64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. 1 2 Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, 3 Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2013: recommends be adopted 4 5 is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House 6 Bill 513, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 595, Senate 7 Amendment #1 to House Bill 702, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 827, Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1288, Senate 8 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1309, Senate Amendment #3 to House 9 Bill 1349, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2339, Senate 10 Amendment #2 to House Bill 2432, Senate Amendment #2 to House 11 12 Bill 2471, Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2508, and Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2695." 13 Speaker Lang: "Happy Memorial Day. The House will be in order. 14 15 Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by his Lordship Bishop Camillo Ballin, Apostolic Vicar 16 17 Northern Arabia. Bishop Ballin is the quest of 18 Representative Demmer. Members and quests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones 19 and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance." 20 21 Bishop Ballin: "We thank You, Lord, for Your presence, for Your 22 grace, for Your bounty, for Your mercy. We thank You for this Assembly which is greeting the problems of their brothers and 23 24 sisters. We thank You for this a great country which is the leader in the world, the leader for freedom. We thank You, 25 Lord the Father, for Your presence, for Your grace. Bless us 26 27 all, bless these people, bless their family, bless this country, bless all the world. We ask this through Christ, Our 28 29 Lord."

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

Speaker Lang: "Be led in the Pledge today by all of our veterans." 1 2 Veterans - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United 3 States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice 4 5 for all." 6 Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie." Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that 7 there are no excused absences among House Democrats today." 8 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost." 9 "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that 10 11 Representative Pritchard is excused on the Republican side of 12 the aisle today." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 13 Members present and we do have a quorum. Mr. Clerk." 14 15 Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Phelps, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Utilities reports 16 the following committee action taken on May 27, 2013: 17 18 recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 105. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 405, 19 20 offered by Representative Tryon, is referred to the Rules Committee." 21 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Demmer." 22 Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." 23 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir." 24 Demmer: "I... I'd just like to, again, welcome and thank for doing 25 the invocation, Bishop Camillo Ballin. He's the Apostolic 26 27 Vicar of Northern Arabia, meaning that he works with more than 4 million Catholics in Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain and Saudi 28

Arabia. And we know that there are many American servicemen

64th Legislative Day

1	and women who are stationed there and a large part of his
2	ministry includes serving their needs and helping bring them
3	peace and comfort as they're deployed overseas. So on this
4	Memorial Day we thank him for being here and welcome to
5	Springfield."
6	Speaker Lang: "We welcome you. Thank you very much, Bishop.
7	Representative Tabares."
8	Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on the point of personal
9	privilege."
10	Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
11	Tabares: "Just want to welcome my family who is visiting here
12	today from Chicago. They're up on the gallery, my aunt, my
13	uncle, my my mom and my grandmother who recently celebrated
14	her 90th birthday, just like to give them a warm welcome to
15	Springfield. Thank you."
16	Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Welcome to Springfield. Happy you're
17	here with us. Representative Halbrook."
18	Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
19	Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
20	Halbrook: "Yeah, I'd like to introduce my guests and their family
21	my my Pages for the day and their families, if I could. Over
22	here to my right is Brock McMorris. Brock, if you would stand.
23	Brock is 13, getting ready to enter into the 3rd or 8th
24	grade, his sister Anna is 17, getting ready to enter in as a
25	senior. They're from Newton, Illinois, actually guests of
26	Representative Reis also. Up here in the gallery behind us,
27	if they would stand, is their parents. Yes, they're there;
28	thank you, Tony and Lisa McMorris. Tony is a licensed funeral
29	director and a fourth generation newspaperman. They have a

64th Legislative Day

1	business in Greenup, which is Cumberland County. Actually,
2	that's in the 110th. And his wife, Lisa, is also with us and
3	she is a special education administrator in the South Eastern
4	Special Education Unit. Let's please give them a nice warm
5	House welcome and to Springfield. Thank you."
6	Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House, happy you're here. Mr.
7	Smith."
8	Smith: "Standing for a personal privilege points of personal
9	privilege."
10	Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
11	Smith: "Just want to wish my wife a happy birthday. She came down
12	to be with us today, Valerie Smith."
13	Speaker Lang: "Oh, happy you're here. Happy birthday. On page 3
14	of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Third Reading,
15	appears House Bill 2562, Mr. Jones. Please read the Bill."
16	Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 2562, a Bill for an Act concerning
17	employment. Third Reading of this House Bill."
18	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones."
19	Jones: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I had three other Members talking to
20	me. House Bill 2560 House Bill 2562 is an initiative of the
21	Department of Labor. This Bill just simply provides that there
22	will be a fund established by the Department of Labor,
23	provides that I'm sorry, give me a second. The Personal
24	Review Act, it allows the Department of Labor to hold the
25	employees in violation if they don't allow employees or person
26	to review their employment information. It also establishes
27	a fund. As I stated, this is an initiative of the Department
28	of Labor. I know of no opposition to this Bill and I ask for
29	your support of this Bill."
	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

1 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

- 2 Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 4 Bost: "Representative, you explained that there was no opposition
- 5 to the Bill but yet we have that... that business groups are
- opposed, specifically the Illinois Chamber and the NFIB. Are
- 7 you aware of that?"
- 8 Jones: "Well, I'm mistaken, yes, the Illinois Chamber but this...
- 9 this group, of course, the Illinois Chamber also represent
- 10 the Tooling and Manufacturing Association. The gentleman who
- filed a slip against this Bill, Mr. Shattuck, we tried to
- work out the issues with the Department of Labor but he wanted
- it changed from 7 days to... I guess, the Bill calls for a
- 14 violation. He was against that. We tried to work it out; we
- 15 couldn't remove his opposition from the Bill."
- 16 Bost: "All right... all right, thank... thank you, Representative.
- 17 And... and not directed at you but the Bill itself, let me
- explain to you once again, Ladies and Gentlemen. We continue
- go... to go down a path that we claim in the act of good
- 20 government, that we continue to put a stranglehold on the
- 21 businesses of the State of Illinois. A hundred... I've said it
- so many times, 177 thousand jobs in the last 12 years have
- been lost. Yet, when we have talked about different issues to
- try to make it to where we swing the door open in support of
- business to try encourage them, yet even you might think that
- this isn't that important, but it is. It's another burden
- that is on the backs of the small business and... and large
- business alike, here in the State of Illinois. We've got to
- stop. We've got to stop. There has to be a time that we

64th Legislative Day

1	encourage business. Now, I don't think this is done in any
2	other state. So, there's got to be a time that we wake up and
3	say, we want your jobs, we want your businesses here, we want
4	to put the people of the State of Illinois to work. I don't
5	know when it stops. Ladies and Gentlemen, I encourage a 'no'
6	vote on this piece of legislation."
7	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."
8	Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
9	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
10	Durkin: "Representative Jones, can you tell me what problem we're
11	trying to fix with this legislation?"
12	Jones: "Well, Representative, thanks for that question. The
13	problem is when people leave employment, they are not allowed,
14	currently, to receive a copy of their records. This Bill
15	simply just says that employers have to make sure that people
16	get a copy of their employment record; they're allowed to
17	review it. This Bill triggers once a company is violating.
18	Now, it just"
19	Durkin: "But is who's violating? Is it is it a pervasive
20	problem?"
21	Jones: "And according, they are allowed under the law, it's not
22	being enforced right now. This allows the Department of Labor
23	enforcement techniques which is not being done now. So,
24	employers can just ignore the law and the Department of Labor
25	doesn't have any enforcement mechanism."
26	Durkin: "If I look to my left, I'll see about 10 different volumes
27	of state statutes which allow every agency to do whatever
28	they want against any employer or against any person in the
29	State of Illinois. I don't believe can you give me one

64th Legislative Day

1	specific problem or an issue which has arose which this Bill
2	will cure? And I'm not asking for any generalities. Do you
3	know of anybody who's come to you and said this law needs to
4	be changed because this is what's happened to me?"
5	Jones: "Well, I I can't cite a specific, but all I can just tell
6	you is according to the Department of Labor they have over
7	300 or 500 complaints and they don't have any enforcement
8	mechanism. So, this is just to cure that."
9	Durkin: "I understand. I let me just To the Bill. I I, again,
10	we we often pass Bills that I think are well-intentioned,
11	but I'm not sure if there's a problem that exists which
12	warrants us to be able to add more ink to the Illinois state
13	statutes. And I do believe that when the business associations
14	are are opposed to it, we need to listen to it. And I would
15	recommend a 'no' vote."
16	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."
17	Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"
18	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
19	Kay: "Representative, are you aware of the fact that in law today
20	there is a thing, an Act, called the person Personnel Records
21	Act?"
22	Jones: "Yes."
23	Kay: "And what does that Act do?"
24	Jones: "It simply requires that the employer provides the
25	personnel record to the employee or the employer itself."
26	Kay: "Well, and that's my point. We have laws on the books today
27	that already entitle an employee to request any and all
28	records in the personnel files contained in any office,
29	whether it be a terminal or a home office, and at the expense

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

of whatever the going rate is for copy. So, there's a law in place now and I'm trying to figure out what we're doing with this."

"Well, we're just simply allowing the Department of Labor 4 5 to have more enforcement tools. Currently, the ... as you stated, 6 the employers... Walmart, for example, is one of the biggest 7 violators of this law. So this is not, as you can understand, Representative, this is not to penalize Walmart. This is 8 9 simply to say that if you do not follow the law, we have this enforcement tool because currently the Department of Labor 10 does not have that tool in effect." 11

12 Kay: "Well, under... I'm sorry, Representative."

Jones: "Well, this Bill will simply allow the Department of Labor to say, well, if you violate this law, you have to pay this penalty. And if you see in this Bill, Representative, it's \$250 plus a \$25 per day and the department will not institute that only if the company violates it. So, it... it's an enforcement mechanism."

Kay: "I understand. I... I think we've got a law in the books that 19 does just what you're wanting to do today and I think this is 20 duplicative. So therefore, I'm going to simply remind you 21 22 that we do have a situation in the State of Illinois where we are in the process of diminishing the capacity for any 23 business to operate because of the regulations and the fees 24 and the burdens we put on them and then we wonder why we can't 25 create jobs. This is another, not... may not be as big a deal 26 as some of the things we do, but it's just another signal 27 that we don't have open doors or a good environment for the 28

64th Legislative Day

- 1 businesses in this state. So, I'm going to recommend an 'aye'
- vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."
- 4 Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 5 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 6 "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two weeks ago 7 Representative Arroyo brought to the floor a Bill that seemed to come out of nowhere and what it did is it 'pierced the 8 veil of corporate protection'. I had never heard that term 9 before, but it was so well articulated by Representative 10 Sandack and others. But it, again, it was one of these Bills, 11 12 and Representative Durkin and Representative Bost and Kay have all articulated that this, again, is an attack on 13 14 business. We... we are creating something here 15 Representative Kay pointed out that there already is such protections in place, but you have the Department of Labor 16 going after business for an issue that isn't even an issue. 17 18 Ladies and Gentlemen, why do we continue to punish the business creators? Those that are providing the jobs, the 19 ones that are going to take their businesses and leave this 20 21 great state. I'm not going to pontificate. This is, simply 22 put, bad legislation and it needs to be stopped. This is not necessary in Illinois. Your prominent business organizations 23 are saying that it's a boondoggle. Listen to them, Ladies and 24 Gentlemen, and vote 'no'. And Mr. Speaker, should this Bill 25 26 reach the requisite Majority, I ask for verification."
- 27 Speaker Lang: "Your request will be acknowledged. Representative
 28 David Harris."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a quick question of the
- 2 Sponsor."
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- 4 Harris, D.: "Representative, I notice here that Amendment 1 was
- 5 added to the Bill. Does Amendment 1 remove the General
- 6 Assembly from the provisions of the Act?"
- 7 Jones: "Representative, you are correct. It does remove repre...
- 8 General Assembly from the Act."
- 9 Harris, D.: "Is there a reason why we're doing that?"
- 10 Jones: "The reason is simply... it just removes the General Assembly
- from the Act, Representative."
- 12 Harris, D.: "Okay and I guess... I guess to the Bill. One of the
- things that people always complain about is that the laws
- that are passed in Washington, D.C., Congress conveniently
- 15 exempts themselves from the laws that they pass. So, I have
- a concern here that you are exempting us from the laws that
- we are passing. I mean, if it's good enough for everybody
- else, it ought to be good enough for us. Thank you very much."
- 19 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- 20 Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 21 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 22 Davidsmeyer: "All right. To the Bill. We continue to create laws
- in this state that make the government out to get people.
- Everyone's afraid of their government right now. We need to
- 25 quit making laws that penalize people and create laws that
- 26 allow people to follow the law and help them in that
- direction. I... These laws are horrible. They're out to get
- everybody. And we need to vote 'no' on this Bill."
- 29 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 2 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 3 Sullivan: "Representative, there's going to be a civil penalty
- 4 assessed, it could be a thousand dollars, it could be
- 5 thousands of dollars. It's... if they don't fix the problem
- 6 it's \$25 a day. Is that correct?"
- 7 Jones: "No, Representative, that's incorrect."
- 8 Sullivan: "Okay."
- 9 Jones: "If you notice, currently, as I stated, there are estimated
- 10 200, 300 cases that are filed with the department each year.
- 11 This triggers only if the employer doesn't comply with the
- Department of Labor. As you notice, the civil penalty is \$250
- plus \$25 per day. Currently, the law states and it allows the
- Department of Labor to go to court."
- 15 Sullivan: "Right."
- 16 Jones: "The Department of Labor has not gone to court. This just
- 17 allows that enforcement mechanism."
- 18 Sullivan: "So, if someone did not comply with the court... with the
- 19 Department of Labor and chose to go to court, they
- theoretically could get the \$250 plus the \$25 a day?"
- 21 Jones: "Yes, but it's too costly to do it that way,
- 22 Representative. This will..."
- 23 Sullivan: "I... I'm just... I'm just building a case here, if... if you
- 24 will."
- 25 Jones: "Yes."
- 26 Sullivan: "So, this money is going to be then directed to
- 27 Personnel Records Enforcement Fund?"
- 28 Jones: "Yes."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Sullivan: "Okay. That fund, of all the moneys used, will be the ...
- 2 the moneys used will be for the enforcement of this particular
- 3 part of Department of Labor. Is that correct?"
- 4 Jones: "That's correct, Representative."
- 5 Sullivan: "What happens if there's excess money beyond what they
- 6 need to do this portion of this legislation?"
- 7 Jones: "Representative, it's... if you see in the law, it says it's
- for any other department to use. It can be transferred from
- 9 one fund to the other account from the Department of Labor to
- 10 any other..."
- 11 Sullivan: "So, if there's extra money, it doesn't go back to
- 12 anybody. It goes..."
- 13 Jones: "I'm sorry."
- 14 Sullivan: "...to the general upkeep of Department of Labor?"
- 15 Jones: "Yes. Yes, Representative."
- 16 Sullivan: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen,
- 17 you just established another tax. Don't call it a fee, don't
- 18 call it anything else, call it a tax on business. Because
- what happens is they're going to use this money to run the
- organization and if there's excess money, they're going to
- 21 use it as a little slush fund to run the rest of the
- organization. What do we call that? We call it a tax. No
- 23 different than anything else except it's subject to one group
- of individuals and one group of people, businesses. It's a
- 25 tax on business, Representative. You cannot call it anything
- other than what it is. Please vote 'no'."
- 27 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- 28 Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 29 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

64th Legislative Day

1	Zalewski: "Thaddeus, in a rush to decry everything that is is
2	deals with the Department of Labor and their inability to
3	enforce the laws and call it antibusiness, I think it's
4	important for the Body to know what the Bill does. Tell the
5	tell us exactly what happens when an employer violates this
6	this Act right now."
7	Jones: "Well, currently, if an employee, if if I leave a job and
8	I want to see my records, currently I can go and I can ask
9	the the company, I want to see a copy of my records. They
10	have 30 days 30 days to provide that to me. Currently, they
11	are not providing that. So, we have over 300 cases, 2 to 3
12	hundred cases where employers, such as I mentioned Walmart,
13	are ignoring the law and not providing you a copy of your
14	employment record."
15	Zalewski: "So, we have we have employees who wish to go in and
16	access confidential information about themselves and the
17	employer in violation of the law is saying no?"
18	Jones: "I'm sorry, Representative."
19	Zalewski: "In violation of the law, the employer says, no, I won't
20	let you see those records."
21	Jones: "Exactly."
22	Zalewski: "And this has happened 2 or 3 hundred times in the last
23	year?"
24	Jones: "Yes, 300 documented cases with the Department of Labor."
25	Zalewski: "And what's the Department of Labor's ability to what
26	what happens now that we're fixing?"
27	Jones: "Well, currently, if they're denying an employee of the
28	department that stands with resolving the complaint, but if
29	it's not resolved they have to go to court as a they have to

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

go to Circuit Court to enforce the provisions. And it costs ... 1 2 it's costly to the department. So, this way the department is 3 saying, give us the enforcement tools to allow us to resolve 4 these matters and we won't do this to employers if they comply 5 with the law." 6 Zalewski: "And meanwhile, we're deterring bad behavior amongst 7 employers that say... that willfully violate the law. Isn't 8 that accurate?" 9 Jones: "That's correct." Zalewski: "So, it's fair to say that if this Bill were to pass, 10 11 we wouldn't have to go to Circuit Court every time the statute 12 was violated and maybe, just maybe, we'd have a situation where the law was abided by." 13 Jones: "Correct, Representative." 14 15 Zalewski: "Okay. To the Bill. We... we had this debate a few weeks ago. We're all cognizant of the fact that the ... the business 16 climate in Illinois needs to get better. But just because the 17 18 Department of Labor is a proponent of a Bill that seeks to ensure good behavior and compliance with the statute, it 19 doesn't mean it's antibusiness. There's this perception out 20 21 there because a Bill is a proponent of the Department of Labor 22 and we're trying to do and what we can to help them enforce the law that automatically it's... it's antibusiness and we're 23 doing something on the floor of the House that's antibusiness. 24 So, you... you may cast judgment on the Bill itself, but realize 25 this is a Bill that ensures that employers abide by the law. 26 So, you can say to yourself, well, I'm not in favor of that 27 or yes, I am in favor of that, but... but just read the Bill 28

and understand what the Bill does and cast judgment on the

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

policy put forth in the Bill before you decide to cast your 1 2 vote." 3 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jones to close." 4 Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, I've heard the... the sexy words about this is an anti or this is another tax and 5 this is not another tax. This is not antibusiness Bill. This 6 7 simply provides the Department of Labor the opportunity to do what's currently in the law and it uses the enforcement tools 8 9 only if the business violates it. We have ... want to correct the wrong. We need to help our... This is a consumer-friendly 10 Bill. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote." 11 12 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr. Sacia has requested a verification. Members will be at their 13 own desks and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the 14 15 Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 16 who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Cassidy, Davis, 17 18 Rita, Turner. Please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 48 voting 'yes', 19 66 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman 20 asks for Postponed Consideration. Senate Bills-Third Reading, 21 22 Senate Bill 41, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1192, Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner, 1192. 1192, Mr. Turner. Please 23 read the Bill." 24 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act concerning 25 26 criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner." 27 Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speakers... Mr. Speaker, Members of the 28

House. Senate Bill 1192 provides the Department of Juvenile

64th Legislative Day

1	Justice with the authority to establish and implement
2	aftercare release for youth who are adjudicated delinquent
3	and subsequently released from the juvenile detention center.
4	And also provides that the aftercare release will be
5	supervised by aftercare specialists employed by the
6	Department of Juvenile Justice. Funding is currently included
7	in the Department of Juvenile Justice to implement the
8	aftercare program throughout the state. There's no fiscal
9	implications to the legislation. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
10	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The
11	Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
12	Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
13	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
14	Reboletti: "Representative, if we didn't pass this legislation,
15	what would happen?"
16	Turner: "If we were to pass it?"
17	Reboletti: "Not to pass this, what would happen? How would these
18	individuals be supervised? I know that that the parole agents
19	are supervising them now. What is this transfer? Are there
20	actually people who are aftercare specialists that would
21	address this?"
22	Turner: "I assume the a parole would continue to supervise."
23	Reboletti: "Is this is this shifting it from the Department of
24	Corrections to the Department of Juvenile Justice? Is that
25	really what we're doing?"
26	Turner: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you, Dennis."
27	Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I'm having trouble hearing Leader
28	Turner."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti is correct. It's very noisy in the
- chamber. Could we hold down the personal conversations? Could
- 3 we hold down the personal conversations? Shhh. Thank you.
- 4 Please proceed, Sir."
- 5 Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Is this transferring
- 6 responsibility from the Illinois Department of Corrections to
- 7 the Department of Juvenile Justice? Is this a transition?"
- 8 Turner: "Does it... does it transition from..."
- 9 Reboletti: "Department of Corrections to Juvenile Justice?"
- 10 Turner: "Yes, Sir."
- 11 Reboletti: "And how many... and you may not know this, but how many
- of these aftercare specialists do we have? I know we've been
- trying to get the juveniles away from the Illinois Department
- of Corrections and putting them into DJJ. So, are we... are we
- sufficiently staffed at that position?"
- 16 Turner: "I'm not sure about the specific number of... of people we
- have working the program right now."
- 18 Reboletti: "And then these... these new aftercare sp... or the
- 19 aftercare specialists would basically have the same
- jurisdiction over those individuals as the current parole
- 21 agents do?"
- 22 Turner: "Yes. It's currently being done in Cook County."
- 23 Reboletti: "Thank you."
- 24 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."
- 25 Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 26 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- 27 Franks: "To follow up on Mr. Reboletti's comments, this actually
- won't cost the state any money, will it?"
- 29 Turner: "No, Sir."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Franks: "And this is just a way to be more efficient and to help
- the young people who have not been tried as adults?"
- 3 Turner: "You're correct, Representative."
- 4 Franks: "And there's nobody against this Bill?"
- 5 Turner: "Not that I'm aware of."
- 6 Franks: "I... our analysis doesn't indicate that at all. This is
- 7 just a way to be more efficient and to deal with a subset
- 8 that needs its own specific types of help?"
- 9 Turner: "That's correct. It's more efficient and it's more
- 10 directed towards juvenile issues."
- 11 Franks: "I think it makes perfect sense, and I'd urge an 'aye'
- 12 vote."
- 13 Turner: "Thank you, Representative."
- 14 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."
- 15 Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To this... To the Bill. And with all
- due respect to the Sponsor, and I'm not in... standing in
- opposition of the Bill, but more to the agency. We have
- 18 created an agency several years ago in DJJ and taking it away
- 19 from the Department of Corrections with the claim that it
- 20 would bring a lesser recidivism rate to our youth. It hasn't
- 21 done that. It is shown over and over again and it continues
- 22 to fail and just to be... just as it actually... actually does a
- worse job than whenever the Department of Corrections has it,
- 24 which goes to show just because you change the name and
- 25 relocate something doesn't mean it's going to do a better
- job. As I said, this is not directed at this particular Bill
- or directed at the Sponsor, but I'm telling you that maybe
- this will help, but I think the DJJ does a terrible job and
- they're failing our youth."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner to close."
- 2 Turner: "I just ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
- 5 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Zalewski. Please
- take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes',
- 7 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the
- 8 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning
- 9 to Senate Bill 41, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- 10 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 41, a Bill for an Act concerning
- 11 revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- 12 Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- 13 Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is an
- effort on the part of the Cook County Assessor's Office to
- 15 see to it that people who are deadbeats, who claim homestead
- or senior or other personal residential exemptions to which
- they're not entitled, would finally be subject to some
- penalties if they are obviously gaming the system. So, this
- 19 measure would establish penalties for more than three
- violations. The wo... the specifics have been worked out
- in conjunction with the realtors, with the Taxpayers'
- Federation. I know of no opposition. I would remind all the
- 23 Members that if somebody is cheating on his or her property
- taxes, all the rest of us have the opportunity to pick up the
- 25 slack. So, I think this is good legislation and I am hopeful
- that you will join me in voting 'yes' on Senate Bill 41."
- 27 Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair
- 28 recognizes Mr. Harris."

