State will be required for federal residents of Illinois to get the counting reported to the census."

Moffitt: "To be counted where?"

Ford: "They will be counted also in a census. It'll be up to the Secretary of State to get the data from the federal system."

Moffitt: "So, would you count them in the county where they reside in that facility?"

Ford: "No, they would be counted at their last known address.

And this is also important because if the federal person,
the person that's in federal penitentiary, is not from
Illinois, then we will not count them in our count. We
would dismiss them in our count because they're not
residents of Illinois."

Moffitt: "Can you tell me how many times you have brought this up before?"

Ford: "Many times."

Moffitt: "Ten times?"

Ford: "You know, I think it's the right time."

Moffitt: "No, I... I'm asking you a question. I mean..."

Ford: "You know, I don't have the answer. I just know that I've been here since 2007 and I've been trying it ever since 2007."

Moffitt: "According to our analysis, DOC is opposed to this."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Ford: "There's no opposition."

Moffitt: "Is there any cost to implementing this?"

Ford: "Pardon me?"

Moffitt: "Is there a cost?"

Ford: "No. We... you guys took care of that and now, I'm better informed that there's no cost, thanks to the people on your side. I appreciate that."

Moffitt: "If someone is in the correctional system, in a facility within Illinois, and they need medical care, where would they... and it might be, if it's basic medical care, it would be within the facility itself, but it might be something that would require hospitalization, more significant medical care. Where would they receive that care?"

Ford: "Where would the person be? Where are they at? If they're in... are they in prison at this time?"

Moffitt: "Mmm mmm."

Ford: "Yeah. They'll receive it there."

Moffitt: "There's never a time when they're removed from that facility to get more extensive..."

Ford: "Well, that's a possibility. I mean, I can't answer that.

I mean..."

Moffitt: "And where would that be that they would get the care?"

Ford: "I... I can't answer that. I... I'm sure if it's a... an emergency, it's going to be at the nearest emergency room."

Moffitt: "Right. I believe it would be. You wouldn't..."

Ford: "And I understand..."

Moffitt: "...you wouldn't transport them 150, 200, 250 miles."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- Ford: "Which is... which is a good point because, guess what?

  That emergency room will receive the benefits of caring for that person and receive the payments for caring for that person."
- Moffitt: "You mean, depend on the timely payment from the state?"
- Ford: "Well, I mean... I think things are getting better in the state. If you've been reading the... the budget analysis and things like that, I think the state is moving forward."
- Moffitt: "If these... if the individuals that are in a correctional facility need court services, what court would they use?"
- Ford: "I don't understand your question."
- Moffitt: "From time to time, an inmate might use the courts to file some paper, file something, where would they file it?"
- Ford: "Well, I can't answer that. I mean, because this Bill really doesn't deal with all the things that's being addressed right now. If we could deal with the underlying Bill, then I can answer those questions."
- Moffitt: "Okay. Representative, my point on that is it puts an added burden on local courts, local law enforcement, local medical facilities. And that's the reason why these facilities population has been counted."
- Ford: "That's not true because throughout the year, throughout the year, every time something happens in that county, in that area, they're receiving the benefits of those prisoners at that time. So, if they filed papers then they're going to receive the... the fees for filing the papers in that county. If they go to the hospital, they're

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

going to receive the benefits of that person being in the hospital. If their families come visit them in the prison, they're going to receive the benefits of the families staying at hotels and buying gas. There's a lot of benefits for the home districts of prisons."

Moffitt: "To the Bill. This concept has been advanced numerous times. I thought maybe the Representative remembered but it's certainly several times, and this could drastically change the population in certain districts. I everyone needs to look at what counties would be impacted, which legislative districts. The precedent for counting them where they'd live, and that's always, where... where do you live? Well, while they're in corrections that is their home. That's where they sleep, that's where they eat, that's where they're taken care of, that's where they exercise, that's where they get some training, some education, some rehabilitation and it's... that is where they are a resident. The system has worked for years that you count them where they are located. That is their residence. To change it now, I think for political purposes, would ... would certainly be an unfortunate direction to go. We have defeated this Bill in the past and we should again. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, how will this change the definition of a resident for voting purposes under current State Law?"

Ford: "The definition of voting purposes?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Reis: "The definition of a voter for voting purposes, a definition of a resident for voting purposes. How will that change current law?"

Ford: "That... it doesn't change it. This is all about one thing, counting the person at their last known address. That's it."

Reis: "I... I understand that, but do inmates get to vote?"