64th Legislative Day

- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and just to emphasize what 1 2 the Lady said. This Bill has been addressed for the past two 3 years. It had met opposition from the realtors for the past two years. The Cook County Assessor worked out a.m. an agreed 4 5 Bill this time around. And I stand in support and urge a 'yes' 6 vote." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks." 7 Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Majority Leader yield?" 8 9 Speaker Lang: "Lady yields." "Representative, I... I think this Bill makes perfect sense 10 Franks: 11 'cause I... we've heard many anecdotal stories where folks have 12 claimed multiple residences as their primary residence, receiving exemptions and then used different addresses, for 13 instance, for voting. So, this will certainly crack down on 14 15 that. My only question is, why is it only for Cook County? Because that's something I'd like to see in my county as 16 well." 17 18 Currie: "I believe the answer is that the only assessor who was interested in this program was the one who serves the people 19 20 of the county of Cook. I would've been happy to add assessors 21 across the state, but there was no ground-swell of support to 22 do that. So, my suggestion would be that perhaps we could talk to your assessor over the summer months and invite that 23 individual to decide to participate in the program as well." 24 "Is there an opt-in for the other counties..." 25 Franks:
- 26 Currie: "No."
- 27 Franks: "...or is this solely for Cook?"
- 28 Currie: "Just solely for Cook."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Franks: "I may draft one legislation of this. But thank you and
- 2 I..."
- 3 Currie: "Splendid."
- 4 Franks: "...stand in support of it. Thank you."
- 5 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
- 7 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ford. Please
- 8 take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes',
- 9 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the
- 10 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair
- 11 recognizes Representative Senger."
- 12 Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. A point of personal privilege."
- 13 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- 14 Senger: "I'd like to welcome my two Pages, Josh Bakker and Hannah
- 15 Kozlowski and their parents. Welcome to Springfield."
- 16 Speaker Lang: "Happy to have you here. Welcome aboard. Senate
- Bill 1307, Mr. Ford. Please read the Bill."
- 18 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1307, a Bill for an Act concerning...
- 19 an Act regarding education. Third Reading of this Senate
- 20 Bill."
- 21 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."
- 22 Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill
- is very simple. It simply lowers the compulsory age and for
- school age from the age of 7 to 6. This Bill similarly passed
- 25 the House on a vote of 80 something to prevail to go to the
- 26 Senate. And we're still working on that one in the Senate as
- well. And I move for the passage of Senate Bill 1307."
- 28 Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."
- 29 Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

"Sponsor yields. Could we tone down the 1 Speaker Lang: 2 conversations in the chamber please, Ladies and Gentlemen? 3 Mr... please proceed." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that all the Members of 4 5 this chamber should pay attention to the comments and 6 responses from Representative Ford. First of all, I commend 7 Representative Ford because he was sent a very flawed Bill from the Senate and he has been very open-minded, even though 8 9 I cannot support this Bill, in making the necessary corrections. Even though we were told this was a technical 10 correction and it didn't have to come back to committee, I 11 12 think it's a very substantial Amendment to the Bill. First of all, Representative Ford, you might want to listen to the 13 fact that the Bill is still flawed. In the third correction 14 15 on this Bill, it does not have your September 1 deadline in it. So, it still needs corrections. I just traded... checked 16 with the State Board of Education. They agree that it needs 17 a correction made in that Section. Second of all, is this a 18 19 mandate?" Ford: "No. It's a mandate for parents." 20 21 Pihos: "All right. Do you not think it's also a mandate? I filed 22 a fiscal note and the State Board of Education responded that

26 Ford: "No."

23

24

25

- 27 Pihos: "Basically, what you're doing is lowering the compulsory
- school age to age 6 by September 1. Am I correct?"
- 29 Ford: "Correct."

they can't begin to predict how many students can fall into

this category. So, do you think it's a mandate for schools

that are the receiving schools of these students as well?"

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Pihos: "All right. Can 4-year-olds go to school right now?"
- 2 Ford: "Because of you and your recommendations to make this Bill
- 3 better, we've made the Amendment and yes, they are now. We
- 4 went back to the... the regular language and the law after
- 5 discussing with you and Representative Flowers. They are
- 6 protected to continue to go."
- 7 Pihos: "All right. Four-year-olds who the school district deems
- 8 as having readiness to go to school can go to school. Can 5-
- 9 year-olds go to school right now?"
- 10 Ford: "Yes."
- 11 Pihos: "Can 6-year-olds go to school right now?"
- 12 Ford: "Yes."
- 13 Pihos: "All right. So you are changing the compulsory age at which
- 14 students are mandated to go to school. So, it's not only a
- 15 mandate on the schools. Is it a mandate on the parents as
- 16 well?"
- 17 Ford: "It's a.m. it's a mandate for us to make sure that we get all
- 18 6-year-olds in school in Illinois."
- 19 Pihos: "Six-year-olds who can already go to school?"
- 20 Ford: "Right."
- 21 Pihos: "Okay. My next question is, do you know what the definition
- of truancy is in the School Code right now?"
- 23 Ford: "No."
- 24 Pihos: "Okay. Well, the definition of truancy would be the
- responsibility of a parent if their children misses more than
- 26 nine days of school without cause, without an acceptable
- excuse. Do you know what the responsibility is if you as a
- 28 parent are found truant, Representative?"
- 29 Ford: "I understand now better what truancy means and..."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Pihos: "Do you know that a parent who is found out of compliance 1 2 just by these nine days that they... if they willfully permit 3 the child to persist in truancy, it is a Class C misdemeanor. They're subject to not more than 30 days of imprisonment or 4 a fine of \$500." 5 6 Ford: "I think it's worth it." Pihos: "All right. My next question would be, and this would be 7 in a special concern for the Representatives in Chicago and 8 9 the outlying suburbs who often complain that there are no alternative programs from their... for their children to go to. 10 11 Do you know that a children who is proved truant for nine or 12 more days can be withdrawn in school and should be put into an alternative program? But yet, we repeatedly hear the valid 13 14 concern of Chicago Representatives and some of the outlying 15 southern suburbs that there is no alternative program available to their students." 16 "And truancy is a... is an issue and it's... there's a task 17 18 force that I chief cosponsored with Leader Chapa LaVia and I 19 think we can discuss that in that... at the task force." Pihos: "Yeah, but this law is coming first and that task force 20 only looks at Chicago truancy." 21 22 Ford: "You spoke of Chicago." 23 Pihos: "And this mandate is for the entire state." Ford: "I... I have to say that change is not easy, but I think that 24 when we make the necessary change for something that's good 25 in the long run, it pays off for the betterment of society. 26 27 And do you know that there's... the proponents of this happen to be the IEA, IFT, CTU, the Ounce of Prevention, the Illinois 28

64th Legislative Day

Pihos: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "...remarks to a close?"

24

25

2627

5/27/2013

Action for Children, Voice of the Illinois Children and Stand 1 2 for Children and the Chicago Public Schools." Pihos: "Yeah. I under... I do understand..." 3 Ford: "And ISBE is..." 4 5 Pihos: "...and I respect that." 6 Ford: "...not opposed to this." "And I understand that. But the point is a 4-year-old 7 Pihos: student with readiness can go to school, a 5-year-old student 8 9 can go to school and a 6-year-old student can already go to school. The one good thing about this Bill is you put a date 10 in place. That's the good thing about this Bill, but it should 11 12 list 7 by September 1, not 6. Even though, in reality, that's going to affect a small population of students, it still 13 should be a parent's choice. Does this affect homeschooled 14 students?" 15 Ford: "It... I mean, they have to follow the same guidelines." 16 Pihos: "So, it affects all students across the state no matter 17 18 what their parents think might be an appropriate decision for 19 them?" Ford: "Right now, everyone has to be in school..." 20 21 Pihos: "And again, I remind you, it's a mandate on schools and 22 parents as well." Speaker Lang: "Representative, can you bring your..." 23

is not correctly written. I just checked with the State Board

Pihos: "Thank you. I would urge strong consideration of a 'no'

vote on this Bill. Technically, the third Section of the Bill

64th Legislative Day

28

29

Reis:

5/27/2013

of Education and it needs another Amendment in order to comply 1 2 with what the Representative would like to do." 3 Speaker Lang: "There are still seven people wishing to speak on 4 this Bill. We're going to use the two-minute timer. Next person to be recognized is Mr. Reis for two minutes." 5 6 Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So much to ask and so little time. 7 Representative... will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." 8 9 Reis: "Representative, I want to begin where the debate kind of 10 ended there with homeschool. Why would we mandate this on 11 homeschoolers?" 12 Ford: "Pardon me?" "Why would we mandate this on homeschoolers?" 13 Reis: Ford: "I mean it's not about... it's about the age. This is all 14 15 about age..." 16 Reis: "Yeah, but so many things..." 17 Ford: "...compulsory age." 18 Reis: "...that we've done, I guess to somewhat credit of this Body over the last three or four years, is we've exempted 19 20 homeschoolers. They don't have to comply. I mean, they're at 21 home with their parents now from birth on." 22 Ford: "So, right now, current law says that homeschoolers have to 23 start... enroll their kids at 7..." Reis: "I realize that, but..." 24 Ford: "And so, this follows the..." 25 Reis: "...you're going from 7 to 5." 26 27 Ford: "We're going from 7 to 6. So, it's the same thing."

"I live in rural areas; my... my home county is Jasper County.

We have the largest school district in the state, geographic-

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

wise. Reimbursements for transportation have been cut. 1 2 They're proposed to being cut again. How are we supposed to 3 keep sending more and more kids to school when our classrooms are already full and our buses are wearing out? This is just 4 5 going to add more students to that." 6 "So... so, there was a task force introduced about school 7 funding, but I have to tell you, we all, and I know you're very concerned about jobs, this is a jobs Bill. It also 8 9 provides opportunities for parents to go to work and have a learning environment for their children while they're at 10 work. It could be half-day or it could be full-day. So this 11 12 is an excellent opportunity for..." Reis: "Representative, that's a stretch for using my time. I mean, 13 this is state-funded babysitting service is what this..." 14 Ford: "No, it's education. Right now, I got to tell you, the state 15 already spent money on child care, so why not direct it 16 directly to education that the state regulates?" 17 18 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, please bring your remarks to a close." 19 Reis: "I will, Mr. Speaker and thank you for the little extra time. Ladies and Gentlemen, where do we stop? Next time it'll 20 21 be 5, next time it'll be 4, next time it'll be 3. Sooner or 22 later, we have to have parents... kids and allowing some time with their parents to develop the basic social skills, the 23 responsibility, the respect that aren't being taught in our 24 schools. And at this young age, that's when they need to be 25 at home or with family, a tighter group of people, whether 26 that's a babysitter or whatever. I just think that lowering 27 it to 7 goes in the opposite of that. And Mr. Speaker, if I 28

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

would, if this vote should require the 60 votes, I would ask 1 2 for a verification." 3 Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Bost for two 4 minutes. 5 "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request to have this 6 removed to unlimited debate, please." Speaker Lang: "Your request will be acknowledged. Please proceed." 7 Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. 8 9 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier this year we moved House Bill 2762, which was Representative Scherer's Bill. I 10 11 and 30... 35 others did not support that. We discussed the 12 concerns that we had. That Bill said the ... the age was 7. So, I guess that wasn't good enough, now we're going to do 6. 13 Now, we haven't even had a chance to implement the other Bill 14 15 or put it into law, but yet we're now deciding that 6. We... we've still got three to four more days, okay? Can we go ahead 16 and make it just 3? How about 2? How about at birth we put 17 18 them in? Ladies and Gentlemen, seriously, let's let the 19 legislative process work. We moved a Bill to the Senate. Let's have that Bill move in the Senate. That's fine. I lost along 20 21 with 35 others; we didn't agree. But instead, before the 22 year's out, you come back and you try to make a Bill that we thought was bad enough, worse. Suppose it was an issue that 23 24 you felt this way about? Would you just want to override the process and say skip it, never mind? Never mind. We sent a 25 Bill over to the Senate. Tell the Senate to move that Bill if 26 27 they want to, but that's what was sent over. Not come back here with something like this that many of the people I... I 28 29 represent were... were not real happy with the one you sent

over in the first place. That's why I voted 'no'. If it's

64th Legislative Day

1

28

29

5/27/2013

2 that great of an idea, let it work, give it a couple of years. 3 But no, no, we messed this up this way. Representative, if you would, I'd have you pull this Bill out of the record 4 5 and actually let the process work. I don't care what side of 6 the issue you're on, let's do what we're supposed to do. Let's 7 pass a piece of legislation over, let them pass it if... if need be, but not change it before it even gets out like this. 8 9 Folks, this is a radical move. We're jumping... we're jumping headlong into a case of ... of mandatory requirement on age, 10 11 moving that age. Folks, pay attention to what we're doing. Vote 'no'." 12 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Morrison." 13 Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I have... I have 14 15 respect for the Sponsor. He and I are both fathers, we've talked quite a bit about parenthood and... and just the 16 challenges of that. This... I would urge a strong 'no' vote. 17 18 This is a Bill... this is an issue that is best left up to parents. I'm... I'm so pleased to have, like many of you, I 19 brought my family down here for the weekend. I've got a six-20 and-half-year-old, who's right over here, a five-year-old. 21 22 This is a decision that is best left... left up to parents. And parents may have any number of reasons why they would hold 23 their children back or have their children with them longer 24 or refrain from putting them in school. This is not a decision 25 that should be left to the state. Please vote 'no'." 26 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner." 27

09800064.doc

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

"Representative, I understand what you've tried to do 1 Fortner: 2 with your Amendment to get to what, I think, is actually a... 3 an inconsistency in the current State Law. Our current State Law says the compulsory age is 7. That sounds clear but we're, 4 I think there's an inconsistency is if someone turns 7 during 5 6 the school year, you now have an inconsistency as to whether it's compulsory for that entire school year or just starting 7 on the date when it becomes 7. Now I know that in House Bill 8 9 2762 we addressed that in a clear way. When I look at the language of the Amendment that we're voting on that has become 10 the Bill, I am concerned that the use of September 1 as a 11 12 starting date has two effects. First of all, that starting date is not echoed in both points and a previous speaker 13 addressed that point, that it's inconsistent, so that the 14 15 group of students who would have to start if they were 6 on or before September 1, that would then apply. The second place 16 where there could be a change that is implied here is that 17 18 for those students who have summer birthdays, they would now fall into a mandate where before they didn't. So, I think 19 there's two things going on here. Certainly at a minimum, I 20 21 can't support the Bill because this is a Senate Bill. We can't 22 do any further Amendments to this to correct the problem of the absence of the September 1 clarification in the date in 23 the second Section where it needs to be. The other issue, I 24 think, really I would encourage looking at the language of 25 2762, which made it very clear that what we're trying to get 26 at is our students who turn 7 during th... during the school 27 year. And we want to make sure that they are in school for 28 29 the entire school year. So, I supported 2762, but I'm going

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

- to have to reluctantly oppose this Bill because the language 1 2 does not really fix the problem without the fixes I've 3 suggested. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives." 4 5 "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" 6 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." Ives: "Representative Ford, I completely respect you in the area 7 of education. I look to work with you further on other 8 9 education Bills. However, as I sat in committee when this Bill was being heard, I was refused the opportunity to 10 11 question you on this Bill. So, I'd like you to be able to 12 answer my question now. And it's simply, exactly what will be the penalties for parents who do not enroll their students at 13 this age level? Specifically, what are the penalties to the 14 15 parents? 'Cause you called this a parent mandate not a school mandate." 16 "So, the penalties are the same that's in the current 17 Ford: 18 statute." Ives: "And could you tell me what those are specifically?" 19 Ford: "I don't have them." 20 21 Ives: "What we're going to do to parents of 6-year-olds for not 22 enrolling?" Ford: "They were... previously they were... previously they were read 23 on the floor. I don't have the penalties, but they're the 24 same. No penalty enhancements are a result of this Bill. Sorry 25
- 29 Ford: "You're correct."

correct?"

2627

28

I can't answer that right now."

Ives: "They're going to be assumed to be truant then. Is that

64th Legislative Day

29

to do exac..."

5/27/2013

"And have the full effect of all our truancy statutes if 1 2 they fail to send their child at the age of 6 to school?" 3 Ford: "That's correct." "Okay. My next question is... is, I know you have not... you 4 5 are not part of our appropriations group on K through 12 6 education so you may not understand it, but we spent... we spent 7 over two hours discussing a \$3 million line item dealing with technology. Technology, something that we have to have and 8 9 there's no argument about that. Our analysis indicates that this Bill could cost us upwards of \$40 million. What cuts do 10 11 you think should be made out of our current school budget to 12 fund mandatory kindergarten at age 6? What cuts would you like to see done?" 13 Ford: "Well, like you said, I'm not a part of your appropriation, 14 15 so I wouldn't know. So, let's stick to the merits." Ives: "Well, I'm just... I'm just trying to point out that we have, 16 we discussed for over two hours \$3 million in the cuts and 17 18 this would add \$40 million estimated by ISBE to the education budget. I don't know how we fund that and that's just in terms 19 of general state aid, that's not even the locals portion." 20 "Well..." 21 Ford: 22 Ives: "Do you... have you thought of any funding source..." "...well, what I have thought about..." 23 Ford: "...additional funding source for this?" 24 Ives: "...is Article 10 of the Constitution that we should educate 25 Ford: each person to their fullest potential. And this Bill attempts 26 27 to do this at an early age and that's why ISBE is not opposed. So, if ISBE is not opposed, I think that we're in good shape 28

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Ives: "ISBE is a neutral, they're not also for it either." 1 2 Ford: "Well, they're not opposed. And they've worked with us and 3 they have approved the language and all of the individuals 4 that are proponents have worked at the table, not only in the 5 House but in the Senate. And I think that this is the right 6 thing to do and it's a cost savings to the state. The earlier 7 we put children in school, the better off we are when it relates to dropouts and reenrollment of dropouts." 8 9 Ives: "Well, we're getting new information that ISBE is actually not in favor of the Bill. They think that there's language 10 11 that's necessary to correct some of the date problems that 12 are related to what Mr... what Representative Fortner said." Ford: "Well, you know, that's the way it is from day to day. 13 People change. But I tell you, this Bill has been an issue 14 15 for the entire Session and everyone has had an opportunity to make their point." 16 Ives: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. This is something that at 17 this time we cannot afford to do in our state. There's no 18 19 proof that we have a number of kids that are not getting education at 6 years age ... years of age they already can get 20 21 education at 6 years of age. If they want to enroll in 22 kindergarten, they can do so and it's certainly up to the parents to do so. Mandating this is not... is too expensive at 23 24 this time for us. And I urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer." 25 Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to let my fellow 26 Members know that this was my original intent with the 27 original Bill. I talked to just about everybody in here about 28 29 this. So, if you can think back to when I came and visited

64th Legislative Day

- 1 your green chair, this was my original intent. So, I would
- very strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."
- 4 Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 5 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 6 Kosel: "First of all, is it possible for a 4-year-old to go to
- 7 public school now? Yes or no?"
- 8 Ford: "Where are you at? There you are. How you doing?"
- 9 Kosel: "Is it possible for a 4-year-old to go to school now?"
- 10 Ford: "Yes."
- 11 Kosel: "Is it possible for a 5-year-old to go to school now?"
- 12 Ford: "Yes."
- 13 Kosel: "Is it possible for a 6-year-old to go to school now?"
- 14 Ford: "Yes."
- 15 Kosel: "Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill. So, we are passing
- legislation that we can already do. We are telling parents
- what they should do when they can already make those decisions
- themselves. And we are further putting penalties on them which
- 19 could include jail time... jail time for not complying with
- this Bill. I strongly, strongly urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- 21 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."
- 22 Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 23 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 24 Crespo: "Representative Ford, I just want... trying to reconcile
- something here. With the Amendment were you able to remove
- some of the opposition?"
- 27 Ford: "Well, I mean, which opposition are you speaking of?"
- 28 Crespo: "Well, as I see this, it seems with the Amendment ED-RED
- and LEND... LEND, SCOPE..."

64th Legislative Day

1	Ford: "Yes. Those were the three, SCOPE, LEND and ED-RED. Those
2	were the three organizations that after the Amendment, after
3	working with them, they removed their opposition."
4	Crespo: "Okay. And has the folks who are in favor, you have the
5	IEA, IFT, CTU, Ounce of Prevention, Illinois Action for
6	Children, Voic Voices for Illinois Children, Stand for Our
7	Children and CPS, correct?"
8	Ford: "That's correct."
9	Crespo: "Thank you."
10	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford to close."
11	Ford: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I urge an 'aye' vote."
12	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Please
13	remember, Mr. Reis has moved for a verification on this Bill.
14	Members will be at their own desks and vote their own
15	switches. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
16	'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
17	voted who wish? Please record yourselves. DeLuca, Thapedi.
18	Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting
19	'yes', 52 voting 'no'. And Mr. Reis has moved for a
20	verification. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative vote.
21	Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Members will be in their chairs during
22	the verification, please. All Members will be at their chairs.
23	Please proceed, Mr. Clerk."
24	Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:
25	Representative Acevedo; Representative Arroyo;
26	Representative Berrios; Representative Daniel Burke;
27	Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Chapa LaVia;
28	Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy;
29	Representative Costello; Representative Crespo;

64th Legislative Day

1	Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico;
2	Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis;
3	Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative
4	Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Farnham;
5	Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine;
6	Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative
7	Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth;
8	Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hernandez;
9	Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley;
10	Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson;
11	Representative Jefferson; Representative Jones;
12	Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative
13	Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick;
14	Representative Mayfield; Representative McAsey;
15	Representative Mell; Representative Christian Mitchell;
16	Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman;
17	Representative Nekritz; Representative Riley; Representative
18	Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Sente;
19	Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative
20	Smith; Representative Soto; Representative Tabares;
21	Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner;
22	Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative
23	Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling;
24	Representative Zalewski and Mr. Speaker."
25	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."
26	Reis: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my Motion."
27	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification.
28	On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 52 voting 'no'.
29	And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1493, Mr. Sullivan.
Please read the Bill. Mr. Sullivan. Out of the record. Senate
Bill 1550, Mr. Sandack. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1603,
Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

5 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1603, a Bill for an Act concerning 6 finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

7 Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1603, Amendments 8 1 and 3 are improvements to the functions of the Illinois 9 Finance Authority. The primary job of the Illinois Finance 10 Authority is to issue federally tax-exempt conduit bonds for 11 12 nonprofits and some for-profit organizations. The State of Illinois is not the lender on these projects nor are state 13 dollars involved. The Bill makes eight changes which include 14 15 eliminating mandates, increasing the flexibility municipalities for the treatment of diseased trees, making it 16 easier for Illinois universities to finance dormitories, 17 clarifying definitions of renewable energy to include geo-18 19 thermal, lengthening the planning period for electric energy 20 efficiency projects to three years to better enable investment in long-term projects and exempting contracts for 21 22 lawyers and financial experts who assist in the transaction 23 from the Procurement Code to better take advantage of favorable market conditions. This exclusion affects only 24 contracts that the IFA is a party to and does not apply to 25 the underlying project and does not affect design or 26 construction contracts. The final change allows for funding 27 of multistate projects. These changes will increase the 28 29 ability of many groups, universities, industrial companies,

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

hospitals and local government to use IFA's financing 1 2 opportunities, leading to more investment by Illinois 3 employers, more jobs for Illinois workers. Senate Bill 1603 4 is supported by several environmental groups, consumer groups 5 and industry groups. I know of no opposition and I ask for an 6 'ave' vote." 7 Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Those ... 8 Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti, in a nick of time." 9 Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Lady yields." 10 11 "Representative, I'm looking at our analysis and it 12 talks about the ability of the Illinois Finance Authority to finance projects outside the state or expands that authority. 13 What... what does that exactly mean?" 14 15 Burke, K.: "So, currently they are... the law allows them to do this for nonprofits and an example would be... and how the 16 nonprofit exception came about is that there was a wave of 17 18 consolidations of hospitals and some of those hospitals operated in more than one state. And so the ability of the 19 Finance Authority to issue bonds to the hospital group to 20 21 finance construction in more than one state was helpful and ... 22 and so, this would be expanded to for-profit entities and that for... and the entities seeking it would have to have a 23 nexus to Illinois, would have to have a significant Illinois 24 context. And it would just allow them to take better advantage 25 of favorable... favorable bonding conditions." 26 Reboletti: "And then it talks about exempting certain bonds from 27 28 the procurement process. What is... if you could give a little

detail on that part?"

64th Legislative Day

- Burke, K.: "So, the bonds themselves would not be exempt from the 1 2 procurement process, but in... in the course of doing this, you 3 have to hire lawyers and some financial experts in order to have the bonds issued. And because that can be a cumbersome 4 5 process to go through the Procurement Code, the IFA is seeking an exemption from the Procurement Code only for those 6 7 professionals in order to take... to... to move things quicker 8 and take advantage of favorable market conditions."
- 9 Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."
- 10 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."
- 11 Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 12 Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."
- 13 Durkin: "Representative, the state is not taking on any additional
- debt with this legislation, correct?"
- 15 Burke, K.: "That's correct."
- 16 Durkin: "And the IFA is strictly a pass-through agency for these
- special financing projects, correct?"
- 18 Burke, K.: "Right, authorized by federal statute and it's called
- 19 conduit financing."
- 20 Durkin: "Thank you very much. And I support the Bill and I
- 21 encourage everyone else to vote 'yes'."
- 22 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record
- 25 yourselves, Members. Feigenholtz, Mell, Morrison. Please take
- the record. On this question, there are 86... 87 voting 'yes',
- 27 26 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having
- received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
- 29 passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Acevedo."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in point of personal privilege."
- 3 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- 4 Acevedo: "I'd like you all please welcome a Page today, Jake
- 5 McNamara, who is a nephew of my assistant, Liz Moody. He's
- 6 here helping out today in the chambers."
- 7 Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 1639, Mr.
- 8 Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- 9 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act concerning
- 10 regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- 11 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- 12 Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1639 is a consumer
- protection Bill that allows an owner of a pet purchased from
- a pet store to have a warranty and to ensure some protections
- 15 within the statute if the dog or the cat has some enumerated
- diseases. We've worked a lot on this in the House to address
- any number of concerns. We've made a lion's share of everyone
- neutral. There's still some concerns with the veterinarians.
- 19 I've committed to the veterinarians. I'll continue to work
- with them over the summer to address their concerns. I'd ask
- for an 'aye' vote."
- 22 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There
- being... your light was on and then it was off and then it was
- on. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- 25 Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, for not texting and recognizing
- me. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 27 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- 28 Reboletti: "Representative, is this puppy lemon law applied to
- other animals that are sold in the... in the store?"

64th Legislative Day

1

Zalewski: "Just dogs and cats, Dennis."