Ford: "No. Not in state facilities."

"Okay. So, the... the issue that I brought up with you Reis: after you pulled the Bill out of the record last week, you said it doesn't have a direct cost to the state. And while we might agree or disagree with that, I... I think it's negligible. Where the real cost is is to the county that these facilities are located. Now, there are public aid dollars, we've... we've determined that general assistance dollars have been discontinued, but there are public aid dollars that come to these counties to help deal with the social stresses that having a facility like in this in their county brings. There's a lot more residents that move down to be with their loved one that's incarcerated and that brings with it social issues. And our counties and townships have told us they rely on that extra state aid to help meet those challenges. So, I... I don't know what else I can say here beyond what's already been said. And with all due respect to the Speaker and the Speaker's fine father, who was a great Representative here that pushed this long before Representative Ford, this Bill has either not been called or failed every year since I've been here and it's failed for a reason. We are doing nothing but redirecting

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

population and I don't know why any downstate Member would vote for this because, how much bigger do you want your districts to be? How much smaller do you want the districts in the City of Chicago to be? It will have a great impact on that. So, with that, I would encourage a 'no' vote. And Mr. Speaker, should this... Mr. Speaker, should this get the number of votes required, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman has requested a verification on the vote. Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. So, I... I want to make sure that we're all very clear about what this Bill says. I understand there have been kind of previous iterations as... as to something of this type, this is a very different Bill. So, let's first note that it does nothing to... to impact funding formulas or allocations. But ... but let's talk about the fact this has already actually been adjudicated in several places. So, first of all, both the U.S. and Illinois Constitution clearly state that prison is not a legal address. It is not a legal address. So, what ... what we're seeing in practice is people using what is called usual address, which is where someone sleeps and eats but is not, according to the Constitution, their actual address. So this will address a problem by allowing their last known address, their legal address, to be used. The U.S. Supreme Court just upheld a Maryland version of this Bill, so it's already precedented. This has been done. This is not crazy. This is the right thing to do. Now, somebody asked about moving and address and other effects of redistricting. When the census numbers are taken on

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

April 1, you could have moved the day before or the day after, for the next 10 years you are at that residence legally. So, the census does not verify and movement is only accounted for in so far as it happened before April 1, so this Bill would also be in line with that. But let's just note exactly what's happening here. The bottom line is that the reason why this was upheld is when you look at what happens with gerrymandering, especially as it involves prison, is you have majority African-American, Latino population going to majority white districts. So, the reason why this was upheld is because it violates the vote dilution provision of the Voting Rights Act. Right? So, this is a Bill that would help remediate something that is actually already illegal according to precedent in statute, precedent in law, precedent in legal opinion. So, this is a different Bill than was done in the past. This is the right thing to do. It is getting us back in line with what is already required by federal statutes. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. A lot of what I've... what we've heard today has... has raised really what is a red herring. This will not affect funding to these communities. It very specifically states in the Bill that... that the communities with these facilities in them will not lose funding. This... this... the data that will be... that will be utilized will... will have absolutely no impact on the distribution of state or federal funding. There are already 19 counties and cities here in Illinois that correct their

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

data for the purposes of their local redistricting. This is already being implemented. As... as the previous speaker said, this is based on a... on a law in Maryland that has been upheld. This is a good Bill; it is a timely Bill. It has absolutely zero impact on funding. Be clear. In spite of everything that we've heard during this debate, there is not a single community with a facility that is going to lose a penny of their aid from the State or Federal Government as a result of this Bill. This will merely create a fair and accurate map when... when redistricting time comes, reflecting where people actually live and comport with the State and Federal Constitution. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the question is put. Representative Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say that this initiative is already been successful in four different states and no one, not one state, has repealed the law. So, I think that this is the right time and I want to thank the previous speakers for speaking on this. And I certainly respect those that want to protect what they believe would be something that's good for their community, but I think it's time for this Bill to pass. And once again, I want to thank Leader Art Turner, the previous one, for bringing this Bill forward years ago. Thank you very much."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Speaker Turner: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Reis has moved for a verification. So, all Members are called to vote their own switch. And on that, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 62 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 DeLuca. Representative Lang. Representative DeLuca. Representative Lang. Representative DeLuca. Representative Deluca. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 62, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reis, would you like to continue with your verification?"