2	Reboletti: "Why haven't we why don't we apply this to any animal
3	that's sold in a pet shop? Why stop at the puppies and the
4	and the kittens?"
5	Zalewski: "I think what what we found is that we can ensure that
6	outbreaks of diseases among dogs, and to a lesser extent,
7	cats, are what we need to be concerned about when when we're
8	dealing with consumer transactions in pet stores. So, that's
9	the pressing policy need."
10	Reboletti: "Now, what are the rules for returning the animal? So
11	I thought the dog is sick or the kitten is sick, when when
12	do I have to bring the dog or the kitten back to the store?
13	How how does the process start?"
14	Zalewski: "So, believe it or not, Dennis, they're these animals
15	are goods under the UCC and we are giving the owner 21 days
16	to return the animal to the pet store."
17	Reboletti: "So, if a dog is sick and I begin to incur a lot of
18	vet bills, I have 21 days to return the animal right now? Is
19	that what the process is? Or this allows for 21 days."
20	Zalewski: "No, right now you don't have those 21 days. We're
21	we're instituting that in the Bill. We're amending that part
22	of the Code."
23	Reboletti: "And do I receive a replacement animal? Do I receive
	negotietet. Ima de i receive a repracement animar. De i receive
24	my money back? Do I receive veterinarian bills?"
2425	-
	my money back? Do I receive veterinarian bills?"
25	my money back? Do I receive veterinarian bills?" Zalewski: "You get your you get So, under the so, under under
25 26	my money back? Do I receive veterinarian bills?" Zalewski: "You get your you get So, under the so, under under the under the under the Bill, if it were enacted, we'd get

64th Legislative Day

1	
1	only making it the purchase price of the animal or you can
2	simply have the veterinarian treat the animal and have your
3	expenses reimbursed."
4	Reboletti: "Who is going to be enforcing this? Is the Department
5	of Agriculture enforcing this, or who's going to be enforcing
6	this?"
7	Zalewski: "The Department of Agriculture. I mean, to the extent
8	there's going to be any enforcement. We're you know, what's
9	good about this Bill is that we've noticed that the pet stores
10	have come forth and and said that they're really this is
11	actually a good best practices Act and we're certain that
12	after this Bill's enacted most of the pet store ownership is
13	going to abide by the law and and do what we're asking them
14	to do in the Bill."
15	Reboletti: "Representative, my conversation with the Department
16	of Agriculture is that they are not enforcing this and this
17	would be a civil issue. Are you…"
18	Zalewski: "Well, they"
19	Reboletti: "are you aware of that?"
20	Zalewski: "I you're right, Dennis. I'd hesitate to say there's
21	enforcement here by the department. I think we're asking them
22	to do some things in the Bill that to help pet owners know
23	their rights, but there's there's no enforcement in within
24	the classic sense of the word."
25	Reboletti: "What about animal shelters, are they included in this
26	legislation?"
27	Zalewski: "No."
28	Reboletti: "Why is that?"
29	Zalewski: "I think"

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

- Reboletti: "I'm certain there's issues with animals that are 1 2 purchased at a shelter." 3 Zalewski: "Representative, I think the policy judgment is that we want to enc... encourage people to use animal shelters. So, you 4 5 know, when you go to a pet store it's a consumer transaction 6 and we'd like the... the consumer to be treated under the law rightfully. A pet shelter is more of a benevolent purpose and 7 we want people to take advantage of a pet shelter and... and 8 9 use their function, so we di... we choose not to include them in the Bill to encourage more use of pet shelters." 10 11 Reboletti: "Back to what the remedies are. What happens if the 12 pet shop isn't in compliance? Do I have to go to court to enforce this? So, I try to return the animal or get some type 13 14 of remuneration?" 15 Zalewski: "It's... Dennis, it's a right of action under a contracts law. So, you'd go to court." 16 Reboletti: "And who's this an initiative of?" 17 18 Zalewski: "The Humane Society." 19 Reboletti: "The Humane Society of the United States? They're the..." 20 Zalewski: "Yes." 21 Reboletti: "How many other states have a puppy lemon law?" 22 Zalewski: "Seventeen." Reboletti: "Thank you." 23 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino." 24
- "Representative Zalewski, I... I appreciate what you're

Mautino: "Thanks, Lou. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

25

26

27

Mautino:

- doing with the le... legislation. The veterinarians have tried 28
- to do something like this a couple of years ago and are in 29

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

support of it generally and on your Bill there's neutral, but 1 2 they are neutral at this point, but they have some concerns 3 and I share those as well. The ... is the date still at 21 days?" "Yes." 4 Zalewski: 5 Mautino: "Okay. The... the big concern from them is with that 6 incubation period usually 8 to 9 days by the time the purchase 7 is made, they had a concern that you went too long out and hopefully that can be addressed..." 8 9 Zalewski: "Frank, you have my word to the extent it's persuasive that I'll encourage the Humane Society and I'll certainly 10 11 facilitate meetings with the veterinarians over the summer to 12 review that 21-day time period. At a certain point, we just felt like we had done our best at this point to get everyone 13 as agreed as they could be, but I know the veterinarians' 14 15 concerns. They... they're certainly value... they're certainly wor... worthwhile. I'd like to see the Bill enacted and ... and 16 see what works and what doesn't and see what we can do to 17 make the veterinarians more comfortable with what we're 18 19 doing." 20 Mautino: "I appreciate that and I take you at your word. I have ... 21 their other two concerns are the Bill is very, very vaque. 22 And most of the veterinarians see a certain number of diseases, but this would draw in other diseases that may not 23 be the problem of the pet shop. And I think the third and 24 final piece is it... is the Bill itself, the way it's structured 25 is pet shops only which is about eight percent of the dogs 26 27 that are out there. Most actually come from animal shelters or from other... other programs which remain unregulated. So, 28 29 you have a very heavy set of regulations for one group, but

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

the bulk of the production areas, and this is a big concern, 1 2 are really uncovered. So, I know that you'll work in the 3 future to those. I can't support the legislation..." Zalewski: "Sure." 4 Mautino: "...at this time because I think it is... it doesn't hit the 5 6 major areas, actually, where a lot of the disease and the 7 problems rely. But I do appreciate you acknowledging that there are concerns from the veterinarians." 8 9 Zalewski: "And to the third concern overall, I would just say, Frank, that I... I mean, this is a heavily negotiated Bill among 10 11 a lot of different entities and to the extent that we can 12 ensure some good practices within the pet store community, who have been really good by the way, about what we're trying 13 to accomplish. It's a good start. I'm not entirely sure that 14 15 there'll be much more ground to cover, but what we're trying 16 to do is just promote some good consumer practices within the 17 pet shop industry." 18 Mautino: "Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost." 19 Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" 20 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." 21 22 Bost: "Now, you explained that it is only puppies and cats, not gerbils or anything like that?" 23 Zalewski: "No gerbils, Representative." 24 Bost: "Okay, just want to check. I... and you also said but it's a 25 26 warm and fuzzy feel good Bill really, right?" Zalewski: "No. I don't... I wouldn't... I didn't... I don't think I 27 used that phrase, Mike. It... it's a Bill that encourages ... it 28

protects consumers and encourages good corporate citizenship

so those are

64th Legislative Day

among pet

stores,

1

2829

5/27/2013

two things

it

the

2 accomplishes." 3 Bost: "So... so, you would feel that it would be positive and 4 something that you want to tell your constituents about and ... 5 and because it's, you know, puppies nobody wants... let me tell 6 you why I'm asking that. Because in our analysis, and... and 7 really, I was not going to get up and speak on this Bill, but in our analysis, now I understand why we have pension Bills 8 9 out here, we have conceal carry, we have Bills of ... of great importance, great importance. And we've not seen this. Now. 10 11 I want to let you know how important this is. The office of 12 the Governor has come... come in as a proponent for this. Can't stand up for any other things we're doing around here but the 13 14 puppy lemon law, you talk about somebody riding issues to the 15 hilt, that's ridiculous. How about he takes positions on other things and that's not directed at you or the legislation, but 16 when the Governor comes out and gives a statement he's for 17 18 this but he can't come here and work on the other issues we've 19 got to work on, then there seems to be a problem." Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney." 20 21 McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." 22 23 McSweeney: "The major concern in this legislation, as a dog lover, 24 what will happen to the dogs that are returned? Will they be automatically euthanized?" 25 Zalewski: "So, David, we don't ... we don't institute any automatic 26 fate, for lack of a better word. They... they go back to the 27

have those diseases is... is how they would treat them."

pet store and whatever the pet store does with animals that

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

McSweeney: "Isn't it likely the dogs would be euthanized?" 1 2 "I... they ... so, in instances they may have to be Zalewski: 3 quarantined and separated from other dogs, David, they may have to be euthanized. I... again, I don't know that there's 4 any one outcome that's preferable under the others... over the 5 6 others." 7 McSweeney: "To the Bill. I respect the Sponsor. This is a bad 8 idea. I urge a 'no' vote." 9 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" 10 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." 11 12 Franks: "Representative, presently there are laws covering these types of transactions under the Uniform Commercial Code or 13 Contract Code that, if one gets an animal with a problem, you 14 15 can... there are remedies available, correct?" Zalewski: "Correct." 16 Franks: "But this seems to go much farther than those remedies 17 18 that are already on the books. Why do we need these additional 19 remedies?" Zalewski: "I think that... I think it's important to note that dogs 20 21 and cats under the Uniform Commercial Code are not technically 22 goods. And... and in addition, Frank... or Jack, I'm sorry, it's important to note that what we're doing is installing good 23 24 consumer protection practices and ensuring that the consumer's protected if they find themselves in a position of 25 unknowingly purchasing a dog from a pet store that has a 26 disease." 27 Franks: "Is there anywhere else in the statutes of the State of 28

Illinois where we warranty a living animal?"

64th Legislative Day

- 7 Zalewski: "Well, but... but to that point, Jack, it's important to
 8 note that the largest pet store company that's involved in
 9 this... in this negotiation already offers a remedy. So, we're
 10 doing that for those that choose to employ good corporate
 11 citizenship practices. What we can't account for is those who
 12 choose not to, so this isn't an outlier in terms of what pet
 13 stores do."
- 14 Franks: "Does this only apply to pet stores?"
- 15 Zalewski: "Yes, yes."
- 16 Franks: "So, it wouldn't apply to a breeder?"
- 17 Zalewski: "No."
- 18 Franks: "Okay. What happens if the… if the animal gets sick within 19 21 days, but it wasn't readily apparent? I know that the
- veterinarian has to say that this was something that was
- 21 latent or happened before 21 days, but how would they actually
- 22 know?"
- 23 Zalewski: "You know, the veterinarian authors a statement, Jack,
- that he, in his medical... he or she, medical opinion, would...
- 25 would conclude that the disease was found on or before the
- date of the sale and that's enough for the pet owner to bring
- the dog back."
- 28 Franks: "Is it rebuttable by another expert? Because oftentimes
- in civil matters we can have two different doctors having

64th Legislative Day

27

28

that question."

5/27/2013

very different opinions. Would this be a rebuttable 1 2 presumption?" 3 Zalewski: "It's... it's subject to a second opinion." Franks: "Okay. Now, what happens if the new owner mistreats the 4 dog and during those 21 days fails to feed properly or to 5 give enough water to the animal and the animal gets sick and 6 7 might have been something that could... exacerbates something that was before the sale?" 8 9 "Again, I think we're relying on the veterinarians' medical opinion that they can discern what was mal... what was 10 11 mistreatment and what was congenital from the disease that should have been noticed at the date of sale." 12 Franks: "Now there's something in here that also continues this 13 out for one year. So, within... this isn't just the first 21 14 15 days. What this says is with when... within 1 year of the sale that the dog or the cat possess a congenital or hereditary 16 condition, so you're extending the 21 days to a full year, 17 18 correct?" Zalewski: "For certain diseases, correct." 19 Franks: "Correct. But oftentimes, if you're dealing with a show 20 21 dog or a highly bred dog, they have ... let's say they're more 22 fragile than other dogs. Wouldn't you agree?" Zalewski: "Jack, your knowledge of this is a little more... is 23 24 deeper than mine about show dogs, but I'll take your word for it." 25 Franks: "No, I'm serious." 26

Zalewski: "I believe you. I don't... I don't know the answer to

64th Legislative Day

- Franks: "Because I've seen, for instance, some dogs are bred 1 2 certain ways." 3 Zalewski: "Right." 4 "You look at a Harlequin Great Dane, for instance, and those that are bred for show, they don't last that long. 5 6 They're much more fragile. They might have a 7-year average 7 life, where those that aren't bred for show might be a 10year life to 12. And I think that if you're breeding for these 8 9 show dogs and they're going to be more delicate and to give ... because there's more inbreeding. Correct?" 10
- 11 Zalewski: "I... and again, Jack, the best answer I can give you is 12 we're putting a lot of faith, and rightfully so, in... in the medical licensure of veterinarians that they're able to 13 discern what's hereditary or congenital in nature and what's 14 15 a disease and what's breed-specific. So, the best answer I can give you is the veterinarians have to make a conclusive 16 statement based on their medical expertise of... of what the 17 18 problem is with the dog."
- Franks: "I... I appreciate it. And to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I'm 19 not going to belabor it. I understand what the Gentleman's 20 trying to do. I think this Bill goes too far. I know it's 21 22 hard to vote against a warm and fuzzy puppy Bill, but this is not, I think, something that's begging for public policy. I 23 think the way it's drafted is it's replete with loopholes 24 that I don't think was intended. I think there's proper 25 remedies right now under the law and there's no reason to 26 extend this based on a feel-good measure. I'd encourage a 27 'no' vote." 28
- 29 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, 1 2 over the past months, once Senate Bills started coming over, 3 many would stand on the floor and say this Bill flew out of the Senate with a hundred percent approval, failing to realize 4 5 that that was about the worst thing you could say. The second 6 worst thing you could say is to have a livestock or an animal 7 Bill of any type and say it's supported by the biggest pariahs in the world that for \$19 a month they will send you a slicker 8 9 and a magazine that says you support the humane treatment of animals. These are the same people that statistically for 10 11 every \$100 you send them \$1, yes, \$1, finds its way to 12 protecting animals. And they have the audacity to put this legislation together. I join my colleagues in 13 kind of encouraging a 'no' vote. Thank you." 14

15 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

"Thank you, Mr. 16 Harris, D.: Speaker. And to the Bill. Representative, I wanted to pick up on what one of the 17 18 previous speakers said. Generally, I support your Bill. However, when you stretched it out to a year, there really is 19 a concern there. Let me give you a specific example. A Bernese 20 21 Mountain Dog, known as a Berner, a beautiful animal, they're 22 absolutely gorgeous. Their life span is about 8 years. They're known to have problems. They're known to have congenital 23 difficulties and to... to stretch that out for a year is... is an 24 unduly, in my mind, an unduly long period of time." 25

Zalewski: "Lou, can I... David, I agree, but it's important to note,
I... I don't agree it's an unduly burdensome time, I agree that
there's a different standard. What I would say is, and again,
I would... I would note that the difference in what came over

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

from the Senate and what's being presented now is a hereditary 1 2 disease is not often detectable within the first couple of 3 months. There's not... this isn't an instance where a veterinarian can go in and in 21 days, three weeks, and say 4 5 I... the diagnosis is x. These... the hereditary disease often 6 take a little bit of time to diagnose. So, while... while there 7 may be some concern amongst some of you about the difference in... in time periods, what I would say in response is this is 8 9 a carefully negotiated Bill that we took those in... concerns into account and hereditary diseases aren't often detectable 10 within the first month and there has to be some accounting of 11 12 that within the statute." Harris, D.: "And I... and I understand and just by way of closing, 13 14 there... the breed that I mentioned is... is predisposed to have 15 these sorts of diseases and these sorts of hereditary problems and they have a very short lifespan." 16 Zalewski: "And I'm reminded, David, in the... under the Bill, in 17 18 the statute, we are allowing special pet shops to go into 19 their warranties and offer a special warranty for the type of 20 dog that you're talking about. It may not be ... address your 21 concerns fully, but we're... there's an accounting of that as 22 well." Harris, D.: "Thank you very much." 23 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close." 24

25 Zalewski: "I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

28

26 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this

question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no'. And this

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

1	Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
2	declared passed. Mr. Mautino."
3	Mautino: "I'd like the record to reflect that on that last vote
4	I intended to vote 'no'."
5	Speaker Lang: "As you said in debate, Sir. The record will reflect
6	your intention."
7	Mautino: "Thank you."
8	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino. Gentleman withdraws his request to
9	speak. Mr. Moffitt."
10	Moffitt: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."
11	Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
12	Moffitt: "Are there any plans by the Speaker to take a few moments
13	in observance of Memorial Day today? And if not, I would like
14	to ask that that we do that, unless you had other plans."
15	Speaker Lang: "Why don't we proceed to do that now, Sir. And we'd
16	be happy to hear your comments."
17	Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the Body taking
18	this time. I think probably everyone in here, thoughts are
19	with constituents and people back in their district and other
20	folks they've known, as Memorial Day is a time to stop and
21	honor and say thanks to those that have served and those that
22	paid the ultimate price for service to our country. Probably
23	had a lot of events that you would have attended had we not
24	been in Session. So, I think we certainly would be remiss to
25	not stop and and give this few moments of reflection to
26	appreciate we're only here as a democracy, as an elected Body
27	because of, over of the generations, those who stepped forward
28	and protected this great democracy and we must never just

take it for granted. We've lost far too many soldiers

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

throughout our history. We had recently the ceremony where we 1 2 reflected and honored those who've fallen in the last year as 3 that list during the current conflict has been a long list. But I hope all of you now, if we could just have a moment of 4 5 silence, will reflect on those who have served and those that 6 have paid the ultimate price. Perhaps a few other people want 7 to make a few comments about Memorial Day and in appreciation of our veterans, perhaps if they had comments and then the 8 9 moment of silence. So, if there are people seeking, I would appreciate they'd be recognized and then you call for the 10 moment of silence." 11

12 Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Moffitt. Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll direct everybody's attention 13 14 to the SJ-R today. They had an err... editorial in there about 15 Tuck Belton. Tuck Belton was World War II heavy bomber pilot and flying over Holland, flak hit his plane, blew him out of 16 the windshield with one arm in the parachute. He was the only 17 18 one that made it down alive. He spent the next several weeks with the Dutch underground and faced many challenges which 19 you'll be able to read in that paper. And it's because of 20 heroes like that that we're here today. And so, I'd encourage 21 22 everybody to take a moment and look at the Springfield Journal editorial page. Thank you." 23

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kifowit."

24

25 Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Representative
26 Moffitt and all that was said. Last Wednesday, Representative
27 Harris reminded us of the gravity of Memorial Day with the
28 large amount of casualties that we've had over the years.
29 Every Memorial Day, I wear my uniform in memory of those that

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

45

6

7

8

1011

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

came before me and those that have died serving. Also, in the Aurora area we've lost quite a few and I know that everybody here has a heavy heart for those that have gone before us so that we can live in a nation that's free for all. And so, I'd just like to thank the chamber for having their memorial service on Wednesday. And I'd like to, also, in commemorate of Memorial Day that we... we give those honor for those that are no longer with us."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it was mentioned the other day on the floor we have a... we have a really unique tie in the State of Illinois to Memorial Day in the fact that our... one of the persons that is actually mentioned in the Illinois Song, General John A. Logan, who was Senator John Logan, then requested that the... and established Memorial Day for the fallen from the Civil War. Ever since then, there's not one American that has faced a time without at least war in their life. It's... it's a tragedy; it's... it is hard on all of us. But this day is to remember those who have stood in the gap, who are willing to go forth and sacrifice all so that we can have the freedoms to stand on this floor and arque back and forth and know that... and have elections and know that those elections are not a case where someone will rise up and overthrow the one who's elected, but yet we do it in a manner that is right, in a manner that many countries don't even understand. And those freedoms that we have been blessed with, they didn't come without a price. They came with a price that we remember on this day and... and we also remember on Veterans Day. I spoke the other day about the challenges of serving

64th Legislative Day

1 2

5/27/2013

but even more the challenges of being a parent of someone who serves. You know, when you send them off you don't know. You worry, you... you fret; it pulls at your heartstrings. But yet, we in this nation have been raised in a manner that we know to stand for this idea, this experiment that was started 200-plus years ago to make sure that it is still working and working successfully with what the ideas of our forefathers had put forth. And unfortunately, there's times that you have to stand to hold on to those ideas and beliefs. Today I want to thank the men and women that did do that and the families that'll... that raised the children who understood the importance of that and were willing to go forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

14 Speaker Lang: "Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today I had the opportunity to have a press conference mainly for veterans and for everyone on the subject of hepatitis C. I filed the Bill, House Bill 3631, and I was very encouraged to have Members on both side of the aisle attend that press conference. The genesis is of the Bill is I've had a family member that died with hepatitis C. And there's many people in this country and also many veterans, especially those who served in Vietnam, that are walking around today not knowing they have hepatitis C. Once you have it, there is treatment to try and keep you alive, but like I said, there's so many veterans and people out there that don't know that they have hepatitis C, they're walking... they're brothers, sisters, husbands, wives that are walking all over the state and all over the country. And I'd just like to make an awareness that anyone that's born from

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

the years 1945 to '65 please get treated, get a test and see 1 2 if you are carrying the hepatitis C virus. Since I filed the 3 Bill last Thursday, there hasn't been a day gone by on this 4 House Floor or outside these chambers where somebody came up and told me that they had a loved one that died of hepatitis 5 6 C. So, we know it is a silent epidemic and I'd just like to 7 get the Bill passed and thank my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, that are trying to get this 8 9 Bill heard and find out if we can stop hepatitis C and at least let the people know that have it that... that there is... 10 11 there is not a cure, but there's something that can be done 12 on it and just to make an awareness to get yourself tested. Thank you." 13

14 Speaker Lang: "Representative Hatcher."

15 Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we are graced in this Body to have a number of people who have served and put 16 themselves in danger. I am graced to be the wife of a veteran, 17 18 someone who came back from Vietnam battered and bruised and permanently disabled, but he came back and many did not. And 19 20 I think we need to remember that for many mothers and fathers 21 and brothers and sisters, every day is Memorial Day because 22 someone was left on the battlefield. So, let's all remember that, that the ripple effect of war and the peacekeepers from 23 America around the world make all the difference, not only in 24 the world's peace, but in the peace in each family. Thank 25 you." 26

27 Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "I'd like to just simply add to the remarks of the others by thanking all the veterans' groups and the individuals and

64th Legislative Day

1 2

5/27/2013

the old soldiers who come out on this day and pull out the faded Confederate uniform and plan for the ceremony and prepare remarks and actually hold something so dear to us as a remembrance for those who died. And I think we often take for granted, as we may be the ones simply marched in the parade and waving to the crowds, but somebody behind that actually planned it and took the care to plant the flags and get the honor guard together, and for those I'm very thankful. I'm thankful that we still remember how important our veterans are and especially those who died for our freedom. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Jefferson."

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm reminded today of a young man from my hometown in Waco, Texas, who fought in the

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm reminded today of a young man from my hometown in Waco, Texas, who fought in the Japanese War as it relates to Pearl Harbor. His name was Doris Miller. He was a cook at the time on one of the battleships and during the battle, he actually ran out and got in touch with artillery gun and shot down two of the enemy planes. And you know, we oftentimes talk about freedom is free and how free we are. Our freedom is free only because of the people that make the ultimate sacrifices. The people that are at the forefront protecting us and doing the things we need to do to continue to be free. So, I would honor all those veterans that's gone on before us today and all the veterans that's served in this country to make sure that we are... do have the freedom that we have. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Terry Parks was still here, he would have passed out something for each and every last one of us to read and I remember what he used to pass out to

64th Legislative Day

1	me and I would like to take the opportunity to say it. I am
2	your flag, respect me and protect me and never forget me. I
3	am your American flag. Thank you."
4	Speaker Lang: "In honor and memory of veterans, we'll take a
5	moment of silence. Thank you very much. Representative
6	Davis."
7	Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
8	House. Certainly in this last few days of Session there are
9	a number of young people that are coming here to act as Pages.
10	Many of them are out of school now, so they're coming here to
11	observe what we're doing and maybe even have the opportunity
12	to make a few extra dollars for themselves for the summer.
13	So, I'd like the Body to recognize a young lady that's here
14	as a Page for me. She was here yesterday and she's here again
15	today. If you'll give me a join me in welcoming Miss Leah
16	Newman to the House Floor, I would appreciate it."
17	Speaker Lang: "On page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1817,
18	Representative Tracy. Representative Tracy. Out of the
19	record. Senate Bill 1830, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the
20	record. Senate Bill 1842, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record.
21	Senate Bill 1843, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Please read the
22	Bill."
23	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act concerning
24	criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
25	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."
26	Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
27	House. House Bill 1843 just clarifies language regarding
28	probation departments and who collects the probation fee when
29	a probationer is transferred. It's an initiative of Illinois

64th Legislative Day

1	Probation and Court Services Association. I know of no
2	opponents."
3	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The
4	Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
5	Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
6	Hoffman: "Yes."
7	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
8	Reboletti: "Thank you. Representative Hoffman, what what
9	currently happens? I know when I was a prosecutor there was
10	always issues when cases were transferred, sometimes, not
11	only from other counties but especially other states and who
12	was supposed to get the fees. How is that determined now?"
13	Hoffman: "It's my understanding that what what I can tell you
14	what this does. I'm not exactly sure how it's determined now.
15	But this provides that a transfer case that originates in
16	another state under the Interstate Compact for Juveniles,
17	probation fees may only be imposed and permitted by the
18	Interstate Commission for Juveniles. Currently, the
19	Commission does not allow the receiving jurisdiction to
20	charge probation fees. However, if that changes, Senate Bill
21	1843 would allow the jurisdiction to charge the fees."
22	Reboletti: "So, right now there is no fee charge, but
23	prospectively, if it changes federally, then we can go ahead
24	and we can get fees?"
25	Hoffman: "If the Interstate Compact changes so, right now
26	they're they're not allowed to. This would say if there is
27	a change in the future they would be allowed to."
28	Reboletti: "That makes sense. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

1	Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
2	'no'. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have
3	all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Tryon. Please
4	take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes',
5	0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the
6	Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair
7	recognizes Mr. DeLuca. The Chair doesn't recognize Mr.
8	DeLuca. Senate Bill 1872, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
9	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1872, a Bill for an Act concerning
10	criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
11	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
12	Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 18 Senate Bill 1872 is a
13	criminal justice reform measure. We are seeking to modify and
14	modernize the prostitution statute by removing the felony
15	aspect of it and getting some mental health treatment within
16	the statute for those that need it. It's been shown that the
17	the felony enhancement on this particular statute is not is
18	not does not bear fruit. So I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
19	Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill.
20	The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
21	Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
22	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
23	Reboletti: "Representative, we added an Amendment to this Bill
24	and I appreciate your sponsorship of that. That Amendment
25	allowed for mental health treatment. Is that is that
26	correct?"
27	Zalewski: "Correct."
28	Reboletti: "And that's because we recognize that most of the men

and women that are in prostitution are there because they are

64th Legislative Day

2829

5/27/2013

victims usually of domestic violence, emotional, physical, 1 2 you name it. They have been through the wringer and they end 3 up in this unfortunate position. And so we're trying... if... since we are reducing the potential penalty, that we're going 4 to try to direct these individuals into treatment. I know 5 6 Cook County has the WINGS Program and I think you and I are 7 going to work on a trailer Bill with that to correct some 8 language. Is that ... is that fair to say?" 9 Zalewski: "Cor... correct, Dennis." Reboletti: "And then, when a county has a mental health court, 10 we're going to do some clarification language also that would, 11 12 hopefully, the counties that have a mental health court recognize the need to direct people convicted or supervised 13 under this prostitution statute, that they go, get the mental 14 15 health care that they need as well as substance abuse, survivor care, you name it, that this would be available to 16 them. Is that fair to say?" 17 Zalewski: "Correct. And I thank you, Dennis, for working with us 18 19 on this. It's... it's... your opinion is persuasive on what we can do to modernize our Criminal Code. So, thank you." 20 Reboletti: "And I appreciate that and to the Bill. Ladies and 21 22 Gentlemen, there's very few times that I sat on this floor and look at changing the penalties and actually reducing the 23 penalties. And I have prosecuted these cases where you can 24 elevate prostitution cases to a felony pretty easily. But 25 that approach has not been working. We still see the same 26 amount of individuals returning. They're not getting any type 27

of substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment and I

think this is a commonsense approach. At the end of the day,

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

- if this doesn't work, we can always return back to the current 1 2 approach. But that's not what the intention is here. I think 3 this is no different than people who are addicted to narcotics or that have mental health issues and they should be similarly 4 5 treated. So, I'd urge your support. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury." 6 7 Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields." 8 Drury: "Representative, you're... you're... we just heard from another 9 Representative who is a former Assistant State's Attorney. 10 11 You, too, are a former Assistant State's Attorney. Is that 12 correct?" Zalewski: "Yes." 13 Drury: "And would you agree based on your experience with... with... 14 15 in that position, that one of the most vile crimes that exists anywhere is the crime that involves the molestation of a 16 child?" 17 Zalewski: "Yes. But Scott, before you go any further, did... did 18 19 you not equate anything that we're doing in this Bill with... with molestation of a child." 20 21 Drury: "Well, we're going to get there." 22 Zalewski: "Okay." Drury: "I mean, and as a state, we should be doing whatever we 23 24 can to... with our criminal laws, to prevent the molestation of
- 26 Zalewski: "Correct."

25

young children."

27 Drury: "And the statute that you seek to amend... Well, let me ask

you this. That if we knew that there was a person who was

64th Legislative Day

1	promoting the molestation of a child, we should try to stop
2	that, shouldn't we?"
3	Zalewski: "Yes, but Scott, I'm going to ask you again to not
4	pursue this line of questioning within the context of what
5	this Bill does because it's inaccurate."
6	Drury: "Well, the the statute that you seek to amend currently
7	has an enhancement. It makes it a felony enhancement if a
8	person is convicted of both prostitution and promoting
9	juvenile prostitution. Correct?"
10	Zalewski: "Yes."
11	Drury: "Okay. And promoting juvenile prostitution is a nice way
12	of saying promoting the rape of a child."
13	Zalewski: "Yes. But Scott, I'm going to ask you kindly as a fellow
14	caucus member and as a person who has significant law
15	enforcement experiences to cease and desist this line of
16	questioning 'cause it's simply inaccurate. It doesn't it's
17	not bearing out in the statistics and it's not borne out in
18	the statute that this is what we're doing. We're not affecting
19	anything to do with a child. What we're saying is the felony
20	enhancement for prostitution isn't working and therefore
21	mental health treatment is a better course of action."
22	Drury: "Representative, this Bill gets rid of a felony enhancement
23	that is a tool prosecutors have to fight juvenile
24	prostitution."
25	Zalewski: "And you heard in testimony and you heard subsequently
26	that there is no statistical evidence, none, that prosecutors
27	are losing any tool by doing this change to go after those
28	that would victimize children. So, to pursue the line of
29	questioning that this affects anything to do with children is

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

simply inaccurate. It's wrong and it's inaccurate and it 1 2 misleads the Body." 3 Drury: "Well, I... Representative, I appreciate those comments, but I'm looking at the actual statute, 'cause this was marketed 4 as a Bill that would simply make prostitution a misdemeanor. 5 But what is crossed out in this Bill, and I'm asking if this 6 7 is correct, you cross out all the enhancements for promoting juvenile prostitution, soliciting for a juvenile prostitute, 8 9 keeping a place of juvenile prostitution and juvenile pimping or aggravated juvenile pimping. Those are all crossed out of 10 this Bill." 11 Zalewski: "Is that a question?" 12 Drury: "Yeah. Is that right?" 13 Zalewski: "Yes." 14 Drury: "Okay. And..." 15 Zalewski: "But... but again, the testimony in committee and what 16 was... what was subsequently provided to Members upon their 17 18 request was statistical evidence that showed, that demonstrated, that there were no instances where a prostitute 19 was arrested under the Codes that we're deleting. So, 20 21 therefore, to suggest that we're in any way endangering the 22 life or health or safety of a child based on this Act, is 23 disingenuous." Drury: "Well, I actually received data from those same people 24 showing that these statutes are used. But Mr... Representative, 25 I mean, you know that I'm a former federal prosecutor, right?" 26

Zalewski: "Yes. Yes. The answer's yes."

27

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Drury: "Okay. And as a federal prosecutor were you aware that I actually worked on these cases with some of these... some of these kids who are molested by... by these pimps?"

4 Zalewski: "You mentioned that in committee, Scott."

5 Drury: "And do you know that these sickos beat little kids?"

Zalewski: "Scott, are you suggesting that in... in this Bill, that if we were to enact this Bill, that anything would happen to the life or safety or health of a child? Because if you are, that, based on the evidence that was provided by the advocates for this Bill, it would be inaccurate and misleading to the Body to suggest that that's... We can go down this path of what's possible, but I'm telling you what the statistics evidence bears out and the fact that law enforcement didn't weigh in on this Bill and say no, they're opposed, to me reinforces the idea that we're not doing what you seem to suggest we're doing."

Drury: "All right. To... to the Bill. Members, this Bill, it's important that we listen to it because this Bill is a prochild prostitution Bill. We... we can moan all we want, but there's a lot of bad Bills that come before this chamber. This ones in a league of its own. The proponents claim that it merely makes prostitution a misdemeanor and if that were true, if that's all it did, this Bill would be fine. But what this Bill is doing is its pulling the wool over the eyes of all of us or trying to. This Bill is taking away a weapon that prosecutors have to deter people from engaging in juvenile prostitution. Do we want to have a headline tomorrow that says Illinois votes to protect child rapists and pimps? I certainly don't. It is our duty to... to make sure that we

64th Legislative Day

- have statutes that protect the kids, that don't have statutes 1 2 that get rid of felony enhancements that allow, where someone 3 is involved in prostitution and juvenile prostitution that takes away a weapon that we have. Now, I know there's some 4 5 law enforcement agencies that have been neutral or... or somehow 6 supported this Bill, and quite frankly, as someone who worked 7 with these children and has... have seen the horrors that these crimes inflict upon children, I don't know where that's coming 8 9 from. This Bill should not get a single vote. This one should go down 118 to nothing. It is that bad of a Bill. And I don't 10 11 normally say that and I don't normally speak up like this and 12 I don't normally use my background to talk about Bills like this. This is a horrible Bill for the children of our state. 13 Thank you." 14
- 15 Speaker Lang: "We have gone from no speakers to six speakers. Mr.
- 16 Durkin."
- 17 Durkin: "Thank you. Representative Zalewski, I just want to make
- sure, is the State's Attorney of Cook County supportive or
- 19 neutral on this issue?"
- 20 Zalewski: "We're checking, Jim."
- 21 Durkin: "Thank you."
- 22 Zalewski: "Proponent, Representative."
- Durkin: "Thank you. 'Cause I think it's important 'cause we just heard... previously heard statements about, and I'm not going to get into that, but the State's Attorney of Cook County last year, a few of us remember, created a whole human trafficking statute which is going to go after and will seriously investigate and charge those individuals who are responsible for putting juveniles out in the street and

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

selling them as sex slaves. And the fact is, our laws are very strong and it was this Body who did this two years ago. But I come from a... from a background of working at a place called 26 California. My friend, Representative Reboletti, worked at a very high volume courtroom in Will County. Twentysix California is the busiest courthouse in the United States for criminal cases. I was there from '90 to '95. There was not a felony prostitution statute in place at that point. But on any given day in one of those courtrooms there was probably in every courtroom no less that 10 to 15 first degree murder trials, anywhere from another 15 to 20 sexual assault trials, cases that are awaiting for trial, hundreds of narcotics cases, armed robbery and some of the most egregious cases that have occurred and some of the cases people can't even believe that human beings do to each other. But I will say this, the people that I know who work in the State's Attorneys' Offices throughout the State of Illinois believe that felony prostitution should not be in those courtrooms. Those individuals who are charged with this need help. They do not need to be sent off to the Department of Corrections for a term of imprisonment. I don't believe that the past practices... When this was put in, I was not in the State's Attorneys' Office when it was upgraded to a felony, but I know that it's no longer the right thing to do. I believe that the statements that were previously made are inaccurate. We are not decriminalizing, lowering the penalties for the ... some of these crimes and some of these issues that were raised by the previous speaker. I've worked in those courtrooms. I know the people who are responsible for trying these cases

64th Legislative Day

7

8

9

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

and I know the police officers who are in charge of investigating these types of crimes and they all agree that these individuals need help. They don't need to be warehoused.

Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, you spoke previously in debate, Sir."

Reboletti: "My name was used in debate, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate, so I'd like to address some of the comments of the previous speaker. And it's amazing where I sat in courtrooms and dealt with these issues and for somebody to tell me that if I vote for this Bill that I'm pro-child prostitution is completely absurd. I have an 11-year-old child, so don't tell me about my parenting or what I stand for. That's absolutely bonkers. It's amazing that I sat for 8 years in a courtroom prosecuting felony prostitution, misdemeanor prostitution, child sex crimes, thousands of them. But if you're a white-collar prosecutor on 219 South Dearborn Street, it's a whole different world there. So, at the end of the day, this is the right thing to do. This shouldn't get 118 'no' votes and to listen to the Sponsor of the Bill be treated in the same way is terrible. That Gentleman also prosecuted for Cook County and handled thousands of cases where you're managing caseloads of hundreds of cases and you're trying to do the best that you can and then you bring your experience to the General Assembly only to be told that if you're an Assistant State's Attorney that that experience means basically nothing down here. I can't believe what I just heard come from the other side of the aisle. It's amazing. I know that people may have

64th Legislative Day

- differences of opinion on this Bill and I realize that change 1 2 isn't easy, but the process isn't working. That's why we have 3 drug courts, mental health courts, veterans' courts, you name it. We try to defer people to get treatment and get help and 4 5 to keep them off the streets and make them productive citizens 6 because our job is to rehabilitate those that end up in the 7 system. This system, so far, for the felony of prostitution, isn't working. I've prosecuted those cases. They would get a 8 9 felony conviction, go to Stateville, be out in 61 days and be back on the street without any treatment, without any type of 10 opportunity. They can't find a place to live, they can't find 11 12 a place to work and then what happens? What we... what will happen, though, is someone will tell us that you're pro-child 13 prostitute if you have the courage and the belief that we can 14 15 change something and make a difference. Sometimes things that 16 are said on this floor are absolutely breathtaking and those statements were some of them." 17
- 18 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."
- 19 Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 20 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 21 Martwick: "Representative Zalewski, some comments made about
- 22 taking away certain tools for prosecuting. Are you familiar
- 23 with 720 ILCS 5/11-14.4?"
- 24 Zalewski: "Rob, I'm going to go ahead on a limb and say that I
- don't know that citation off the top of my head."
- 26 Martwick: "Yeah. Well, that's the... actually, that's the statute
- 27 that speaks directly to the crime of promoting juvenile
- 28 prostitution. So, when you take away the felony enhancement,
- you're not changing that statute at all are you?"

5/27/2013

64th Legislative Day

-

- 1 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 2 Martwick: "So that tool still exists for a prosecutor to charge
- 3 someone for promoting juvenile prostitution?"
- 4 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 5 Martwick: "And the crime under that statute is a Class I Felony
- 6 except for certain enhancements in there where it's up to a
- 7 Class X Felony. Isn't that right?"
- 8 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 9 Martwick: "And that's punishable by 6 to 60 years. Let me repeat
- that, 6 to 60 years in a state penitentiary. Is that correct?"
- 11 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 12 Martwick: "And this Bill does not change that statute in one bit,
- 13 right?"
- 14 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 15 Martwick: "So, we can still prosecute people for this crime and
- 16 we can punish them to the full extent of the law."
- 17 Zalewski: "Correct."
- 18 Martwick: "Thank you."
- 19 Zalewski: "Thank you."
- 20 Martwick: "Nothing further."
- 21 Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."
- 22 Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 23 Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."
- 24 Williams: "Representative, are you aware that I am not a
- 25 prosecutor? I've never prosecuted a case, federal and
- otherwise."
- 27 Zalewski: "I am aware of that, yes."
- 28 Williams: "So, therefore, I have to rely on the experts to tell
- 29 me how the prosecution of situations like this and cases like

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

5/27/2013

this moves forward. So, I spent some time before this Bill appeared before to the Judiciary... before the Judiciary Committee, spoke with the Cook County State's Attorney and spoke with the Sheriff's Office about the merits of this Bill. And they assured me that this is very consistent with strong prosecutions of people that traffic other human beings. You'll also note, in a list of proponents, it includes the Cook County Public Defender. So, we have an array of proponents that realize this is the best approach to go after the trafficking of human beings and that making it a felony is exactly what one of the previous speakers said and just warehousing human beings and it has not worked and it has not deterred this activity."

14 Zalewski: "Correct."

15 Williams: "To the Bill. When I was at the Attorney General's Office, not prosecuting, but as a Legislative Director there, 16 we worked for years on something called the CLEAR Initiative. 17 18 And this basically encompassed a complete rewrite of the 19 Criminal Code. And in that time, when we reviewed hundreds and thousands of pages of changes to the criminal statutes, 20 there were some crimes that were crossed out. But that was 21 22 all about words and drafting and not about actually prosecution. I think that's the case here. We've took... we've 23 taken some language, we've changed it. Prosecution for these 24 things is not something that we wish to eliminate or will 25 eliminate in this. I would urge an 'aye' vote and want to 26 27 thank the proponents from all perspectives for their support 28 on this very important initiative."

29 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative 1 2 Zalewski, I... I truly appreciate you moving this Bill forward. 3 A previous speaker spoke of his extensive experience in the federal system prosecuting. I spent 28 years as an FBI agent. 4 I worked numerous cases from white-collar crime to property 5 6 crime to all kinds of felony cases. My first year in Salt 7 Lake City, Utah, I worked a night shift that dealt strictly with interstate trafficking of prostitution and interstate 8 9 transportation to aid in racketeering for prostitution. Every day, literally every day, I interviewed ladies and young men 10 11 caught up in a world none of us even want to comprehend. I 12 listened to prosecutors today speak on this floor that, to quote a street vernacular, have seen the elephant. They have 13 been there, they understand, they get it. They don't stand as 14 15 elitists, as prosecutors from a higher authority that know so much better than those that are in the trenches working it 16 out, day by day, trying to do the right thing, trying to work 17 18 with law enforcement, trying to work with other prosecutors, rather than tying up a courtroom with ladies and young men 19 that have been caught up in an unbelievable world. 20 21 Gentleman recognizes that we want to get these people 22 treatment. Back in my Salt Lake City days, many years ago, we weren't after the ladies of the night; we were after the 23 Johns, the pimps, the people transferring them from one state 24 to another. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Durkin, 25 Representative Reboletti, Representative Zalewski have all 26 prosecuted these cases at length. They recognize the 27 28 ludicrousness of continuing down a road, a very unfortunate 29 road, of giving these people felony prosecutions. They

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

deserve exactly what the Gentleman is trying to do. I ask him 1 2 to add me as a cosponsor and I ask 118 of you to push your 3 green button. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski to close." 4 Zalewski: "A couple... a couple of things to the Body. We, this 5 6 Session, are in a very serious debate about our Criminal Code. 7 There are times when I agree with many of you and there are times when I disagree with many of you about what we should 8 9 be doing. But on this particular issue, I urge you to look at the Bill and realize we have something on the books that 10 11 doesn't make sense. And I would never put anyone in the Body 12 in the position of hurting a child by their switch or doing something to endanger the life and health of a child. I simply 13 wouldn't allow it. So, just think about that and realize that 14 15 in the context of the many things we have to do down here, this is one thing that makes sense. And within the constructs 16 of the Criminal Code, we can accomplish something that gives 17 18 people treatment while maintaining, mind you, a Class A 19 misdemeanor which is still a significant penalty. So, I would never do anything to make people do ... jeopardize the life and 20 health of a child. This Bill doesn't do that. It ... it simply 21 22 doesn't. It's a good Bill; it's got a significant number of cosponsors. And I ask the Body to vote for it." 23 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 24 25 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who 26 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Davis, Golar, Jackson, Jefferson, Tabares, 27 Yingling. Please take the record. On this question, there are 28 29 82 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

64th Legislative Day

Reboletti: "Thank you."

adopted. Mr. Clerk."

26

27

28

29

5/27/2013

1	received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
2	passed. Senate Bill 26, Representative Feigenholtz. Please
3	read the Bill."
4	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning public
5	aid. Second the Bill's on the Order of Senate Bills-Third
6	Reading."
7	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"
8	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 26 is on Third Reading."
9	Speaker Lang: "Please move this back to the Order of Second
10	Reading for an Amendment and read the Bill."
11	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning public
12	aid. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.
13	Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is
14	offered by Representative Feigenholtz."
15	Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
16	Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 is a
17	technical cleanup Amendment. I'd be glad to answer any
18	questions."
19	Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti on the Amendment."
20	Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair."
21	Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry."
22	Reboletti: "What's the status of Floor Amendment #3?"
23	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."
24	Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3 has been approved for
25	consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment shall say 'yes';

opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is

64th Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments have been approved for 1 2 consideration. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed. 3 All notes that have been requested have been filed." Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 4 26." 5 6 Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 26, a Bill for an Act concerning public 7 aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz." 8 9 Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 26 is a historic Bill. It is a Bill that will enable the Department of Health 10 11 and Family Services to begin and op... and take advantage of an 12 opportunity from the Affordable Care Act that will extend basic health care to people in this state who have 13 historically been uninsured, childless adults between the 14 15 ages of 18 and 64. The Bill is made up of five components: the Medicaid expansion Bill, the Medicaid reform, some SMART 16 Act Amendments, provider-based managed care. There's a 17 18 Section about nursing homes and specialized mental health reabation... rehabilitation facility. I'd be glad to answer any 19 20 questions."
- 21 Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair
- 22 recognizes Mr. Reis."
- 23 Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 24 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 25 Reis: "Representative, is this better known as implementation of
- Obamacare in Illinois?"
- 27 Feigenholtz: "Some call it that, Representative."
- 28 Reis: "So, it could be construed as saying that, right?"
- 29 Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry?"

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Reis: "It could be taken that that's what it's doing, is it... it's
- 2 implementing Obamacare in Illinois."
- 3 Feigenholtz: "It's the first piece."
- 4 Reis: "Actually, I thought we passed the first piece last year
- 5 when we did it for Cook County."
- 6 Feigenholtz: "No."
- 7 Reis: "Okay. Whatever."
- 8 Feigenholtz: "That was a waiver to implement it."
- 9 Reis: "Whatever the case. So, in 2003 when... when Blagojevich took office, there was about 1.63 million people on Medicaid. Now, 10 11 we're at 2.9 million and we're getting ready to add another 12 500 thousand people. There are a number of states that are opting out of this because they can't afford it. We're adding 13 500 thousand more people to our Medicaid rolls. We talk about 14 15 the pension crisis in this state, pension crisis. We can't fund anything because we have a pension crisis. We have a 16 public aid crisis. It's 54 percent of our budget. And now, 17 18 we're getting ready to add what many conservative analysts think another billion and a half dollars to our state 19 expenditures. How convenient. We do pension reforms so that 20 21 we can pay for the implementation of Obamacare. So, we really 22 didn't do anything to our fiscal challenges by passing pension reform, we just shifted it to something else. Now, once you 23 opt in you can't opt out. This is something that we can take 24 a look at this fall to see if, in fact, it's going to be 25 implemented at the rate it's going to. I think there's other 26 27 states that are sitting back and... and saying, holy cow. Even the Director Hamos said this is a train wreck. We don't know 28 29 how we're going to afford this. So, I think it's ill-conceived

64th Legislative Day

- that we're doing this right now. There's time to do it this
 fall, if that's the case. We can see what's happening at the
 federal level, but we are adding 500 thousand new people to
 Medicaid. We can't pay for what we have now, why would we add
 more? I would encourage a 'no' vote."
- 6 Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."
- 7 Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor
- 8 yield?"
- 9 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- "Thank you. Representative Feigenholtz, with this Act... 10 I just want to make sure that the Body understands all the 11 12 major other provisions before we start speaking of them that are in Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 26. Number 1), the Medicaid 13 expansion; Number 2), the RUG issue with the nursing homes 14 15 that I think a lot of people would like to support because they feel it's necessary to start basing care in nursing homes 16 on acuity. Number 2), a major initiative on... with the 17 18 hospitals that a lot of people would like to support and care about also is managed care and care coordination and making 19 sure that our hospitals are okay in the transition of those 20 21 and with the ACEs and everything that goes together with care 22 coordination. Number 3), the SMURF Act, which is a major initiative regarding the IMDs in Illinois and how we treat... 23 how we care for people with mental illness. And 4), another 24 major part of the Act is the trailer Bill to the SMART Act 25 and that incorporates a lot of... not a lot... but some important 26 changes that a lot of people would like to have take place, 27 also, especially those of us that cared about the medically 28 29 fragile children, lifting that 500 percent. There are several

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

5/27/2013

issues in there regarding epilepsy, drugs. But the first that I'm going to speak to is the Medicaid expansion because I think that is probably one of the most important changes in health care, not only in the State of Illinois, but in the entire United States. So, this day is probably one of the most important votes that you are ever going take in our state regarding the health care. So, I want to just clarify that all of us, I think our mission is to sustain the Medicaid program in Illinois. We spent a lot of time on addressing that issue last year. The Governor asked us to come in with \$2.6 billion in cuts in order to sustain that system. And still, as of July of this year, our Comptroller has told us we are going to again have seven and a half billion dollars' worth of bills. So, we want to address the Medicaid system and we want to provide the most fragile population in Illinois, we want to provide them a medical home with their own primary care physician. We want to provide them good access to health care and we want to provide them quality health care. What we're moving forward with now, I'm not sure that we're going to have that as the results that we would like to have. So, I'm going to ask you some questions on that. Do you find that under the U.S. Supreme Court decision the Medicaid expansion and the ACA Act is an optional expansion and there is no deadline for states as to whether they want to expand the eligibility and then we could opt in at any time?"