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, after the other night, that was a very quick call. A verification, please."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative votes." Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Acevedo; Representative Arrovo; Representative Berrios; Representative Daniel Burke; Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Farnham; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Representative Franks; Representative Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth;

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hernandez; Hoffman; Representative Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson; Jefferson; Representative Representative Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Representative McAuliffe; Representative Christian Mitchell; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Representative Sente; Representative Representative Smith; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

Reis: "Representative Dan Burke? Mr. Speaker, Representative Burke? Come on, are we going to play this again? Speaker, Dan Burke. Representative Burke. You can always put him back on; we've seen that before. Mr. Speaker, call him off the roll."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke is in the chamber."

Reis: "Representative Mautino. Can we order supper?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino voted 'no'."

Reis: "Representative Scherer? She's in the chair.

Representative Feigenholtz? Representative Kelly Burke? I thought everybody was supposed to be in their chair?"

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative, would you like to proceed with your verification?"

Reis: "I don't know. Are you in a hurry? You weren't before.
Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Not at all, Sir."

Reis: "I withdraw my verification."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman's verification has been withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 62, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, on... not on this Bill, but the previous to that, I believe there's been a breach of the House Rules in, that pursuant to Rule 59, that when a question has been called that no other Motions or comments or closings may be given and the question before the Body should be put. I move to appeal your ruling of the Chair. It's not about the Bill itself, Mr. Speaker, not about the contents of the Bill or if it has merit or not, but as we try to follow a process the... the Rules were voted on here, and I believe that there is a breach of the... of the Rules here and those... that breach needs to be corrected. And if I have to again move to appeal the ruling of the Chair or that that Bill be put back up on the board for a proper consideration, then I'll stay here for the rest of the day myself, Mr. Speaker, because that's what Rule 59 says."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, we made an inquiry of the parliamentarian and we'll address your concern in one second."

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Point of personal privilege."

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

Hays: "I wasn't able to speak to the last Bill, but in light of the fact that I just lost 2 thousand residents, I feel like I... I need to make a statement. I'm assuming now when the Danville Correctional Facility catches fire I can send a bill to ... to the City of Chicago. When the water line that was dedicated and paid for by the citizens of Danville breaks, the dedicated line going to the sewer, I assume the bill can now go to the City of Chicago. When the road needs to be repaired that is dedicated to the prison, I assume you will be on the receiving end of the bill. I'm assuming, starting in 2020, mail that's only delivered to people who are residents and businesses will no longer be delivered by the local post office, as those folks will no longer qualify. I assume the match for the bridge that goes over the railroad tracks to ensure that the prison is appropriately protected by the fire protection in Danville, that the local match, half of the money for the sole purpose of protecting the prison, will be refunded to the City of Danville. This notion that there's no money in this, that nobody is going to take a bath financially, is absurd. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I have the privilege of being in my 11th year here, and a Gentleman that... other than the freshmen, all of us knew and loved, still do know

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

and love, was Bill Black who retired a couple years back. And I often heard him say, I don't take myself seriously but I take the process seriously. And Mr. Speaker, what just occurred was an absolute sham. You know I've always been here in the Minority and that's never really bothered me and this is my last Session. I made a commitment that I would run and stay no longer than 12 years, if I was fortunate enough to keep getting reelected, but I see a lot of people here on both sides of the aisle that want to stay here. They're good people. Every one of us worked hard to get here and we're very, very proud of what we do. But what just occurred was literally a sham. If you needed the Bill to pass that bad, you know, we could have played games on this side. Somebody could have voted 'yes' and then changed the vote, but that didn't happen. But to get something like this shoved down my throat, it... it used to raise my blood pressure, it doesn't anymore. It's like, why do we have to be treated this way? Whether you're on that side of the aisle or this side of the aisle, there's mutual respect among us and when this kind of thing happens, it really takes from the process. And I'm not pointing at you, Mr. Speaker. I hold you in the highest esteem and you know that. But this was a game and it was a shame. No pun intended."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "We're having further discussions on the previous Motion by Representative Reboletti, but I do want you to remind you that under House Rule 59(c), a Motion for the previous question approved is not an order for adjournment.

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

So, I would just like to remind you, so you're following your own Rules, not to adjourn before this has been settled, but we're having further conversations with your... with your counsel. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker."

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

Kay: "You may recall back when we were sworn in, both our second terms, and it was shortly thereafter, in fact, it was that day, I think you were named the Leader by Speaker Madigan. And I went up, and if I'm getting this wrong, you correct me. But I came up to you and I said, you have the highest privilege and honor that I can think of for a man your age. Do you recall that?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Kay: "Do you recall what I said after that? I said, with... with that honor comes a tremendous responsibility to every Member in this Body. Do you remember that? I'm not being critical of you, but I would remind you that what you do here, regardless of whether you do it for the House or you do it for your Party, all comes down to a matter of reputation. You're a better man than what you just did here. You are a better man. Now, I understand that you take orders from somebody else, but you are... you are a better man than what you just did. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Speaker, I'd like to speak to some of my colleagues who seem to have wanted... point of personal privilege."