27 Feigenholtz: "Representative, are you asking me if this is optional?"

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Bellock: "Yes. If the expansion is optional and you can opt in at
- 2 any time?"
- 3 Feigenholtz: "Yes."
- 4 Bellock: "Thank you. Okay. So..."
- 5 Feigenholtz: "I'd also like to add, Representative, that in early
- discussions, people had concerns that if the Federal
- 7 Government ever dropped its commitment beneath 90 percent for
- 8 the duration that we could opt out. We put that in the Bill
- 9 as a safeguard. People should understand that it is in this
- 10 Bill."
- "We've had that discussion before. I'm just going to 11 Bellock: 12 touch on it because others who are speaking will also and I know that that's a topic of discussion in Washington right 13 now, as we are here today. But what I can tell you after 14 15 researching this for the last month that what I have found out is that even though Kathleen Sebelius, who's the head of 16 HHS in Washington, has sent out a notification about this, 17 18 the Supreme Court and all the other lawyers in Washington feel that in order to change that population, that would have 19 to be changed under the Affordable Care Act by the United 20 21 States Congress. The head of HHS cannot make a ruling on that 22 by herself. So, the trigger in this Bill of opting out with those 500 thousand people I don't... Number 1), I don't think 23 24 our Legislature would ever choose to take 500 thousand people off of health care in one day. And 2), I do not think the 25 Federal Government would allow it and there has been several 26 articles in major newspapers quoting that that will not be 27 allowed." 28

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I have a letter from Kathleen 1 2 Sebelius stating that this is an optional program. I think 3 that last year was a watershed year for Medicaid reform here in Illinois where we removed a lot of people who did not 4 5 belong on Medicaid, were not eligible for Medicaid and that 6 was never challenged. We took optional services off of our 7 plans or modified them and we did not hear from the Federal Government about removing or cutting back on those services. 8 9 So, I'm ... I'm pretty convinced that it's a state's right issue and that we would be able to do this." 10

- 11 Bellock: "Well..."
- 12 Feigenholtz: "That's my understanding."

Bellock: "...I think when the Afford... when the Supreme Court made 13 their decision last year, they said that they had found that 14 15 there was coercion in that Bill, that you cannot mandate that all states take the Medicaid expansion and if they did not, 16 they would have to give up their Medicaid population. The 17 Supreme Court said that that is not... that that is coercion 18 and that we would not be allowed to do that. And I do think 19 that Kathleen Sebelius, even though she is the head of HHS, 20 21 that others have said that that law would have to be changed, 22 that right now, that would be considered a mandatory population and I wouldn't classify that as what we did last 23 24 year in the SMART Act. But moving on to what you said, when we did do the SMART Act, one of the major compromises we had 25 in the SMART Act when we brought forward the Obamacare in the 26 27 Cook County hospital, the other part of that Bill was to have the moratorium on Medicaid because we realized at the time, 28 29 all of us almost unanimously in this Legislature, agreed that

64th Legislative Day

1	we were having a hard time. We had \$3 million I'm sorry \$3
2	billion still of unpaid Medicaid bills"
3	Feigenholtz: "Representative, I don't think that any of us
4	predicted the Supreme Court decision on that and it was always
5	presumed that this would be the first phase of the Affordable
6	Care Act."
7	Bellock: "but that figure, when the Governor asked us to cut
8	\$2.6 billion, that figure said that we had, at the time, \$3
9	billion of unpaid Medicaid bills and we were going to try to
10	address that issue. So, we were putting a moratorium on all
11	expansion of Medicaid programs in Illinois until we could get
12	our costs under control. I think all parties agreed to that
13	almost unanimously in the House, in the Senate, and the
14	Governor signed the Bill. Isn't that correct, Representative
15	Feigenholtz?"
16	Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, Representative. I was speaking to
17	Representative another Representative. I could you just
18	repeat the"
19	Bellock: "That's okay."
20	Feigenholtz: "I apologize."
21	Bellock: "I'm just going to reiterate for everybody in the Body
22	that less than 12 months ago, in order to address our
23	unsustainable Medicaid program, we all voted that we would
24	pay off \$2.6 billion worth of bills. And in one of those laws,
25	we said that in order to have Obamacare, what we considered
26	a lot of us disagreed with it to bring that forward for Cook
27	County. In that same Bill, we all vote or the majority voted
28	for a moratorium in Illinois until 2015 on any expansion of
29	Medicaid programs because we wanted to sustain the system,

provide care to those who need it and pay our providers who

were six months to nine months behind in getting paid. Isn't

64th Legislative Day

1 2

5/27/2013

3 that correct?" Feigenholtz: "Representative, it is correct and I think we were 4 5 preparing ourselves for a population of people who live in 6 Illinois who were uninsured, who we already pay for in other 7 parts of our budget. You and I have discussed this. We've experienced it, we've seen it. And ultimately, this is really 8 9 kind of shifting people out of emergency rooms to finally have a medical home. One of the things people have to know 10 11 about this effort is that family physicians are going to get, 12 for the first two years, a Medicare rate on... on this population to bring more physicians into care for people who 13 need it and... and to fi... help them find medical homes to keep 14 15 them out of hospital emergency rooms. I mean, I think that that is really where the driving costs have been. You and I 16 know this. We are paying for this out of our prison lines, 17 18 our county jail lines, our local government lines. We have never gotten one dime of Medicaid match..." 19 "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for order in the chamber, 20 Bellock: 21 please." 22 Speaker Lang: "Representative, I will give you order. However, 23 it's time for you to close your remarks, you've been speaking for quite a while. So, please proceed and... please proceed 24 with your comments." 25 "Okay. Thank you. All right. I'm going to go on to a few 26 Bellock: more other questions that we have. But what my point was, 27 Representative Feigenholtz, is that I feel that this is going 28 29 totally back on the... what we put in place last year on the

64th Legislative Day

1	moratorium until 2015. So, what do you think is the total
2	cost over the next five years of the Medicaid expansion in
3	Illinois?"
4	Feigenholtz: "Representative, I just for a point of
5	clarification, I want you to understand that the moratorium
6	was voted on before the Supreme Court decision. So, there
7	were those of us who predicated this was in before that
8	moratorium. Okay?"
9	Bellock: "I understand that, Representative, but that is the State
10	Law, whether it occurred before or after the Supreme Court
11	decision. The law of the land in Illinois right now is a
12	moratorium on expansion of Medicaid."
13	Feigenholtz: "Representative, I'm going to answer the question
14	about cost."
15	Bellock: "Okay."
16	Feigenholtz: "We are poised to get somewhere between for five
17	years, it's we'll be getting \$9 billion from the Federal
18	Government and it will cost us 200 million."
18 19	Government and it will cost us 200 million." Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not"
19	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not"
19 20	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500
19 20 21	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put
19 20 21 22	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put general revenue out and don't get any money back. We are
19 20 21 22 23	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put general revenue out and don't get any money back. We are finally going to get match and it's going to be matched dollar
 19 20 21 22 23 24 	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put general revenue out and don't get any money back. We are finally going to get match and it's going to be matched dollar for dollar for three years."
 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put general revenue out and don't get any money back. We are finally going to get match and it's going to be matched dollar for dollar for three years." Bellock: "It's the uncertainty of this Bill is the major concern
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Bellock: "I think the cost by the Kaiser Foundation is not" Feigenholtz: "But it's a cost it's a cost shift. It saves us 500 million in our current state-only programs where we put general revenue out and don't get any money back. We are finally going to get match and it's going to be matched dollar for dollar for three years." Bellock: "It's the uncertainty of this Bill is the major concern of a lot of people, Representative Feigenholtz, the

64th Legislative Day

2627

5/27/2013

right here, and I know that you... the uncertainty right here 1 2 is that President Obama, in his budget of 2013, already 3 suggested that there be a change in the rate after the three 4 years. On page 169 in the Government Federal Budget, they 5 have that they will change that rate to a blended rate. So, 6 what the Kaiser Foundation has said..." 7 "Representative, they've taken that off the table. Feigenholtz: 8 That has been very clearly recently taken off the table. That 9 is no longer being considered." Bellock: "I acknowledge that it's taken off the table right now, 10 11 Representative Feigenholtz, but what about in the future? 12 This program... I would like everybody to listen. This program is costing the United States tax dollar \$985 billion. The 13 Federal Government right now has a \$16 trillion debt. The 14 15 debt ceiling talks, which were supposed to have happened in March, have been pushed off to September. And Paul Volcker, 16 who's the head of the SEC, Paul Ryan, who's the head budgeteer 17 18 for the House of Representatives, both have said that every proposal in the debt ceiling talks is going to have a change 19 in the rate and make it a blended rate. The Kaiser Foundation 20 21 has said if we go to a blended rate, that will cost the State 22 of Illinois \$6.5 billion, \$6.5 billion. So, the uncertainty here is huge. When we're looking at the State of Illinois 23 having the worst bond rating in the United States, we have to 24 get on a better fiscal footing. That's our concern, is the 25

Feigenholtz: "Representative, first of all, our Medicaid rates have never been lower. And you asked me what?"

you think are going to be in the newly eligibles?"

uncertainty. How many numbers, Representative Feigenholtz, do

64th Legislative Day

enrolled."

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

1 Bellock: "What are the numbers that are predicted to be on the newly eligibles that we're basing..."

3 Feigenholtz: "Three hundred and forty-two thousand."

Bellock: "Okay. The Kaiser Foundation, which is a nationally known 4 organization, has projected at least 500 thousand in the new." 5 6 Feigenholtz: "So... so, Representative, I can answer that. The... the 7 difference in the number is essentially people who are 8 currently already Medicaid eligible, but they are not 9 enrolled. Let's keep in mind that on January 1 and beginning in this October, everyone will be eligible for health care, 10 whether it be Medicaid or to purchase on the exchange. So, 11 12 people are going to go to the insurance portal whether they're Medicaid eligible or they're going to purchase health 13 insurance. But we do have a significant mon... number of people 14 15 in Illinois who shou... who are currently eligible but not yet

Bellock: "Representative Feigenholtz, I don't think that our rates are lower. I want to say that, right now, as far as the numbers go, an honest figure which the head of HFS used for the three years prior to this was 700 thousand people would be going on to the new expansion. If you want to change that down to 325, you can do that but there are several national organizations that have predicted 500 thousand in the new eligible at 100 percent. But in the woodwork population, which comes on at 50 percent, they're saying at least 180 thousand more. So, whatever you're talking about, it's at least between 500 thousand and 700 thousand new people coming on into the Medicaid system of which we have right now 2.7 million people on already. That is a huge expansion. I think it is the most

64th Legislative Day

- 1 major expansion of Medicaid ever in the State of Illinois.
- When the Federal Government puts this in, are they able to
- 3 put a new maintenance of effort on to us?"
- 4 Feigenholtz: "No, they are not."
- 5 Bellock: "That's in law? I don't think so. They put a maintenance
- of effort on to us a couple of years ago and that's restricted
- 7 us from making some of the major changes in the SMART Act
- 8 that we wanted to do."
- 9 Feigenholtz: "Representative, that would actually take an act of
- 10 Congress. I mean..."
- 11 Bellock: "To implement a MOE?"
- 12 Feigenholtz: "...a Bill would have to pass to do it, yes."
- 13 Bellock: "Okay. I know there are other people that want to speak
- to this issue. So, I'm going to wrap up this part of it and
- talk about, just briefly, the uncertainty. All of us want to
- see this population served with a medical home, a primary
- care physician, good access to quality health care, but with
- all the uncertainties here, number 1), how much is this really
- going to cost the State of Illinois? Is it going to be \$1.5
- 20 billion which the Kaiser Foundation has said or is it going
- 21 to be \$6.5 billion? There's a major uncertainty there. Are
- 22 the rates going to change after three years? We think so. The
- 23 President already suggested that. He has changed the payments
- for hospitals, the DSH payments have already been changed.
- They were going to be cut, now they've been put back in.
- Initially, you could have partial expansion, now Kathleen
- 27 Sebelius has changed that. It has to be all or nothing. There
- have been several changes in the last six months and we all,
- including Paul Volcker, who is the head of the SEC, who knows

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

45

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

5/27/2013

more about finances in the United States than probably any individual, he is totally opposed to the expansion. He has said that every proposal in the debt ceiling talks, because we're at a \$16 trillion debt, will definitely have a change in the rate. The administrative costs, nobody has been able to answer what the administrative costs. The new hires, we're hiring 600 new people, but right now in your local public aid office, like in mine, we have 2500 clients to one case manager. Twenty-five hundred clients of needy people who need services and there is one case manager. That's with 2.5 million people on Medicaid. When you expand that another 500 thousand to 700 thousand, are we going to go to 5 thousand people needing services by one case manager? We can't even get a phone call through to our public aid office. The phones are not answered because they can't... they do not have the time to answer them. I am asking all of you to think of how serious this expansion is. We know we want to serve people, but we also have to look at the status of the financial ability in the State of Illinois. I ask you to defer this decision. We do not have to make this decision now. We can make this decision in Veto Session or we can make it in next spring Session after the debt ceiling talks have taken place and we have more certainty as to what the figures are going to be and how this will affect the State of Illinois. I ask you to vote 'no' on this expansion at this time 'til we have more certainty in our facts and figures and the negative impact on a state that is near financial insolvency now."

- 28 Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."
- 29 Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

1 Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

2 "Representative, I want to preface my remarks by saying 3 what I have said quite a few times, that I do support Medicaid 4 expansion. I have supported it throughout my political career and I think the problems that we're having today is because 5 6 we did not ever, in the State of Illinois, have coordinated 7 and integrated care. That's the reason why it's easy for people to throw numbers around and talk about what all hasn't 8 9 been paid, what all hasn't been done. The reason why it hasn't been paid and hasn't been done because there has never been 10 11 any coordinated care. We've allowed people on Medicaid to go 12 to any emergency room that they wanted to because we figure we wasn't paying the bill and it would never catch up with 13 us. We allowed people to go to various doctors for various 14 15 prescription, no one was watching, no one cared. We hired who we wanted to. We gave contracts to who we wanted to. The 16 hospitals charged what they wanted to. The doctors did what 17 18 they wanted to. And everybody did their own thing and as a result, we had the problems that we have today. And who got 19 the short end of the stick? It was the people on Medicaid. It 20 21 was the children that suffered. It was the poor people of the 22 State of Illinois that has suffered because there has never been coordinated care. Now, if you're really responsible and 23 if you really care about the children, if you really care 24 about the bills being paid, you would make sure that this 25 Bill is done right and the proper care is in place. And I 26 27 would like to begin with saying that this change that we are about to embark upon will give the State of Illinois the 28 29 health care and the delivery that the people well deserve

64th Legislative Day

29

women."

5/27/2013

because we are talking about human beings here. These people 1 2 that we're talking about, they're human, they have children, 3 they have families and they have lost their lives because of the games that we have been playing throughout the years. In 4 regards to the moratorium, I didn't support that. In regards 5 6 to the SMART Act, I did not support that because none of those 7 entities would have done a dog-gone thing to bring continuity, integration and coordinated care into this conversation. 8 9 Representative, I have talked to you on numerous of occasions about some concerns that I have with this Bill. And the list 10 11 that was passed out today at a meeting that we had I would 12 like to ask you some questions. On the list that you passed out, the top of the list, it says restore adult dental. Can 13 14 you explain to me what restore adult dental means? And before 15 you answer that question, I want to also bring to your attention that in regards to dental for pregnant women has 16 also... is already in the Bill. So, explain to me what do you 17 18 mean by restore adult dental?" Feigenholtz: "Are you talking, Representative, about what's in 19 20 the Bill right now?" 21 Flowers: "Yes. This is what was passed out today at the meeting 22 and under subtotal..." "So, Representative, currently in the Bill, this 23 Feigenholtz: Bill actually clarifies that dental procedures are... the 24 following dental procedures are covered. Services necessary 25 for... for other medical procedure such as transplant, 26 extractions and dentures for diabetes or individuals with 27 cancer and services necessary for the health of pregnant 28

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Flowers: "So... well, pregnant women is another line item, so that's 1 2 where my confusion came in. So, would you like to explain the 3 second line that says pregnant adult women? So, is this the 4 same?" Feigenholtz: "Representative, the specific definition, I believe, 5 6 in this is that this does not provide for preventative 7 dentistry, but it does provide for emergency..." Flowers: "So, Representative..." 8 9 Feigenholtz: "...to prevent an emergency, I'm sorry." Flowers: "Okay. Representative..." 10 Feigenholtz: "It's broad." 11 12 Flowers: "...it goes ... The Bill is flawed. The Bill is flawed because if we cannot have regular dental care, the conversation that 13 I just... the conversation that was had on the other side of 14 15 the aisle about the cost and the uncoordinated care because people will continue to go to the emergency room. So, we're 16 defeating our purpose." 17 18 Feigenholtz: "I... Representative..." 19 Flowers: "It costs \$6 thousand to go to the emergency room and it costs less than \$600 to have a doctor's visit. So, where and 20 how will this matter be addressed?" 21 22 Feigenholtz: "Representative, in this Bill, although it isn't a 23 complete restoration of dental, which is a \$40 million cost, it does begin... it does double what... what we currently are 24 doing and provide \$15 million worth of care to people under 25 those provisions. Also, for the entities that are providing 26 27 care through the CCEs and some of the other managed care... managed care pilots that are in the state, many of them are 28 29 providing dental care if the physicians feel..."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Flowers: "But for those who are not, Representative... once again, 1 2 for those who are not, and I am not trying to be difficult, 3 I'm very serious about this. People are dying. They are... they 4 have aches and pains because of something as simple as dental and we've had all of this debate about access to health care. 5 6 What part of dental hygiene or dentistry or access to dental 7 can I carve out from the rest of my body to say that this pain cannot be covered under health care? And why is it that 8 9 we are finding emergency... I'm sorry... finding medical homes for ordinary care, but we cannot find medical homes for 10 dentures or for dentists?" 11 12 Feigenholtz: "Representative, like I said, one of the nice things that I heard recently is that some of these CCEs and managed 13 care entities are providing this service because they view 14 15 this holistically. They also are, like you, thinking about a person as a whole." 16 Flowers: "Well..." 17 18 Feigenholtz: "I... I certainly agree with you that the elimination 19 of dental completely was probably the most egregious thing in the SMART Act and commit to working with you to completely 20 restore it. Unfortunately, we're not able to do it, but we 21 22 have doubled it in this Bill. We have doubled it and I ask you to try and think to not make perfect the enemy of good." 23 Flowers: "And... and Representative, that's exactly my intention. 24 But I have to also have it understood, for the record, just 25 how I feel about this. And when you... I've heard some people 26 mention about the FQHCs. The FQHCs are not being provided the 27 necessary services that is needed in order to do the job 28 29 that's going to be expected of them. FQHCs have been thrown

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

around like they're the be all to the end all, that they're 1 2 going to service all the gaps where, for instance, like in my 3 district, there are FQHCs, there are no clinics, there are no hospitals, there are no access to health care, there are no 4 5 dentists. So, what is it... what type of access to health care 6 will the people in my district have for ... and on the west side 7 of the City of Chicago?" Feigenholtz: "Representative, the..." 8 9 Flowers: "What type of services will they be getting?" Feigenholtz: "...the Affordable Care Act and the expansion is... is 10 11 really focused on... the people who will benefit the most from 12 this are community providers who are taking care of the uninsured and the underinsured." 13 Flowers: "And that's..." 14 Feigenholtz: "This... this is an infusion of dollars to those very 15 providers who have not had any kind of support from the 16 Federal Government for taking care of these people. And 17 18 hopefully, with the infusion of these resources, there will be a much more robust opportunity for them to provide what 19 you are... what you are not... what you claim does not exist in 20 21 your district." 22 Flowers: "Well, I just wanted to bring to your attention that a lot of the... the FQHCs are reducing their dental staff and 23 24 their providers are leaving because of the lack of reimbursement and of... they are begging for private donations 25 just to keep their doors open. But let me just move on. What 26

about dentures and partials?"

27

64th Legislative Day

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "In... in the provision in the Amendment, 1 2 Representative, if you have cancer, if you're diabetic or you 3 need a transplant, you are eligible. Right now, you're not." Flowers: "And so, once again... I want to go back to the Affordable 4 Care Act, Representative, because it's going to be the 5 6 doctor's responsibility and the hospitals, they are going to 7 be paid based on outcomes. They are going to be penalized based on readmissions. And so, if the doctors do all that 8 9 they can and the hospitals do all that they can to prevent people from coming back to the hospitals and then when, the 10 11 end of their contract, they're going to be looked upon in a 12 negative manner because they have... did what they were supposed to do, but because their patient did not have access to 13 dentures in order to digest their food properly and so it 14 15 caused the stomach or the other ailments to expand and get worse and force them to go to the emergency room. What savings 16 is there going to be?" 17 18

Feigenholtz: "Representative, all I know is, is that Senate Bill 26 improves that. It... it is better than what we have."

Flowers: "Of course, Representative. If you have nothing and then you get a little something, it is a little better, but the fact of the matter is that this is supposed to be access to health care. This is a mandate. This is not something that people have a choice in. And so, my question to you, what are the poor people of the State of Illinois is supposed to do since some of them, if they, God forbid, if they were to ever get a job, get off Medicaid and go on to the exchange to get the health care, what are they supposed to do? How do they have a quality of life? How do they have... how do they digest

64th Legislative Day

1	their food? How do they articulate it and are able to talk
2	when they have no teeth and are constantly in pain?"
3	Feigenholtz: "Representative, as I said earlier, we're hoping
4	that this whole transformation of health care and the infusion
5	of this money, the whole reorganizing of health care in this
6	country and in this state is going to provide better access
7	simply by virtue of a new model that we're bringing to this
8	state."
9	Flowers: "Well, if the new model is absent something that is
10	necessary in regards to health care and that is dentistry,
11	and for instance, are we going to fund the universities are
12	we going to fund the University of Illinois in order for the
13	College of Dentistry to keep its doors open so the poor people
14	can continue? And then there's a school downstate, the SIU
15	School of Dental Medicine, are we going to continue to fund
16	those schools?"
17	Feigenholtz: "Rep"
18	Flowers: "So, at least if the poor people cannot get that type
19	of from their that health care from the hospitals or the
20	doctors, they will be able to go to a dental school since a
21	medical doctor is not a dentist."
22	Feigenholtz: "Representative, if you look in the Bill I'm glad
23	you talked about education we are restoring EAM, Excellence
24	in Academic Medicine, which was we're going to be utilizing,
25	through some creative methods, university dollars for
26	teaching hospitals so that we we can increase payments to
27	them by \$27 million. Many of these hospitals none of this is
28	General Revenue by the way many of these hospitals provide
29	these services to people in our community."

64th Legislative Day

1	Flowers: "So, once again, just for the record, I need to ask
2	specifically about SIU School of Dentistry as well as UIC
3	School of Dentistry. Will the moneys be restored to keep those
4	doors open so we can have those students constantly coming in
5	to work on these students because we do like access to
6	dentistry?"
7	Feigenholtz: "If that university is an academic medical school"
8	Flowers: "They are."
9	Feigenholtz: "the answer would be yes."
10	Flowers: "And and can you please elaborate on the access to
11	psychotropic drugs?"
12	Feigenholtz: "Currently, in this particular Bill, there is an
13	exemption for anticonvulsants only for epilepsy treatment,
14	not any other off-label treatment, only for epilepsy."
15	Flowers: "So, why is it that you think there needs to be only the
16	exceptions for epilepsy when there are other issues out there
17	that are medically necessary and the doctors, considering
18	we're once again, we're talking about a health care Bill?
19	You know, this is not about health care and family services.
20	Where is it that it's like a nanny state, you have to go and
21	get permission first. The doctors and the hospitals are the
22	ultimate providers. They're the ones that supposed to be
23	offering and coordinating this care. Why is it that it's being
24	impede by an administrative office?"
25	Feigenholtz: "Representative, I I think you're refor referring
26	to something we did last year that was actually given a very
27	wrong name, which was the four-drug limit. The fact of the
28	matter is, is that we are enlisting the help of pharmaceutical
29	specialists who are reevaluating drug protocols that doctors

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

are giving to patients to make sure that they're not taking too many drugs that are contraindicated. Ultimately, once that is done, that... that list goes down dramatically. Most of the appeals are... 81 percent of them are satisfied and if you want to continue to talk, as many of us are also very interested and share the same concerns you do, we... I saw your Amendment. I think with a few minor tweaks, so that we're specifically addressing certain things, that there may be a possibility that we could accomplish that at no or low... a low cost or no cost. But at this point, it really only takes 30 minutes for prior approval for a doctor to... to get a response about this and the system seems to be working relatively well. Also, many, if not all, patients receive a three-day prescription to get them through a weekend, if that's what the issue is, so that we can reconnect with them on a workday. So, it's actually been a very productive exercise. It's not perfect and we are trying to get all the squeaks out, but in the meantime, we've been able to address patient safety, toxicity issues and save money all at once."

Flowers: "Well, Representative, I appreciate what it is, the hard work and the efforts that you put into this Bill. But I just wanted to remind you that one of the first things that the Affordable Care Act did was to implement the IT in regards to Internet technology to make sure that the... the people that's been floating around trying to get various prescriptions from various doctors, so those items should be in place. So, we should not have the problems in which you just articulated because everything should be on the Internet now. So, once again, I think we should leave that in the hands of the

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

1415

16

1718

1920

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

doctors. But let me just go back to a letter that I received from Dr. Cantor; he is with the Easter Seal Dental program. And basically, he said without the dental benefits, the few hospitals that had accepted our patients for treatment under general anesthesia will only accept the patients in emergency situations. This create a bottleneck and causes our needy patients to suffer for weeks and many times months before they can receive any care... before they can receive any required care. It makes a lot more sense to remove or find a patient badly decayed teeth before the pain and infection sets in. It is not only more humane but probably more costeffective, since it cuts down on very costly emergency room visits, which only postpone the need for definitive dental care. And it goes on to say, if this Bill were to pass without the necessary dental protection, it'll... it will increase psychiatric hospitalization because a lot of these nonverbal patients are being given psychotropic drugs because of their behavior when all they really needed was a little dentist to ease the pain of a toothache. So, I need... I needed to stress that to you so you can better understand the importance. There are some nonverbal people who are disabled. They are in pain because they need a tooth extracted. And instead of going to the dentist, they are being given psychotropic drugs. Representative, I don't think that is the intent of what it is that you're trying to do. And I know that it is more important for me to focus in on the 500 to 800 thousand people who will benefit under this legislation. But if we don't do it right this time, we will continue to hear the conversation from the other side of the aisle in regards to what we can

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

afford, how much it costs, how much we owe the providers, 1 2 what all we haven't done. And it will still be the people who 3 will get the short end of the stick because we haven't hired more doctors, more providers. We haven't even began to put 4 5 these people on any type of Medicaid list, so when January the 1st come in, they're able to go to the doctors. We are 6 7 behind the eight ball on this issue. So, I would appreciate that something be done on this behalf ... on behalf of the people 8 9 of the State of Illinois, poor people of the State of Illinois because I do have faith in the State of Illinois. I do know 10 that because of a job that's going to be created there will 11 12 be rev... more revenue coming in and we will continue to be able to pay our bills. I have that kind of faith in this state 13 and I wish you all had the same because if you did, we would 14 15 have dental care in this Bill. Thank you very much."

- 16 Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. David
- 17 Harris."
- 18 Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor?"
- 19 Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."
- 20 Harris, D.: "Representative, how... Amendment #1... Representative,
- 21 Amendment #1, how long is that Amendment? How many pages?"
- 22 Feigenholtz: "Six hundred and eighty-three pages."
- 23 Harris, D.: "Six hundred and thirty-three? I counted 635 but I..."
- 24 Feigenholtz: "Eight three, 6-8-3."
- 25 Harris, D.: "Oh, 683. Oh, 683 pages. Okay. You and I had a
- discussion and I understand the... the logic of Medicaid. You
- and I had a discussion that for some of the services which
- 28 are currently being provided and we are not receiving
- reimbursement, we would receive reimbursement for those

64th Legislative Day

1	services if this population was expanded. And I believe you
2	told me that the… the figure was roughly 105 or 110 million
3	dollars. Is that correct?"
4	Feigenholtz: "We have \$114 million, I believe, in capacity grants
5	in the mental health budget, much of which are services that
6	will be matchable depending on how many people are accessing
7	specific services in this new eligible population. Not all
8	services, some."
9	Harris, D.: "Right, right and but those people who would the
10	services that are currently being provided are at the Medicaid
11	rate of 50 percent right now, correct?"
12	Feigenholtz: "Correct."
13	Harris, D.: "And they would be matched so, potentially it could
14	be 110, 120 million dollars?"
15	Feigenholtz: "Those are for currently eligible."
16	Harris, D.: "Right."
17	Feigenholtz: "But for the newly eligible, it will be 100 percent
18	matchable."
19	Harris, D.: "Oh, I understand that, for the newly eligible. Let
20	me go for a second and the numbers are important here and I
21	know that the the Gentlewoman from Cook who spoke before me
22	said we throw numbers around, but numbers are important here.
23	What does HFS anticipate by way of new enrollees, the number
24	of new enrollees?"
25	Feigenholtz: "Three hundred and forty-two thousand."
26	Harris, D.: "Okay. And what about because of the publicity that's
27	coming around because of the new enrollees, there's an
28	expectation that individuals who are now currently eligible

64th Legislative Day

Feigenholtz: "Really big."

27

2829

5/27/2013

would sign up even though they had not signed up already. Do 1 2 we have an estimate of... of how many that involves?" 3 Feigenholtz: "Well, I believe a previous speaker inflated 342 to 4 500. My response was that these are people who are already 5 eligible for Medicaid, Representative Harris, but have yet to 6 apply because they're generally in good health." 7 Harris, D.: "Right." Feigenholtz: "And let's not forget that, you know..." 8 9 Harris, D.: "Do we have... do we have an estimate of how many there might be? How... how large that population is?" 10 Feigenholtz: "About 140 thousand is a rough estimate, currently 11 12 eligible. We... There's... there's actually no way we could avoid them. They could be enrolling right now." 13 Harris, D.: "I... I understand. They could be. And I know that... 14 15 that there's lots of sources for information about this, but let me turn to the numbers for a second. And it's not a 16 question that we don't want to provide health care to those 17 individuals who don't... we don't... it's not that we don't want 18 to provide health care to individuals who truly need health 19 care. That's not the issue. And I understand that we stand to 20 gain as much as \$12 billion from the Federal Government if we 21 enroll these individuals. Is that correct?" 22 Feigenholtz: "Yes." 23 Harris, D.: "That's a big number, \$12..." 24 Feigenholtz: "Big, big, big, big." 25 Harris, D.: "...billion. Big number." 26

Harris, D.: "But Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's look at

some specifics of those numbers and I quote here from the

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

Civic Federation of Chicago in their recent study of the State of Illinois recommended operating budgets for ... operating capital budgets, their analysis and recommendations for FY14. The Lady answered the questions right on target as to the term of what the Civic Federation suggested. However, what are the dollars and cents implications of those numbers? If we add 342 thousand individuals to Medicaid, as she said we probably would, after that 100 percent federal reimbursement expires, we are going to add \$573 million to our budget responsibilities, \$573 million. That's a half a billion dollars or slightly more. About the new population that she talked about, the 142, a slight difference from the... the Civic Federation. They reco... they thought it would more along on the order of 168 thousand individuals. What are those 168 thousand individuals going to cost the State of Illinois? According to the Civic Federation, the cost would be \$1.2 billion. You add 1.2 billion to 500 million and you get 1... roughly \$1.8 billion. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we owe, what, 5 or 6 billion? Fortunately, we had an influx of ... of good dollars in April so we reduced our back bills from 8 to 9 billion down to 5 or 6 billion, but they're going to go back up again. We owe 5 to 6 billion dollars in back bills. We're putting an additional \$1 billion into the pension funds for this year, a \$1 billion increase. We've told our Appropriations Committees to hold the line. You can't spend any more because we don't have the dollars to give the operating budgets for those agencies and departments, the money that they need. And guess what? Next year, next year when we come back here and try to do the budget for FY15,

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

45

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

2829

5/27/2013

what's looming right in the face? A tax decrease. The tax rate decreases from 5 percent, as we know, from 5 percent to 3.75, which reduces our revenue roughly 3 billion or slightly more than \$3 billion. Having said all that, with all our financial problems, with the fact that our revenue next year could be substantially less than what it is this year, we are about to take an action which is going to add 1.8, \$1.8 billion to our state budget. Those are dollars, folks, we simply do not have. This isn't a case of not caring about people who need health care. This is a case of us being responsible Legislators. We have the duty to craft a budget that puts this state on a found... sound financial footing. This Bill does not do that. This Bill weakens our financial footing. This Bill puts us again in a financially precarious situation. As much as we'd like to provide the health care, as much as the fact that the Federal Government is going to reimburse us for the first three years, the other numbers out there aren't good ones. The other numbers don't add up beneficially for us. The other numbers cause us more problems next year and the years out. That's the difficulty with the Bill. It's not just a health care Bill. Six hundred and thirty-eight pages... 680 pages, we can all find something we like, we can all find something we dislike. The bottom line here is the dollars and cents involved. And as responsible Legislators, I think it is irresponsible to vote in favor of this Bill and I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Members, I know we're in the middle of a very important debate, but with leave from the Body, I'd like to take a moment just to recognize our great U.S. Senator

64th Legislative Day

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

27

2829

5/27/2013

here in the chamber with us, Dick Durbin. Thank you very much. 1 2 Representative Sullivan." 3 Sullivan: "Okay, well, we'll see if we get this in. Thank you, 4 Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield." 5 6 Sullivan: "Leader Feigenholtz, a year ago today on the House Floor 7 we talked about a Bill that would scale back our Medicaid program that even the Governor described as on the brink of 8 9 collapse, if you will. And House Republicans have been warning 10 about this for years. In a bipartisan manner, we crafted a 11 Bill. That was the SMART Act, was it not?" 12 Feigenholtz: "Yes, it was." Sullivan: "In that Bill we were trying to get our House in order. 13 One of the major components of that Bill was to scrub the 14 15 Medicaid rolls to ensure that we have those who areeligible 16 for Medicaid were the ones that we were paying for. Is that correct?" 17 18 Feigenholtz: "Yes." 19 Sullivan: "Last week, the Department of Healthcare and Family Services summary report, Maximus, the private company we 20 21 hired to scrub the rolls recommended approximately 48 22 thousand cases be canceled out of the 73 thousand they reviewed. Is that correct?" 23 "Representative, I am having a very tough time 24 Feigenholtz: 25 hearing you." 26 Sullivan: "I can speak louder."

Sullivan: "So, last week the Department of Healthcare and Family

Services had a summary report out on the private company,

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

1	Maximus. And in that, they to scrub the rolls, they
2	recommended approximately 48 thousand cases to be canceled
3	out of 73 thousand that they reviewed. Is that correct?"
4	Feigenholtz: "I knew that that number continues to change,
5	Representative, and remember, it it was a bipartisan
6	decision to"
7	Sullivan: "Certainly."
8	Feigenholtz: "to do this. So but I believe that they're doing
9	a lot of hard work and that people who are ineligible for
10	Medicaid are being removed from the rolls."
11	Sullivan: "Did you read the report that was put out by the
12	Department of Family Services last week? I'm assuming you
13	did. So, this is directly out of the report, is that correct?"
14	Feigenholtz: "Why don't you remind me what I read?"
15	Sullivan: "Okay. Well, I'm trying to build a discussion based off
16	a report on something that you passed and I give you credit
17	for, that we helped support, on Medicaid scrubbing that hasn't
18	been done."
19	Feigenholtz: "Well, Representative, this is a little bit
20	different. I I think that we're Legislators and we can
21	actually do more than one thing at a time, especially when
22	the opportunity of putting uninsured adults when we for 100
23	percent of federal support and finally take the burden off of
24	our community providers, our hospitals, our FQHCs, our
25	emergency rooms, et cetera. You need to know that the first
26	three years there is no cost to the State of Illinois."
27	Sullivan: "Certainly.
28	Feigenholtz: "So, I I'm and the simple fact that we do have an

eligibility system in place. It may not be perfect. I know

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

1	that they're working on this to get it right. We're going to
2	have an opportunity to reap a lot of federal support and it's
3	something this state has needed for many, many years."
4	Sullivan: "Representative, getting back to the point that I'm
5	trying to make on scrubbing the Medicaid rolls, how much do
6	you believe was built into the FY13 budget on the savings we
7	should have had if we would have had the scrubbing done from
8	day one?"
9	Feigenholtz: "It's been brought to my attention that we missed
10	liability by \$77 million, but not a penny more."
11	Sullivan: "Okay. So so, we built we built \$350 million into the
12	budget. Correct? And you believe that we didn't make it"
13	Feigenholtz: "There were other savings that made up for that,
14	Representative."
15	Sullivan: "Well, no, I believe that the Medicaid scrubbing portion
16	was \$350 million alone."
16 17	<pre>was \$350 million alone." Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that</pre>
17	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that
17 18	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that."
17 18 19	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay.
17 18 19 20	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have
17 18 19 20 21	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have heard previous Legislators talk about some things that are
17 18 19 20 21	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have heard previous Legislators talk about some things that are going to be done, some points in a discussion that took place
17 18 19 20 21 22	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have heard previous Legislators talk about some things that are going to be done, some points in a discussion that took place today. Could you clarify what those points are going to be,
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have heard previous Legislators talk about some things that are going to be done, some points in a discussion that took place today. Could you clarify what those points are going to be, more specifically, maybe in the budget or the 'bimp'? Are we
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Feigenholtz: "There were other elements of the SMART Act that achieved significantly larger savings than that." Sullivan: "Certainly, but I'm trying to focus on one point. Okay. Well, then let's talk about the SMART Act in general. We have heard previous Legislators talk about some things that are going to be done, some points in a discussion that took place today. Could you clarify what those points are going to be, more specifically, maybe in the budget or the 'bimp'? Are we going to see some hidden gems that might remove or diminish

deal that's going to come before us this week that..."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "Representative..." 1 2 Sullivan: "...are going to diminish some things?" 3 Feigenholtz: "...for my knowledge, anything that has anything to do with the SMART Act is in this 683 page Bill. And it's... in my 4 5 analysis, I would assume it's in yours, it's enumerated..." 6 Sullivan: "Thank you. To the Bill. Exactly one year ago, or one 7 year and one week, I guess, we had a Bill to reduce our 8 Medicaid rolls and Medicaid liability. We're here a year ago... 9 a year today to expand our Medicaid program under Obamacare. Let me be clear, this is an option for our state. It's been 10 11 declared an option for our state. This is not a mandate from 12 the Federal Government. You guys and those that vote for this are choosing to move it forward. Ladies and Gentlemen, I 13 brought up the SMART Act because we are not even close to 14 15 reviewing our cases. We built in the savings into our budget, FY13, which we hoped for, for FY14 that have not even come 16 close to being realized, \$350 million. With these preliminary 17 18 numbers, our Medicaid program is failing miserably to meet 19 the obligations of our state. We have a big problem in our Medicaid program and now is not the time to expand it. Why 20 21 would we expand a broken program? How can we administer this? 22 How can we clear... I mean, clearly, we cannot administer this program and now is not the time to expand it. And Mr. Speaker, 23 if this gets the required vote, I ask for a verification." 24 "Representative Sullivan has requested a 25 Speaker Turner: 26 verification. All Members will be required to vote their own 27 switch. Representative Currie." Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to 28 29 start with a quote from a very important political figure in

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

this country. Her name is Jan Brewer. She is the Republican Governor of Arizona. 'With this move', the move to participate in the Affordable Care Act, 'with this move, we will secure a federal revenue stream to cover the costs of the uninsured who already show up in our doctors' offices and emergency rooms.' The issue is not cost. The issue is who's paying, this pocket or the other pocket. You should know that the cost of uncompensated care in emergency rooms adds about a thousand dollars a year on average to your constituent's health insurance premiums. That is not going to go away. Under this Act, under Senate Bill 26 as amended, we will be able to add people, real people to our state Medicaid rolls and for the first three years it will cost the State of Illinois not one penny. In fact, we will save money that is currently not covered when we provide mental health and other services to low-income, childless Illinoisans. The Federal Government will pay the full cost for the first three years and at least 90 percent for the next two. In fact, the estimate... the estimate, for those of you who want to bring money and jobs into the State of Illinois, the estimate is that through 2016 this legislation will bring an estimated 5.7 billion into Illinois in Medicaid payments for newly eligible adults. Let me tell you who some of them are. Earlier today, we memorialized our veterans. Twenty-eight thousand, of the newly eligible Medicaid people in Illinois under Senate Bill 26, are veterans and another 25 thou... 48 thousand are veterans, which is more than 10 percent of the total and another 25 thousand are their family members. The real point of this Bill isn't dollars and cents, although we make out

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

like bandits if we pass Senate Bill 26, the real point of Senate Bill 26 is to make for healthier Illinoisans. It is to mean that people who face serious health problems don't have to wait until they get to the emergency room to have those problems solved. It means preventive care. It means that people who today go without the shots they need, the ordinary doctors' visits that they ought to be having on an annual basis, they'll be able to have those visits. It has been said on this House Floor that once we go into expanded Medicare, we would never take it back. Well, the premise of a decision never to take it back is that, yes, it's good. It is a good thing in our society for people to be healthy. You wouldn't want to take it away because you would be consigning people to illness, to emergency rooms, to early death. The point of this Bill is to say let us take care of our own. Let us help the least among us. Let us make sure they have access to health care that will help them live healthy and will help prevent illness and death. The only... the only conscienceappropriate vote on Senate Bill 26 is a 'yes' vote, a 'yes' vote that in fact will stabilize our finances, stabilize our medical budget and see to it that real people have the opportunity for the kind of health care the people in this room enjoy today. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I guess I would begin by saying nobody in the state, let alone this chamber, knows more about this subject than Representative Bellock. And I think we would all do well to listen to her admonitions, the first of which being there's no reason in the world why we

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

should have to do this now. Indeed, it's irresponsible to do this now because the Federal Congress, later this summer, will be reviewing many of the promises upon which this measure is predicated, specifically, reimbursement levels. Indeed, the Federal Government right now not only cha... is challenged by the extraordinary deficit by the problems in Social Security, but 10 times the liability in Social Security is represented in this very matter, Medicaid. It is simply not sustainable to do what the Federal Government proposes to do and it should then be a lesson to us not to repeat mistakes we've made in the past and rely on promises that cannot be kept. I would also suggest that it was only two years ago that we asked on a bipartisan level for the Healthcare and Family Services and the Department of Human Services to identify and remove those individuals in the Medicaid rolls who shouldn't have been on there by virtue of income and... and residency. That has moved at a very, very slow pace and the numbers of people who should not have been and are still on those rolls is quite extraordinary with great financial impact to our state. I think it is also very important that we actually know how many people would be added to our rolls, that we have some idea of certainty in these formulas because, at the moment, this measure threatens to put our state in a level of even greater fiscal risk and insolvency. And by the way, we're not doing that great of job now even in this proposed budget this year. DHS will tell you that 19 percent of people who need mental health care in the state are receiving mental health care and that 7 percent of the people who need substance abuse are being served. Those numbers are

64th Legislative Day

- shocking numbers. And rather than invest in more and more and 1 2 more state employees, our resources should be refocused to 3 community-based agencies and community levels which actually provide these services. So, for all these reasons, I would 4 implore you, we do not need to act today. It is irresponsible 5 6 to take the financial risk today. And in my view, together, 7 working more closely in a bipartisan basis, we could craft a system that does far more to help the people whom we all 8 serve. Thank you, Mr. Speaker." 9 Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."
- 10
- 11 Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- 12 Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- 13 "Thank you. Representative, I have just a few very short
- questions. The first being, how many people have been scrubbed 14
- 15 from the rolls based on our activities of the last year or 18
- months?" 16
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Kay, I think the number that I've 17
- heard is 30 thousand." 18
- Kay: "And... and that's 30 thousand out of what number which... from 19
- which we started at?" 20
- Feigenholtz: "I believe, Representative Kay, that 50 thousand 21
- 22 people have been removed from the Medicaid rolls out of 80
- thousand that have been checked." 23
- 24 Kay: "Okay. And how much further do we have to go... starting ...
- working backwards to get to ground zero, how much further do 25
- 26 we have to go?"
- Feigenholtz: "I believe in about six to eight months we'll be..." 27
- Kay: "No, no. How many people?" 28
- Feigenholtz: "We've actually only just begun, Representative." 29

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Kay: "Well, is it fair to say that there is..."
- 2 Feigenholtz: "But I... one of the things that I do want..."
- 3 Kay: "...50 to 100 thousand, 100 thousand to 200 thousand, 200 to
- 4 300 thousand or more than those numbers?"
- 5 Feigenholtz: "Well, I mean, I think what's important to note is
- 6 that things are moving in the right direction; that the
- 7 process is working. It's a very arduous, difficult process,
- but there is a strong commitment to make sure that only people
- 9 who deserve to be on Medicaid are on Medicaid."
- 10 Kay: "You may not know this answer, but I'm curious. Out of the
- 30 to 50 thousand that have been eliminated or scrubbed from
- the rolls, how much money has that saved the state?"
- 13 Feigenholtz: "It depends on what their Medicaid utilization was.
- I... I don't have a specific number."
- 15 Kay: "Well, your staffer, I think she's whispering something to
- you, would it be in the neighborhood of 10 to 50 million, 50
- to 100 million? What... what neighborhood are we in here?"
- 18 Feigenholtz: "When we were writing the SMART Act last year, your
- caucus requested that we use a \$700 million number. We thought
- 20 better of being a little bit more realistic and possibly using
- 21 350 million. So, that is the goal."
- 22 Kay: "And if my math is right, we're about 20 percent of the way
- there. Is that correct?"
- 24 Feigenholtz: "Possibly."
- 25 Kay: "Possibly. Okay. I... I see in Amendment 3 that there's a
- reference to workers' compensation. Can you tell me what that
- 27 reference refers to?"
- 28 Feigenholtz: "We've removed that, Representative."
- 29 Kay: "What did you remove?"

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Feigenholtz: "The workers' comp language has been taken out of
- 2 the Bill."
- 3 Kay: "Okay. Is it fair to say, based on the numbers that have
- been provided to us today, in fact, you have related, I think,
- 5 some of the numbers to us that by 2019 this program will cost
- 6 us somewhere in the neighborhood of 573 to 650 million dollars
- 7 out of pocket?"
- 8 Feigenholtz: "I think for the first three years there's no cost,
- 9 Representative."
- 10 Kay: "I understand."
- 11 Feigenholtz: "And then..."
- 12 Kay: "I understand. You're right. Beyond the first three years,
- I... I'm looking..."
- 14 Feigenholtz: "When everything is racked up..."
- 15 Kay: "Yeah."
- 16 Feigenholtz: "...the benefit is 315 million in savings."
- 17 Kay: "Well, I understand the savings part. I want to look at the
- 18 cost part though. I'm interested in what the state will have
- 19 to pick up after the three-year expansion window closes?"
- 20 Feigenholtz: "What window?"
- 21 Kay: "Well, you're going to have the three-year window where,
- essentially, we have gifted health care. It's given to us.
- So, after that I'm wondering what the state then has to
- encumber themselves."
- 25 Feigenholtz: "Representative, it... it ramps down to 90 percent.
- The first year our obligation is 98 million."
- 27 Kay: "Ninety-eight million."
- 28 Feigenholtz: "But it saves 105 million, so there's... you can't
- ignore the offset."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Kay: "No, of course not."
- 2 Feigenholtz: "The offset..."
- 3 Kay: "I... I understand. So, you have a... a declining schedule, is
- 4 that the way it works? Expense to savings? And how far out
- 5 does that go?"
- 6 Feigenholtz: "Representative, could you please repeat the
- 7 question?"
- 8 Kay: "Well, you're... we're looking at cost to savings and I'm just
- 9 asking, if you have a sliding scale, what is it and how far
- 10 out does it go?"
- 11 Feigenholtz: "It doesn't... We begin paying in 2017, Representative
- and we have numbers through 2020."
- 13 Kay: "Can you ra... could you rattle those off for me real quickly
- on the cost side?"
- 15 Feigenholtz: "The savings outweigh the costs until we're 20... we're
- in 2022, Representative."
- 17 Kay: "Well, I... no, no. I... I understand that. I... Sara, I... but what
- 18 I'd like to hear is that the cost that we have and if you
- want to make it a net number, that's okay. But I'm just
- looking at what the state is obligated to pay on either a
- 21 scale basis or go net, net I don't... I don't care."
- 22 Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think that the... the lowest would
- be 200 million... the highest would be 200 million. And I will
- tell you that I think that's about eight days in the Medicaid
- 25 cycle."
- 26 Kay: "So, you're saying..."
- 27 Feigenholtz: "Seven. Seven."
- 28 Kay: "...200 million is going to be the cost to the state..."
- 29 Feigenholtz: "The most."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Kay: "...the most... with the addition of the number of people that
 2 we've talked about today, which varies, but we know we're
- 3 talking about at least 168 thousand, if not more. Is that not
- 4 correct? People."
- 5 Feigenholtz: "A hun... I said 200 million the most."
- 6 Kay: "Say... that's what it's going to cost for the first... or for
- 7 the 168 thousand people that will be integrated in the system.
- 8 Is that what you're telling me?"
- 9 Feigenholtz: "No, that's for the 342 thousand people."
- 10 Kay: "Okay. And that's..."
- 11 Feigenholtz: "Not for the other currently eligible group..."
- 12 Kay: "Okay."
- 13 Feigenholtz: "...that is not enrolled in Medicaid."
- 14 Kay: "And that's not a one-time expense? That'll be an annualized
- expense and as we..."
- 16 Feigenholtz: "If they... if they remain on Medicaid instead of
- 17 earning more money and going into the exchange and purchasing
- insurance, yes."
- 19 Kay: "Well, you mention this..."
- 20 Feigenholtz: "But there's a lot of people who will go off Medicaid
- as they do currently when they find work and they're no longer
- 22 eligible. Their income is high and they will go into the
- 23 exchange and purchase health insurance with a subsidy."
- 24 Kay: "Okay. Yeah. We probably could debate that. But I'm not...
- one... one last question. Wouldn't you agree that we're in some
- 26 pretty serious financial debt, that we in fact might be
- 27 underwater and in some cases, people consider us to be
- 28 penniless?"

64th Legislative Day

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "I think we're in much better shape this year than 1 2 we were last year. I think we have curtailed our Medicaid 3 growth lower than most states. I believe that our growth is only at 2 percent where most other states are at 6, 4 5 attributable to some of the liability reductions that we enacted last year in the SMART Act. So, but I think, you know, 6 7 we have the great fortune of more revenue in this state. We're paying down bills. But Representative, this is about giving 8 9 people who have never had health care, insurance. People who we pay for, you and I, anybody who has a private insurance 10 policy right now. A family of four, on average, pays a 11 12 thousand dollars a year in increased insurance premiums a year. This will change that. This cost shifts that 13 uncompensated care off of the backs of private insurance plans 14 15 and it... it smooths out how we pay for care for the poor."