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

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

Dunkin: "You know, folks, this Bill addresses or addressed what we have been talking about over here for the last several years, a number of us at least. Prisoners coming back to the City of Chicago, or anywhere in the state, needs to be accounted... accounted for in their respective home state or home municipality or county or city. They put a... additional burden or pressures on the water mains Chicago, in Rockford, in Danville, in East St. Louis when they leave those respective prisons. And so, when they're not accounted for, they don't get the matching dollars in those respective cities as well. So, you can't have it both ways. You don't have a transitional program. You don't have the reentry programs there when they get out. You don't even want them in your district when they get out of the joint. You want to send them back to Chicago, back to Rockford and some of these other major metropolitan areas. You want to get rid of them. Once their time is done, you give them a train ticket or a bus ticket. So, let's stop thinking that we're fooling ourselves; that's the reality. They come right back to some of our neighborhoods. And we're saying, we just want them accounted for. That's all. But to sit here and talk about our young able Speaker who has been fair with most of all of us, is unfortunate. He's simply trying to do his job. It's not perfect down here. We recognize fairness and you know this man, this Speaker, our Leader, is most equal and most fair. So, that's unfortunate to hear because you know the facts. And the fact of the the Bill passed. The verification successful. And so, let's not cry over spilled milk

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

unnecessarily 'cause you'll get another chance here, my friends. You can run the Bill again, or another Bill thereof, a version of it, and let it hit the floor. Let it go up or down on its own merits. Let's grow up in some respect and not be so accusatory. The Bill was passed successfully by 60 votes. It's over."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

Davis, M.: "First... first, I'd like to commend you for your ability to withstand the pressures of that seat in which you stand. I think you're certainly an excellent person to have received this achievement."

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

Davis, M.: "And I also would like to urge the Body, let's see how many enhanced penalty Bills we'll pass, let's see how many new Bills we'll put in the Criminal Code if that population is no longer valuable to certain groups. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Real briefly, as some of the previous speakers indicated, I've... I've been here awhile. I would like to know... I would really like to know what the Speaker did wrong? What he did wrong? There were 60 votes; there were 60 people here. That Bill went through committee with a majority of vote. It got 60 votes per the Constitution. There were 60 people here. To, in any way... any way, disregard or disrespect the ability of the Speaker

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

for him following the Rules of the House and passing a Bill and running this chamber in a respectful way is absolutely absurd."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point, Sir."

Mitchell, C.: "So, I just want to say a couple of things. You know, first of all, the previous Bill that was just passed addresses something that was already improperly done, something that needed to be corrected and in fact, we've got 19 counties, including Danville, who already do this. So, what I would hope is that going forward we could just continue to have a debate about the facts and just to talk to each other as equals. I... I have the highest respect for the Gentleman who rose to berate the Speaker, but I just think that the personal attack was unfortunate and that we should try our best to make sure that even as we have impassioned debates, that we do so on the basis of facts, that we make sure not to attack folks who are doing their job and for the most part, doing it well. I think it's unhelpful to this chamber and unhelpful for the public policy that we're all here to pass. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

I've been here for 15 years and there was a short little snapshot in 95' and 96' in which I was in the Majority, but I've seen these types of flare-ups in the past. We're going to be here another two and a half weeks, folks, and we can...

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

I think that... let's... let's make sure we... people are watching us. We have our constituents who've driven many ways to watch us perform the work of the people. I think everybody needs to dial down a little bit and take a deep breath, let's try to cooperate. We can get things done, we can get things accomplished, but let's... let's keep the rhetoric low. We respect all of us. We're all elected to represent the same amount of people. I think all of us on my side of the aisle, we respect the individuals over here, but let's do a better job of keeping our comments direct to the issue at hand. Let's not let personalities get in place. But anyway, folks, like I said, we've got two and a half weeks here. We can cooperate in a lot of things, we can get home and we can go back to our families. Let's try to do that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jones."