Kay: "Well, I agree with one of the previous speakers that, I think, Sandy (sic-Patti) Bellock probably has the… the best handle of where this is going to take us. And I heard a good deal of what she said and I've listened to you and my… my opinion is this. We… there's not a person on this side of the aisle that doesn't want everyone to have health insurance…"

Feigenholtz: "Well, then you should vote for the Bill."

Kay: "...but I think there's not any one on this side of the aisle... Well, but it's not a good Bill the way you've got it structured. So, let me just... let me just say this. The problem with everything we do is it sounds good and we get very emotional about it and then when it comes time to find the money and we open our wallet, we find there's nothing there. And that's true the last 3 to 5 years, maybe 10. But since

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

1999, we've been very wasteful with money. We're not good money managers. And that's what concerns me. That's what prompted my questions. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think it's... I think it's very irrational, if not totally irresponsible, to go down a path of increasing insurance, as we intend to increase it today, when we can't pay for it. This state is underwater and it's going to take a long time before the salvage operation to pull us up is complete. To put more people into a system with the promise that we can pay is simply not true. We haven't even... we haven't even made the SMART grid program work to its fullest extent and it's had plenty of time to do that. This is a matter that you need to take very seriously because we've got a serious problem with pensions. We've got a serious problem with past paid bills. We have a serious problem with managing money, period. And I'm going to encourage the Republicans to vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong support of this Bill. The Affordable Care Act provides only one way to offer health insurance to this vulnerable population, a population who historically has had no access to regular medical care. They've used costly emergency rooms as their doctors. Individuals who earn up to \$15 thousand a year who do not have children, who are between the age... children under the age of 18, and who themselves are between 18 and 64 are the ones that will be eligible for this... this program. Now, according to the Robert Wood Johnson Report, 75 percent of the uninsured are working people, but they don't have access to health insurance through their jobs. If we don't pass this

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

5/27/2013

Bill, this population will also not have ... not be eliqible to buy into the new insurance marketplace or exchange, nor will they be able to be given subsidies by the government. It was expected that all these folks would be able to be in the Medicaid expansion program and if not they will have no other option. This is an amazing opportunity, 100 percent coverage for all these people. It's... It will bring in so much money to the state and because of that and this opportunity, there are over hundreds of supporters and among those supporters are the Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and the Civic Federation. Why do they support this? They support this Bill because it brings in over 1 to 2 billion... billion dollars every year into our economy and it saves 100 million in the General Revenue Fund. It also creates tens of thousands of jobs throughout the state. Now, we know that we're in fiscal... serious fiscal conditions and we know that we can't cut our way out of that problem nor can we tax our way out. The way out of it is to grow our economy. This Bill will help to create jobs to help us grow our way out. We all have people in our district who will benefit from this Bill and I strongly urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this measure because this is a long overdue measure for this country and especially for Illinois, especially with the setbacks that we've had in Illinois when we did welfare reform. And so, I think that it's important that we provide health care for everyone in this state and I think that the Bill has been

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

vetted even before it came to the Illinois House. It's been 1 2 vetted all the way in Washington D.C. And so, I think it's 3 time. So, would the Sponsor yield? Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield." 4 Ford: "Thank you. Leader, could you tell me how much it will cost 5 6 the state to implement the ACA?" Feigenholtz: "Nothing." 7 Ford: "Nothing? You mean, we could provide health care for the 8 9 poor and it will not cost us anything out of taxpayers' dollars?" 10 11 Feigenholtz: "This... for the next three years, Representative Ford, 12 for every dollar we spend..." Ford: "Just for the implementation?" 13 Feigenholtz: "...the Federal Government... Yes." 14 15 Ford: "Yes. So, nothing. If the state decides that we cannot afford this expansion after the 100 percent has been zeroed 16 down to 90 percent, can we back out of the expansion as a 17 state because we can't afford it?" 18 Feigenholtz: "Yes we can, Representative." 19 Ford: "Okay. So, there's no danger there. If we find out that the 20 21 economy is not improving, we can back down and say that we're 22 going to repeal this. So, that's great. Can we say that the ACA is an opportunity to provide health care for those who 23 24 wouldn't ordinarily have the opportunity to have health care in Illinois?" 25 Feigenholtz: "I'm sorry, Representative?" 26 Ford: "I said, would you say that this Bill would provide health 27 care to those that would not ordinarily have the opportunity 28

to have health care in Illinois?"

29

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "Yes, I would." 1 2 Ford: "So, that's another reason why I support it. But there are 3 some other things that I have to ask you. Will the passage of this Bill correct some of the pressures that this state is 4 5 experiencing due to the fact of the high cost of health care 6 in Illinois? Will it provide immediate relief for the State 7 of Illinois so that we can pay other bills?" Feigenholtz: "Yes, it will, Sir." 8 9 Ford: "Okay. Everything is good so far. The FQHCs, will this Bill 10 provide timely payments for FQHCs and hospitals that accept Medicaid?" 11 12 Feigenholtz: "Yes." 13 Ford: "So, you're saying now as it stands, I know that the FQHCs in the neighborhoods that I represent and hospitals that 14 15 accept Medicaid, they complain that payments are not made. And as a result, they fired people and they had to close their 16 doors. Is this an opportunity to support strongly FQHCs and 17 18 provide timely payments and provide access to health care in neighborhoods that are in need?" 19 Feigenholtz: "Yes, it will." 20 21 Ford: "And so, with that, the SMART Act was a big problem for me. 22 When that passed, I voted against it because of the cuts that 23 were made as a result of the budget problems that we had when 24 the Bill passed. But it looks like this is a new opportunity to correct some of those problems as a result of the cuts. 25 Could you tell me some of the programs or services that would 26 27 be restored as a result of the passage of Senate Bill 26?" Feigenholtz: "Certainly, Representative. There's been a lot of 28 29 discussion about concerns about eye glasses, adult dental.

64th Legislative Day

1	There's different pieces in the Bill that are really slight
2	modifications. The two that are that are in the Bill are the
3	medically fragile technology dependent provision that was in
4	the SMART Act that was enjoined and taken to court. Also, the
5	bed hold policy was found to be in violation of the Federal
6	Olmstead decision. There's also some changes around EAM,
7	around dental, as I spoke about earlier, that specifically
8	addressed some changes in the SMART Act."
9	Ford: "And some of the… one of the major problems that I had with
10	the SMART Act was it limited the number of drugs to four. Is
11	that still the case?"
12	Feigenholtz: "Representative, the the Bill never was designed to
13	do that. What what the full what happens when a Medicaid
14	recipient has four prescriptions is it triggers the
15	University of Illinois who works with patients on medication
16	management to call a physician and review the list of drugs
17	that patients are on, many of which are suffering from severe
18	mental illness, see multiple doctors, and are taking drugs
19	together that give them an adverse reaction. Most of the
20	reason for this provision in the SMART Act wasn't to limit
21	the number of drugs a person can have, it was to manage the
22	drugs that they have."
23	Ford: "So, will this better manage it and provide that drugs
24	that's needed for patients when they are prescribed the drugs
25	from their physician?"
26	Feigenholtz: "Yes."
27	Ford: "How does this Bill provide mental health services to those
28	that need it? Is there any mental health component to this?"

64th Legislative Day

- Feigenholtz: "Well, the underlying Bill, Representative, the 1 2 expansion Bill is... I mean, it is widely believed that the 3 great benefactors of... of the 342 thousand newly eligibles 4 are... many people who are in need of behavioral health services, substance use services, and will greatly benefit 5 6 because they have never, in the history of Medicaid, been 7 covered. We have never given... gotten any federal money for what we expend from our Human Services budget. You sit on the 8 9 committee and you see the enormous amounts of money that we spend for these people. This will now give us incentive to 10 11 build our infrastructure, to put together better service 12 systems for these people and to help them to get a health home for physical and mental illness." 13
- 14 Ford: "And for... will the Bill provide care for those with disabilities?"
- 16 Feigenholtz: "I'm not..."
- 17 Ford: "You could... we could talk about it."
- 18 Feigenholtz: "This improves access to mental health treatment and
- depending on how severe that illness..."
- 20 Ford: "Physi... I should say physical disabilities. Let me clarify
- 21 that."
- 22 Feigenholtz: "I don't believe that this particular Bill impacts
- 23 that. I believe that there is a lot of federal assistance
- 24 that comes to the state prior to the Affordable Care Act for
- 25 that population."
- 26 Ford: "So, will this Bill allow us to continue to reach for
- federal matches if we see possibilities? If there's something
- that we missed in this Bill, is it possible that we could
- 29 continue under this measure to find more dollars from the

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Federal Government because of the implementation of this 1 2 Bill?" 3 Feigenholtz: "Yes. Actually, I'm glad you brought that up. There 4 have been some states that have applied for the... an 1115 5 waiver to close the gaps on services that are not necessarily 6 in the Medicaid service package that will create a continuum 7 of care and close gaps. The Federal Government has granted some states a great deal of money. The Governor's Office and 8 9 HFS are very seriously prepared to... they have a outline of the items that they want to bring in under the waiver 10 including more services for youth. Wards of the state, and 11 former wards of the state are covered in the Affordable Care 12 Act in the Medicaid expansion up to the age of 26, so that it 13 is... it mirrors our current insurance policies where parents 14 15 can cover their children to that age. So, it is ... there are many, many opportunities, Representative, to get more federal 16 dollars if we apply for this waiver." 17 18 Ford: "And copayments... it's good to have access to care, but if 19 you have the care and you get the prescriptions and cannot afford it, is there any relief for those that cannot afford 20 21 their medicine and cannot afford the copayment? Does this 22 Bill provide relief for those people?" Feigenholtz: "You cannot be denied services, Representative, if 23 you cannot afford a copay. There's nothing, I believe, in 24 this legislation that addresses that issue in any direction. 25 I believe that it was addressed perhaps last year." 26 27 Ford: "And I know we've been debating a long time. I just would 28 like for ... I know that if we do everything we can to prevent 29 severe illnesses in the state, it'd save the state a lot of

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

money. And the last question that I have for you is, could 1 2 you tell me how this Bill deals with prevention? And that ... 3 how could that save the state money as a result of dealing with this Bill and how it provides revenues for preventative 4 5 measures?" 6 Feigenholtz: "Representative, I think that the whole idea behind 7 the Affordable Care Act was to create a value-based system for people who are look... in need of health care. I think it 8 9 was pretty clear to the Federal Government that eliminating childless adults from Medicaid and they... it's not like they 10 11 just... they ... they don't disappear. They don't go away. They 12 seek health care, but they seek it in very inefficient places. And this is a... the Affordable Care Act is designed to give 13 people comprehensive health care, finally giving them a 14 15 medical home, no discrimination based on whether they have children or not and what their... and again, on the federal 16 level does not permit discrimination based on preexisting 17 18 conditions which, you know, is a very serious problem in this country. So, I believe that the spirit of this on the federal 19 level and the opportunities that we're going to have here in 20 the State of Illinois are abundant. This is a Bill we should 21 22 celebrate. It is a watershed moment and I hope you can support 23 this Bill." Ford: "And my... I thought I had... that was my last question, but do 24 you think that this Bill will cut down on emergency room care? 25 Because I believe emergency room care costs a lot of money 26 for the state and right now I think there's up to 800 thousand 27 people that use the emergency room for just simple colds and 28 29 flus and things like that and that costs the state a lot of

64th Legislative Day

- money. Do you see this Bill cutting down on the emergency room as a place for primary physician care?"
- 3 Feigenholtz: "I do."
- Ford: "Thank you very much. I know that you're tired and standing 4 5 on your feet. I appreciate you doing that and to the Bill. I 6 rise in support of the measure simply because it will cost 7 the state nothing to implement. So, if it's not going to cost us anything to provide health care for the people of Illinois 8 9 that needs it, what would stand in our way for doing that? I rise in support of the measure also because if we find in the 10 future, after the three years, that we cannot afford the 11 12 Medicare expansion... Medicaid expansion, we can repeal it right here in Illinois. So, what's the fear there? And so 13 there are some things in this Bill or there are some things 14 15 that's not in this Bill that I'm not happy with, but what I am happy with is that this Bill will pass and it will benefit 16 more than not. And I want to thank President Obama for putting 17 18 his career and putting his whole focus on providing health 19 care for all the people of this country. And I want to thank him for sending money to Illinois so that we can provide 20 21 health care for those who need it. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- 22 Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."
- 23 Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 24 Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Dunkin: "Representative, I know that you have worked for quite some time on this measure when you passed the SMART Act last year. Well, actually, about a year or so ago. And you have worked just tirelessly, so my hat goes off to you. This is a almost 600-page document that attempts to address what our

64th Legislative Day

1	President wants us to address and again, hats off to you.
2	What I'd like to do is to ask a couple of questions in terms
3	of what it is some Members here had some issues with. As it
4	relates to restoring the adult dental costs or care, where
5	are we with that item?"
6	Feigenholtz: "Representative, in Amendment #1 in this Bill, we
7	have expanded the services in the emergency definition of
8	dental to include care for people who are waiting for some
9	surgeries where their physicians believe they may need some
10	dental care for diabetics, transplants, people with cancer,
11	and also to avoid emergencies with pregnant women. That
12	doubles the size of the current program."
13	Dunkin: "Is there anything as it relates to preventive care or
14	maintenance care for dental, basic dental services?"
15	Feigenholtz: "We haven't changed anything about that in this
16	Bill."
17	Dunkin: "I'm I'm sorry?"
18	Feigenholtz: "No."
19	Dunkin: "Is there a chance with that, some of those items could
20	be reentered into this legislation here?"
21	Feigenholtz: "Representative Dunkin, earlier I discussed
22	conversations that we were having with some representatives
23	from insurance agencies who currently are involved in the
24	managed care pilot program for the Innovations Project. And
25	many of them are already providing dental care for some of
26	their patients because they understand its value."
27	Dunkin: "Are they joining for some of our underserved
28	communities?"
29	Feigenholtz: "These are all Medicaid clients."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

- Dunkin: "Okay. So, they're in the HMO or coordinated care?" 1 2 Feigenholtz: "Correct." 3 Dunkin: "So, you're saying that that would cover most of the individuals on this plan who would vie for those dental 4 5 services?" 6 Feigenholtz: "Some of them currently do, yes." 7 Dunkin: "Okay. What about the dentist... a dental clinic grant? Has 8 that been addressed?" 9 Feigenholtz: "I don't believe that that's in this Amendment. But I... but I will say that with all of the infusion of resources 10 11 coming to the states that our hope would be that there would 12 be some addition around this state for this kind of care." Dunkin: "Okay. Can you update me on what the latest is with the 13 wheelchair rate increase and/or limit prior to approval up to 14 15 about \$500 dollars? Was that addressed, as well, in this Amendment? Or how will the Department of Health and Family 16 Services deal with or address that particular issue?" 17 18 Feigenholtz: "Right now we... in this Amendment are at 400 and with 19 a one business day approval. And there is discussion about being able to bump that up to 500 with some wiggle room. So, 20 21 there's a lot of discussion and agreement going on about that 22 right now." "And this is regarding the prior approval for the 23 wheelchairs? That's..." 24 Feigenholtz: "Correct." 25
- 28 Feigenholtz: "One day. One day."

2627

Dunkin: "And what's... what's the turnaround time to get a response

or an answer for wheelchair approval for a... repairs and..."

64th Legislative Day

- Dunkin: "One day. Okay. Thank you. What about the... did you restore
 detoxification?"
 Feigenholtz: "Representative, there's been a lot of discussion
- 4 about readmission and detox. There is a task force that's
- 5 going to be working on this and a report, if you read the
- Bill, needs to be filed by the first of September as to the
- 7 solution and the finalization of that policy."
- 8 Dunkin: "By this September of... of this year?"
- 9 Feigenholtz: "Correct."
- 10 Dunkin: "What about the restoration of the therapy, such as
- 11 podiatry or chiropractic? Was there some modification with
- 12 that that deals speech therapy, occupational therapy or
- 13 physical therapy?"
- 14 Feigenholtz: "On the optionals, Representative, the changes... As
- 15 you know, in the Smart Act we changed eyeglasses so that it
- 16 mirrored your private insurance and my private insurance,
- once every two years. Podiatry is available for people with
- diabetes and I believe we... we extend... we provide 20
- 19 chiropractic visits to people on Medicaid."
- 20 Dunkin: "Okay. Twenty for the year?"
- 21 Feigenholtz: "Correct."
- 22 Dunkin: "Okay. The last question is, what about the... the eyeglass
- 23 limit? Did you address that?"
- 24 Feigenholtz: "It... And it also may be... it may be physical therapy.
- 25 I'm sorry?"
- 26 Dunkin: "Did you address the eyeglass?"
- 27 Feigenholtz: "Yeah. I already talked about that."
- 28 Dunkin: "Okay. That's..."
- 29 Feigenholtz: "Once every two years."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

- 1 Dunkin: "...one pair. Okay. All right. Thank you."
- 2 Feigenholtz: "Just like private insurance."

3 Dunkin: "Thank you so much, Representative. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a historic moment here in our state 4 5 that addresses an issue that probably every elected official 6 here, be you a Republican, Democrat, Independent, has talked 7 about. That... that is health care and how it is that we get the cost down, how it is that we address and deal with some 8 9 of our most vulnerable population that often use the emergency room as their preventive care, as their first and last result 10 for medical treatment. This Bill here will bring in... Okay. 11 12 I'll even... billions of dollars. Here's what the... the Civic Federation recommends. They recommended that the State of 13 Illinois expand it's eligibility for medical care under this 14 15 Affordable Care Act due to the resulting of significant increase in federal resources compared to the projected state 16 expenditures. So, as we know, most of our counties and our 17 18 municipalities here across the state, it'll be, by the end of this year or January of next year, they will pay zero. Zero 19 dollars to treat the most vulnerable people here in our state 20 21 in their respective county. That's a major accomplishment. 22 That is something that every elected official here in this state can feel, oh, so proud of. To go back and talk with our 23 constituents at every level and say, look, we are taking care 24 of our vulnerable population, one. Two, it's not costing any 25 of our county governments or our local health care facilities 26 a red cent, at least up until 2016. That's a major, major 27 accomplishment for us. If you go up to 2018 or 2020, that's 28 29 about \$12 billion that this state would capture. That is

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

hugely significant. Covering any and everything from breast cancer screening, HIV/AIDS or comprehensive care HIV/AIDS, substance abuse and treatment, preventive care. That's considerable... that's a considerable amount of savings that all of our municipalities can take advantage of as it relates to them dealing with, again, their most vulnerable population. And to have, for example, a county such as Cook to receive 100 percent reimbursement or matching dollars or, excuse me, reimbursement that go directly to the cost or reducing the cost of health care that is a major, major accomplishment. This Bill also deals with a number of issues as it relates to providing access to a number of individuals who otherwise are intimidated or would not seek health care services because they don't have an ability to pay. And some facilities, hospitals or clinics, even some of our health care centers, may even shun some members who didn't have health care insurance because it's important for them to have a good, balanced mix. So now, this won't cost them a red cent. I think Illinois is in a perfect position to take advantage of this with full steam ahead, really sort of applauding and complimenting our President, who is from this state and living up to his promise when he started over four and a half years ago. And that is to take care of its most vulnerable citizens. This Bill is not perfect. At some point the state will pick up costs in the year 2016 at about \$573 million. Then it'll go up to about maybe \$1.2 billion later on to help offset the billions of dollars that we'll receive from our Federal Government. This is something that our country, certainly in our state, can feel proud of. It does a lot more than not

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

doing some of the little things that we can hopefully work on and maybe pick up, as a state, as a priority in the budget later on. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Again, I'd like to commend the Sponsor for her diligence in this for years it seems like. I know you've been pretty stressed out about this, but we're all proud of you and we want to see all of our citizens, especially our most vulnerable citizens, take advantage of such a great program. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

"Mr. Speaker, first, in regards to my Memorial statement earlier today, I want to state that I inadvertently used the term Confederate when I meant to include those who wear the ceremonial Union uniform as well. To the Bill. Most everyone would agree the reason to expand Medicaid is to provide better health outcomes to our most impoverished citizens, but just because you have a Medicaid card does not mean you have better health outcomes. Expanding our Medicaid program is not the best way to deliver care to those in need and there is now evidence to support this. In 2008, Oregon officials wanted to expand eligibility for their Medicaid program, but only had enough funding for 10 thousand of the 90 thousand eligible people wanting to sign up. So, they held a lottery and the Oregon Health Insurance Experiment was born. economists used this unique opportunity to create the first ever randomized controlled study of the effect of Medicaid on patients' health. The next few years, those who received Medicaid and those who did not were tracked. A new study published in the Journal of New England Medicine about this

64th Legislative Day

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1819

2021

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

experiment showed... it showed that Medicaid coverage generated significant improvements in measured physical health outcomes despite the fact that the Medicaid group ended up using much more health care than the control group including the use of emergency rooms. The Wall Street Journal reported specifically that the Medicaid group used about 35 percent more health services but showed no clinical differences from the identical uninsured group across basic health measures like blood pressure, blood sugar and cholesterol levels that can be improved with the right treatment. The same was true comparing subgroups such as those with chronic diseases like diabetes. Health spending on top of that was higher among the Medicaid group despite claims that using more preventative care and less emergency room will lower costs. By the way, Oregon pays physicians about 30 percent more to treat Medicaid patients than Illinois does and Illinois doctors are 1.7 times as likely as Oregon doctors to stop taking new Medicaid patients. Continuing from the Wall Street Journal, they reported that federal Medicaid rules require states to offer all you can eat benefits to everyone rather than targing... targeting public assistance to those in need. These mandates often force states to squeeze provider payments to pennies on the private dollar, further harming quality and access for the poor. Here in Illinois, we are blessed with some of the most advanced health care resources in the United States. We must work with our hospitals, managed care organizations, doctors and dentists, and health economists to figure out what works best for us, especially as our budget pressures are both unique and severe. I believe we need to work closely

64th Legislative Day

1	with all involved to see if expanding programs like Access
2	DuPage or expanding access to health savings accounts, which
3	give individuals more accountability for their health
4	spending while providing the insurance coverage they need, is
5	more of a solution. We are about to make promises we cannot
6	keep. And promising benefits that we cannot afford or that
7	people cannot access and for which the outcomes are negligible
8	is the wrong way to care for our most needy. If there ever
9	was a time to proceed cautiously with a program and rethink
10	how we provide care to the needy, that time is now. Please
11	vote 'no' so we can separate the good from the excessive in
12	this Bill and direct our health care care dollars in the
13	most effective way possible. Thank you."
14	Speaker Turner: "Representative Demmer."

- 14
- 15 Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield." 16
- Demmer: "Representative, this is a.m. this is a big Bill. This is... 17
- I think we said earlier 638 pages. It includes expansion of 18
- Medicaid, various fixes to the SMART Act, creation of an 19
- entirely new care coordination program, changes effecting 20
- nursing homes, mental health providers, prescription drugs. 21
- 22 Why are these Bills all put together? Why couldn't we debate
- and vote on each of these provisions on their own merit 23
- instead of one massive sink or swim Bill?" 24
- "Well, they're all related to Medicaid, 25 Feigenholtz:
- Representative Demmer. They're all germane, if that's what 26
- 27 you're asking."
- Demmer: "Yeah, it is. And you know, I just... I bring that up 28
- 29 because I think several Members on our side have indicated

64th Legislative Day

28

29

5/27/2013

that there are significant portions of this Bill that we 1 2 support. I draw your attention to the care coordination plan 3 which, I think, is an exciting opportunity to improve care and also control costs and I'd like to have had a chance to ... 4 5 look at that, to debate that and vote on that 6 independently, you know, on its... on its own merits, rather 7 than being tied in with all these other changes together. But I want to look at the major... the biggest portion of this Bill 8 9 which, I think, is the Medicaid expansion portion. And a lot of the argument that's been made today has been based on the 10 11 argument that the Federal Government will pay 100 percent of 12 the cost for the first 3 years, that this has no financial impact on the state. And so, my question is, what assurance 13 do we have that the Federal Government will not change its 14 15 FMAP matching rate?" Feigenholtz: "Representative Demmer, I don't believe ever in the 16 history of Medicaid that the Federal Government has ever 17 18 rolled back a program. I know that we had a few programs. We 19 knew the duration of enhanced match and the second the Federal 20 Government said it was going away, we knew it. In this 21 situation we are comfortable because we did put a speed bump 22 in the Bill with the drop below 90 percent provision." 23 Demmer: "But we don't have any legal assurance that nothing... that 24 the Federal Government will not change its rate?" Feigenholtz: "The only assurance we have is history and they have 25 26 never repealed Medicaid." 27 Demmer: "So, what would happen... tell me what would happen if the

Federal Government does drop its rates below 90 percent?

What's the ... what's the Bill provide for in that situation?"