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

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

Jones: "You know, I stand and rise in support, not only of you as our Leader, but you know, I think I've heard many times, before someone blasted someone, they say I have the highest esteem for you and I think that was... that happened today. It's kind of sad that we have gone to this level and we've... you know, you've been attacked and I kind of find that offensive. And just... just would point out to the Representative that if he wants to continue with those comments, maybe next time he should run as a Democrat and not... not consider attacking the Speaker, you, as our Leader. And now, I know we have a lot of important issues

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

that are coming up. We talk about respect for each other and people listening, our residents listening. Our residents heard what you said you said about our Leader. Our residents heard how you disrespected our Leader, and I don't take that lightly. And hopefully, Representative Kay, if you want to be a Democrat, next time run as a Democrat."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the per... point of personal privilege. First off, let me tell you that I respect you tremendously. I respect the process more. Okay. Not... not any disrespect to you, but I do respect the process more. I think we had two things that piled up on each other. One is the fact that what we're looking into now and that is the ruling that was misruled, as far as I'm concerned, on a previous Bill. Even if that Bill, many people just take lightly and we were going through the process, the process must be followed and the Rules must be followed. The other issue is that you, from the Chair, and that's well within your right, slow counted. That's okay. I've seen it done before, and that's within the power of the Chair. But when one follows the other, it's seems like a slap in the face to those of us who are trying to make sure that the debates that occur here are done in a way accordance with the Rules and of the accordance with what we believe should be right to give the opportunity for everyone involved, regardless of how they feel about the issue, to truly be treated correctly. The two piled up on each other. A lot of things have been said and I hope that those things will be forgiven between each other. I still have tremendous

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

respect for you, but I believe that we should watch very closely as we move through these next weeks and it's going to get intense. I'll do my part of making sure that it'll be as intense as possible, but as we move through and it will be intense, that it will be directed towards the Rules. And that's why I wanted to make this statement is that I want to make sure that the Rules are followed even if we're playing... we're... we're dealing with a Bill that many might think is just not much. Okay? So... so, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, and... and I hope we would look to go down that path, and I do hope that we come up with the right ruling on... on the other issue we're dealing with. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

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

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, would join that I have a great deal of respect for you and your professional capabilities. I have a disagreement with you right now. It's not personal; it's about the Rules. But I would also suggest to each Member of this Body, when there's a slow count, it depends on what side of the Bill that you're on. I wonder if the Bill had been a Republican Bill and that it failed or it passed, how slow or fast the Bill would have been called? There should be consistency. It's not the first slow count. I'm sure it won't be the last slow count. This is not directed personally to this Speaker. It could be anybody who's in the Chair. It should be within a reasonable amount of time that the Bill is called, that

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

roll isn't open for 5 or 10 minutes to make sure you get 60 votes. I hear the Rule of 60 all the time, you have 71. That should have been pretty easily passed based on a purely partisan Roll Call. But part of our job, too, is to respect the process and to make sure that the process is enforced fairly to each one of us because we do represent 108 thousand people. It's our job to do that as diligently and with as much respect and professionalism as possible. And so, I am, Mr. Speaker, going to persist 'cause I did make a Motion to overrule your ruling that I was out of order in my Motion to overrule the opinion of the Chair. And I am going to persist in that because I believe there has been a breach of the House Rules. And so, I am going to that previous Bill, in and I don't Representative Arroyo's Bill number, that I move to overrule the opinion of the Chair that I was (a) out of order and that the Bill should be put back up on the board and the merits of the Bill should be voted up or down."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Might... might I suggest as we wait, all on the edge of our seats on this monumental ruling, I have a sneaky suspicion it will not be in favor of this side of the aisle. So may we go to committees and at least do something for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois today, and then maybe check back in in the morning and see what you've all come up with?"

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 344, offered by Representative David Harris. House Resolution

55th Legislative Day

5/15/2013

- 345, offered by Representative David Harris. And House Resolution 346, offered by Representative Sims."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, committee announcements.

  Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed
  Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the
  Resolutions are adopted. Committee announcements, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "There were two committees that were canceled this afternoon. The Appropriation-General Services Committee has been canceled, the Appropriation-Public Safety Committee has been canceled. Meeting immediately after Session is Labor & Commerce in C-1, State Government Administration in D-1, Appropriation-Elementary & Secondary Education is 413, Human Services in 114 and Small Business Empowerment in Room 115."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves for the adjournment of the House from... all in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. And the House will adjourn 'til Thursday, May 16 at 2 p.m. Thank you."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 27, offered by Representative Nekritz. Senate Joint Resolution 29, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia. And Senate Joint Resolution 32, offered by Representative Sosnowski. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."