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

Feigenholtz: "The program... the expansion program phases out. I 1 2 believe we've given three months to ramp down the program." 3 Demmer: "And that could happen at any time? The Federal Government 4 could, at any time, change and that would trigger the three 5 month... Okay." 6 Feigenholtz: "Yes." 7 Demmer: "Now, the... the trigger really only kicks in if it drops 8 below 90 percent. Is that right?" Feigenholtz: "Correct." 9 Demmer: "So, in the first 3 years, when we're basing our argument 10 11 today on the assumption that the Federal Government will pay 12 100 percent, should the Federal Government decide... I think this Bill takes effect on January 1... should the Federal 13 Government decide on January 2 that instead of paying 100 14 15 percent of costs it will now only pay 90 percent of costs, what would the ... what would the maximum exposure ... because under 16 that, the trigger wouldn't be activated and the program 17 wouldn't exist as it is. What's our maximum exposure here? 18 What... what would 10 percent of this new population's cost be 19 in a given year?" 20 21 Feigenholtz: "In the third year, it's 200 million, but 22 Representative, I really believe it's very unlikely that that scenario would ever happen. This is a.m. this is, as you can 23 imagine, the cornerstone of our President's agenda. And I 24 believe that many of us have been waiting for this moment." 25 Demmer: "There have been..." 26 Feigenholtz: "And I'm sure he has." 27 "Representative Bellock brought up earlier... there was a 28

proposal, and I know you said that proposal has been

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

withdrawn, but it certainly shows that... that, at a time when the President put together that proposal, he was willing to consider a blended rate. I mean, they even cited in the creation of that budget, they cited that it doesn't make sense to have these all different rates applying to this enhanced match for this population this... They proposed simplifying it at one single blended rate which would be lower than the 100 percent. So, it's... it's very much in the realm of possibility that the President could choose to... to decrease this rate."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I... I think that there have been a lot of ongoing discussions about the Affordable Care Act, including various populations, above 100 percent and what kind of hybrids will be accepted by Kathleen Sebelius. I... I think that there are a lot of moving parts to this. There's no... there's no question about it. But I believe that the blended rate issue is dead on arrival."

"Well, I appreciate that and thank you. Mr. Speaker, to Demmer: the Bill. I think that's a great point, that there are so many moving parts in this negotiation still. Today we still don't have a firm knowledge of where the Federal... Federal Government will go with this in years to come. I think it's important to look at. This is supposed to be, Representative Feigenholtz said, this is supposed to be the crowning achievement of the Obama Administration. The intent, when this Bill was written, was never to allow states to opt in or to opt out of this Medicaid expansion. cornerstone of their... of the program. In fact, they made it as like... as likely as they could that states would... would enter into this expansion by giving a 100 percent match for

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5/27/2013

the first 3 years and by saying in the original Bill that if you said no to the expansion of Medicaid that you lose all Medicaid dollars, all of the state's Medicaid dollars. The ... the Supreme Court came in and said you can't do that, that's coercion. It was so important to the Federal Government that they enact this that they coerced states into accepting this. The Federal Government put into place the option for us to say yes or no based on only the money at hand for the expansion of Medicaid. In fact, in the Supreme Court case, the Federal Government called this 100 percent subsidy 'extremely generous'. The Federal Government said this was an extremely generous subsidy. So, in a world in which debt ceiling negotiations are happening regularly, in which the Federal Government subsidy is a subject of continued debate, wouldn't an extremely generous subsidy be one of the things that's on the table to try to control this or to try to make ends meet in debt ceiling negotiations? I think today we're... we are committing to a program that is very much in motion, the details of which are very much uncertain, the landscape for which is not set yet. And the State of Illinois just can't afford to make these kind of open-ended commitments given the... the current budget situation in the state. So, I support a 'no' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, I do come from a health care background. I may have a different perspective on this from many, even on my own side of the aisle. The mission of the organization that I come from is

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

building communities of healing and hope. Before I came here, the last few things that I was involved with, very proudly: building a women's health center so women in my area don't have to travel to Indianapolis and St. Louis for noninvasive breast procedures, refurbishing a cancer center that is now working in concert with Sloan-Kettering and world class facilities right in Danville, Illinois, reaching out to those in need and those in the margins of society, making sure individuals don't leave our local hospital without the prescriptions that they need, access to health care. The emergency room at the hospital in Danville, Illinois, a community of 31 thousand, 40 thousand visits a year to the emergency room. The discussion as it relates to, is our health care system broken, to me, is a given. It is, in fact, broken. Community outreach programs that reach out to seniors and teens, teen pregnancy rate in my community, the highest in the State of Illinois and not by a little. The issue becomes not can we do better; the issue is, are we rushing in? The implementation of this Act... of this Bill has many, many positive aspects as the previous speaker just discussed. The care coordination piece should be discussed separately. It's something that I'm very interested in. It's something that Representative Bellock and Leitch and others talked about. It's something that hospitals talked about, that they want to be even more involved and engaged in instead of giving money to some third-party insurance administrator. The RUGs dynamic that should have been taken care of years ago, something that needs to be done. The United States Supreme Court has ruled that states may opt out. I have a question that relates to

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

why the rush. States like Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, have said we're going to take a cautious and deliberative and thoughtful approach. Fifteen states have said we're not just going to rush in. It is my belief that there's going to be a massive, massive renegotiation of how this is implemented. I am very, very concerned on a number of different levels. The President of the United States himself, in two consecutive budgets, has suggested less federal money for this dynamic than the year before. Less money. What more evidence do you need that the states are going to inherit more of this than was promised than that? The previous speaker spoke about a dynamic in which states were going to be coerced into just rushing in with a massive expansion of Medicaid. Certainly, when the Supreme Court ruled that that was not going to be okay, the math got thrown a curveball in a huge way on that date. I'm also very concerned about the confidence level that the department has to even implement this. Let me give you a quick review in my two and a half years in this Body of the department in implementing different dynamics and I will assign a degree of difficulty, and you see if you agree with me that I'm a little concerned. When I first got here, there was an RFP for health care, the simple health care plan for employees around the state. It was awarded to a company who, upfront, said we don't have a program around the state nor are we going to implement a program around the state. So twothirds of our state, the employees and retirees, had no plan at all. When the Auditor General did a review and an audit of that RFP, he suggested that it was a boondoggle of the highest order, that we were assigning a letter grade to that dynamic,

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

5/27/2013

it would an F. I would assign that on a scale of 1 to 10, in terms of difficulty, a 1, and that's being generous. Any junior high school class could have got that right. Now, the Governor asks us to implement some very serious, serious reforms to Medicaid led by the Sponsor. The Sponsor herself pulled me aside and said, Representative, you know a lot about this. I need your help with this. And I thought it was my responsibility to do my share to help with some very, very, difficult decisions. But what happened? Three hundred and fifty million dollars in terms of scrubbing people off the rolls and these are people who don't even live in the State of Illinois or who blatantly do not meet the participation requirements. We decided upfront, on a vote of 112 to 4 in this Body and 57 to 0 in the Senate, that we needed a thirdparty company to do the simple scrubbing of people from the rolls. What more do you need to know, in terms of an admission, that something on a scale of 1 to 10 that I would assign maybe a 3 or a 4, we couldn't get done by ourselves? Now we have the largest expansion of services in the history of, not only this state, but in the history of the nation. Massive. Numbers that are unparalleled, yet the same department meeting after meeting after meeting, committee meeting after committee meeting, used terms like, well, we hope we can get it done, maybe we will be ready. I would argue, on a scale of 1 to 10, this implementation's about a 25. And the same team is being called on to implement it. If that doesn't frighten you, you are a brave soul. How many people in this chamber, if we're being honest, have read this Bill? I would argue probably about the same percentage that

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

14

15

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5/27/2013

in U.S. Congress admitted that they hadn't read the Bill, which is almost everybody. The biggest expansion in history, the biggest factor in terms of our economy in history and most Members haven't read the Bill. The people in Congress that handed us this admitted they didn't read the Bill. I don't know what's in it. It sounds like a pretty dog-gone good idea to me, didn't read it. I've not only read it, I went back in 2005 and 2006, many of the folks in this chamber were not here, many were, and I read some of the transcript of the debate on the floor that day when Medicaid was dramatically expanded the last time around. And it is shocking how similar that transcript is to the debate today. Won't cost us any money. It's going to save us money. And then in my first year, the Governor comes right here in this chamber in the well and says, wow, we didn't do the math. Turns out that didn't save us any money. It's cost us a heck of a lot of money. It's unsustainable. We need you to help us out. So, on a vote of 112 to 4 in this chamber, 57 to 0 in the other chamber, we said Governor, you're right, unaffordable. Twenty-four months later, it's as if the memory has been zapped from this chamber and the math skills have just simply been put aside. I would offer this. It is okay to call a timeout. It's okay to take a thoughtful and deliberative approach to this. I come from a health care background. I am deeply concerned about these issues. But to rush in and make promises that we know in our hearts cannot be kept is the wrong thing to do. I... I urge a more thoughtful and deliberative approach. I urge a road map that can actually

64th Legislative Day

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

2324

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

get us to the finish line. Think long and hard about this vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I believe I'm the last speaker on this Bill and I noticed that the esteemed Majority Leader quoted the Governor of Arizona, Jan Brewer. I would like to paraphrase Lady Thatcher when she said, the problem with liberalism is sooner or later you run out of other peoples' money. The State of Illinois, the United States Government, they've run out of other peoples' money. I've been sitting here listening to this debate and my good friends on the other side of the aisle take a lot of pride because Uncle Sam is going to pay for this. Uncle Sam is borrowing 40 cents on every dollar it's spending. It's borrowing 40 cents on every dollar. The State of Illinois is insolvent and yet, the next few years we're going to have to pay an additional \$2 billion or nearly \$2 billion and that's from the Kaiser Foundation, not a Republican, not a Democrat. Let's just walk ourselves through the last 10 years of this horrible governance in the State of Illinois. In 2003, you expanded public assistance and our rolls were about one and a half million out of 12.5 million people in the State of Illinois. 2003, you borrowed \$10 billion. Go ahead to 2005, 2006, you decided we wanted to expand public assistance rolls more. So, what are we going to do to find that money? We're going to skip the pension payments that year and you did. In fiscal years '10 and '11, you wanted to expand public assistance more, so what did you do to the pension payments? We're going to borrow \$4 billion. So, in the last 10 years, you've

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

17

1819

2021

22

23

24

25

26

2728

29

5/27/2013

quadrupled the state debt and you've expanded Medicaid from one and a half million people to nearly 3 million people. Three million people out of about 12 and a half million people. It's easy to be compassionate when you're spending the taxpayer dollars. It's easy to be... say I'm compassionate and giving people health care when the taxpayers of the State of Illinois are picking up the tab. It's easy, but it's wrong. It's very wrong. So, what should Senate Bill 26 come with? What little warning should this Bill come with? It should come with a big sign on it that says 'taxpayers beware' because the working men and women of the State of Illinois, we're going to sock it to you again because we're going to promise our client interest groups more free things. It doesn't work. There is no free lunch and the people... the working men and women of this state are going to be socked billions of dollars. Thank you. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope that Leader Bellock gets to have some additional comments on this issue, as she's been dealing with this for years and works on this issue tirelessly, probably about 16 hours a day. God bless her. I'm not sure how she does it, but we would all do well to heed her warnings. As I... I think about this Bill on unlimited debate. When we were talking about concealed carry it was five minutes. This is unlimited debate because we're handing out unlimited money. So, we can all talk about all the freebies, and everybody gets something, and Christmas comes early to the Statehouse. The Majority Leader talked about it's going to come out of one pocket or the other. I

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

5/27/2013

would suggest to you it comes out of both pockets. Why does everybody that talks about it comes out of one pocket or the other pretend that if money comes here from the Federal Government, it's got to be other people's money, not taxpayers from the State of Illinois who put money in the Federal Treasury? It's somebody's from Florida, or Washington, or somewhere else. They're going to pay for our free health care. Maybe we should ask Senator Durbin how that's going to look 3 years from now, if we'd be able to pay for everything. We talked about if veterans are covered in this Bill today. Let's carve out everybody else and just put veterans in the Bill. I bet you could get 118 votes. I'm confused as to who is the vulnerable population in this state, because for many years under Rod Blagojevich, we expanded it to be almost be everybody. You could make 400 percent of the poverty line and you could qualify for Medicaid. So, what happens after 4... after the third year out? We'll be stuck with 900 thousand new people on the rolls that we simply can't pay for. So, now if I don't support the Bill, the Leader said that we're for early death of individuals. I've heard that talking point from Alan Grayson on the Congressional Floor a few years back when Obamacare was being debated. I am going to vote my conscious. We can't afford this. The state is hemorrhaging money everywhere. So, what we'll do is add a 3, 4 billion dollar tab at the end. So, we'll talk about old bills that we have. We'll talk about new old bills. And we'll talk about the old bills that we'll be trying to pay off when these new bills come up when we add \$3 billion worth of payments. So, now what happens? I heard sirens going off not that long ago.

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Those were the fiscal sirens warning us that we cannot vote 1 2 for this Bill. We have doctors who aren't taking Medicaid 3 patients right now. Why are we going to hand them a useless piece of paper and say, oh, look, you have health care now. 4 5 Now you can go get services when doctors aren't taking it. I 6 think it's time to put a fork in the State of Illinois because 7 it's... we're done if this passes. We can't afford it. I've heard on this House Floor that this saves money and I haven't 8 9 seen it. And somehow, this is going to stimulate the economy and that is exactly wrong. I've talked to businesses in Itasca 10 who know that if this passes they will simply lay people off, 11 12 they won't hire more people, and you can stick a fork in the State of Illinois 'cause it's done." 13

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon." 14

16

- 15 Tryon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to yield my time to the Lady from DuPage, Representative Bellock."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock." 17
- 18 Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think 19 we've had a really, really good debate on the Bill. I just would like to close on our side by saying I want to thank 20 21 Representative Feigenholtz for all the work she has done in 22 the past along with Senator Steans, Senator Righter, and myself last year. We spent almost a year trying to sustain 23 the Medicaid system in Illinois. We are trying to look at 24 this in a fiscal way as well as an emotional way in trying to 25 serve the people that the Medicaid system serves. I just ask 26 27 in the end today, looking forward to the largest expansion of 28 health care in the State of Illinois, that we would look at 29 the uncertainty of the numbers that we're looking at right

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

5/27/2013

now. We're not sure if it's 300 thousand, 500 thousand, or 700 thousand. We're not sure after the first 3 years if it's going to be a 90 percent rate or will it change to a 65 percent rate? Will the cost to this state be 1.5 billion or will it be 6.5 billion? Right now, across the United States, this issue this week is being debated in Legislatures across the country. Only 25 states have opted in taking the cautious approach, not knowing how much it will cost their state, especially states that are in financial, fiscal, ill-footed right at the time being. So, that's why I would ask you to take a second look at this before we take this vote, because I pointed out in one of my original questions Representative Feigenholtz, we do not have to opt in now. We can wait 'til the fall, we can wait 'til the spring Session next year. We can wait 'til the debt ceiling talks take place in Washington in September and then we will be more certain about the facts. We will know if the options on the table in the Federal Government are going to have changes as far as the rates go. So, I would ask all of you right now to defer your decision today on this major expansion of health care until we have more clarification on the federal fiscal policy. Remember, the numbers are \$985 billion as to the cost of this expansion. With a Federal Government with a debt of \$18 trillion and a State Government that Judy Baar Topinka, our Comptroller, said even with the extra 1.5 billion we got in April, that in the end of June, we will have on hand \$7.5 billion of unpaid bills. We are trying to pay the Medicaid bills because we care about the population that needs their health care. And I'm asking you, by deferring this decision,

64th Legislative Day

7

8

9

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

28

29

5/27/2013

to not end up having to make the heart-wrenching decisions
that we did last year in the SMART Act. Please, let's defer
this decision 'til we have more financial knowledge as to
where we're going and protect the solvency of the State of
Illinois, enabling it to take care of this most vulnerable
population in the future. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to push back on a few things and then move to exactly why this is one of the best things that we can do for the State of Illinois. So, first of all, Margaret Thatcher's quote was actually about socialists, not liberals. So let me start there. Secondly, the example cited about Oregon, Medicaid having no effect on health has been widely debunked. The sample size was too small and even if you consider that, the effects on mental health were sizeable. So, let's... let's talk from facts here. Second, it was cited that this is going to be disruptive to Illinois businesses. This does not apply to anyone with fewer than 50 full-time employees, which is 96 percent of all businesses in the State of Illinois. And of those over 50 employees, only .2 percent do not currently provide coverage. In addition, we'll be setting up an exchange that will allow smaller businesses or folks with a lot of part-time workers like the hospitality workers in my district to find an affordable plan on the exchange. I'd also like to note that recent GOP Governors to sign on to Medicaid expansion are Terry Branstad, Kasich in Ohio, and Rick Scott in Florida, and Jan Brewer, that wonderful liberal from down South, has said expand Medicaid or I will veto all Bills. So,

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10 11

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

this isn't something that's just being considered by liberals or by Democrats in the State of Illinois but by people everywhere as being very good policy. But let's look at Illinois as we close this debate. So, in terms of Medicaid, our Medicaid spending growth is down. The assumed rate of growth is 2.2 percent for fiscal year 2014, which is a 20year low. And we know that every dollar, every dollar that we receive in matching funds generates more than 2 dollars in local and state economic activity. So, it is a net stimulus to our economy. Furthermore, I would just note that nationally, the Kaiser Foundation, which has been cited multiple times here, estimates that states on average are going to increase their budgets by .3 percent, compared to an 18 to 20 percent increase by the Federal Government. So, this is one of the best returns on investment we could possibly have. I would also note that we here in Illinois have the 44th lowest cost of Medicaid per patient in the nation. Right now, before any of this goes into effect, 44th in the nation. We have continued to cut and we will continue to find more efficiencies, but this is actually the fiscally responsible thing to do. We are covered by 100 percent for the first three years and 90 percent thereafter. Now, some folks have said, well, hold on, what happens with that 10 percent? Well, currently, once again, according to the Kaiser Foundation, a conservative estimate is that over 10 years this will save us \$950 million in uncompensated care, care that we're currently giving but that is being passed to all of us as private citizens in the form of private insurance premiums. A further study by the Harvard Law School says that that number would

64th Legislative Day

1 2

5/27/2013

be 1.7 billion over 5 years. So, either way we are saving money with this. This is the right thing to do. The matching funds will free up general revenue funds for other things, some of the restorations that we talked about with the SMART Act or spending on schools or whatever else. We are going to generate at least \$4.6 billion over the next three years, if not more. We are not just talking about people who are... are poor and have been poor all their lives. We're talking about people who were hit hard by the 2008 recession who need this coverage, who've never had to use it before but will have an opportunity now. We're talking about poor people who need an opportunity, who are trying to keep their jobs. This is the right thing to do and it's the fiscally responsible thing to do. I strongly, strongly urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year, my colleague on the other side of the aisle and I had a very, very difficult day, 365 days ago, on the floor of the House where we... we did a very painful exercise. And one of the reasons that I stayed at the table on that is so I could be here today and do this. A lot of people on the other side of the aisle say, why now? Why are we rushing into this? Three hundred and forty-two thousand people in this state who have historically been discriminated against because they're childless can't wait another day for this. In October, they will begin to enroll in this program and they will become insured for the first time in the history. Why do it at all? Because, you know, there are actually people here who don't want to make perfect the enemy of good. They want to be able

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

27

2829

5/27/2013

to take care of their constituents who walk through the front doors of their district offices and every day it's another story. Why is the mental health facility closing? Why haven't I got paid in... in 9 weeks? What is... 9 months? What is going on with the State of Illinois? Let me tell you the benefits coming to our state and the very, very interesting group of allies on this Bill. The Shriver Center and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce support this Bill. There are 20 thousand jobs coming to this state under the Affordable Care Act to your communities. The benefit is exponential. As the previous speaker said, for every dollar we spend, we'll benefit 2 dollars and 44 cents. The saddest thing is that a lot of your constituents, those of you who are considering a 'no' vote, are going to benefit dramatically from this measure over the years. We are going to be able to celebrate reconstructing health care in this state. But if you want to make it political, if you've been waiting for your chance for the last few years to hit the red button because you don't want to support Obamacare, think twice, because a lot of people in your districts can benefit from this. And again, I encourage you, this is a watershed moment for Democrats, a watershed moment for people who have been waiting for health care their whole life. I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the passage of the Bill. Let me remind the Body that Mr. Sullivan has asked for a verification. So, Members will be at their desks and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please

64th Legislative Day

1	record yourselves, Members. Mr. Thapedi. Please take the
2	record. On this question, there is 63 voting 'yes' and 55
3	voting 'no'. And Mr. Sullivan has asked for a verification.
4	Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative vote."
5	Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.
6	Representative Acevedo; Representative Arroyo;
7	Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios;
8	Representative Bradley; Representative Daniel Burke;
9	Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Cassidy;
10	Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Conroy;
11	Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative
12	D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William
13	Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury;
14	Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative
15	Farnham; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine;
16	Representative Flowers; Representative Ford; Representative
17	Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth;
18	Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hernandez;
19	Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley;
20	Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson;
21	Representative Jefferson; Representative Jones;
22	Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative
23	Martwick; Representative Mautino; Representative Mayfield;
24	Representative McAsey; Representative Mell; Representative
25	Christian Mitchell; Representative Mussman; Representative
26	Nekritz; Representative Phelps; Representative Riley;
27	Representative Rita; Representative Sente; Representative
28	Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Smith;
29	Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Representative

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Verschoore; 1 2 Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative 3 Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Zalewski; and 4 Mr. Speaker." 5 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan." Sullivan: "For the Obamacare vote, is Representative Smiddy in 6 7 here?" Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy is in his chair." 8 Sullivan: "Is Conroy in their chair?" 9 "Representative Conroy is in her chair." 10 Speaker Lang: Sullivan: "Is Representative Beiser in his chair?" 11 12 Speaker Lang: "Representative Beiser is standing and waving at you." 13 Sullivan: "And Representative Drury?" 14 15 Speaker Lang: "Representative Drury is in his chair." Sullivan: "Thank you." 16 Speaker Lang: "On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 55 17 18 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On House Bill... on Senate 19 20 Bill 26, Representative Currie now moves that we reconsider 21 the vote by which this Bill passed. Representative 22 Feigenholtz moves that we lay that on the table. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the 23 Motion to reconsider is laid on the table. On page 5 of the 24 Calendar appears Senate Bill 2266. Please read the Bill." 25 26 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

27

28

regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

64th Legislative Day

Amendments?"

5

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2266, the purpose of this legislation is to encourage gas utilities to..."

 Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps, do you have
- 6 Phelps: "If we do, I'd like to adot... adopt them and debate the 7 Bill on Third."
- 8 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Sponsor asks that this Bill be 9 placed on the Order of Second Reading. Please put the Bill on
- 10 the Order of Second Reading. And please read the Bill."
- 11 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning 12 regulations. The Bill was read a second time on a previous
- day. Amendments 3 and 4 have been approved for consideration.
- Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Phelps."
- 15 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- 16 Phelps: "Believe this becomes the Bill. I'd like to adopt it and debate on Third Reading, please."
- 18 Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the
- Amendment. There being no debate, those in favor say 'yes';
- opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is
- adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- 22 Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative
- 23 Phelps and has been approved for consideration."
- 24 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- 25 Phelps: "This Amendment... we exempt MidAmerican Energy and Mt.
- 26 Carmel Public Utility Company. I ask for its adoption."
- 27 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment.
- 28 Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."
- 29 Sullivan: "I'm sorry. I want it to be on Third Reading."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes';
- opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is
- 3 adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- 4 Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- 5 Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- 6 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2266, a Bill for an Act concerning
- 7 regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- 8 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- Phelps: "You... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 9 House. Senate Bill 2266, the main purpose of this legislation 10 11 is to encourage gas utilities to invest their infrastructure 12 in order to improve the safety and reliability of the system for their customers. That's all we're doing. We're making it 13 safer, making it more reliable. We don't want a San Bruno, 14 15 California. Eight people lost their lives. Some of the gas lines in Chicago are as old as when President Lincoln was in 16 office. So, that's what we're dealing with here. Not only to 17 18 invest, but to prioritize the investments so that the most important improvements will be done first. The process is 19 going to work as follows; it's not formula rate. The utility 20 21 will submit their investment plan, which is going to be called 22 a Rider. It's going to the ICC for approval and the ICC has 120 days to respond. The legislation clearly lists the 23 projects that qualify for the Rider. Some examples, and I'm 24 not going to read them all because of time, they're going to 25 replace old leaky pipes with new pipes, relocate meters, 26 upgrade low pressure to medium pressure, install smart 27 meters, replace high pressure pipelines and replace difficult 28 29 to locate mains. Clearly, all these improvements are meant to

64th Legislative Day

28

5/27/2013

1	do one thing, and I said it earlier, the safety and
2	reliability of our for our customers, and the ICC must
3	approve these prior to construction. Now let me make this one
4	point clear. I commend I commend all these utility companies
5	for taking a proactive approach, because sooner than later
6	the feds are going to come down with unfunded mandates to do
7	this work. So, we want to make sure that we want to make
8	sure we pass this today because this is a cheaper way to do
9	it, unless the feds come in and mandate, and they're going to
10	do that any day. So, I ask for its passage."
11	Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The
12	Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."
13	Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
14	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
15	Sullivan: "Representative, some of the financial figures that
16	might worry some people, I'd like to kind of address some of
17	those."
18	Phelps: "Sure."
19	Sullivan: "We have a rate cap, do we not?"
20	Phelps: "We do in this Bill. That's one of the safeguards we put
21	in there for the for the ICC and that also got them and the
22	Attorney General to be neutral on the Bill."
23	Sullivan: "This rate cap ensures obviously, the costs are going
24	to be down, but also in there we also look at and in past
25	things we've seen a rate of return. Can you explain in this
26	Bill what the rate of return is?"
27	Phelps: "It's for their work that they do. The legislation, we

don't make any change on really the rate of return. The ICC

64th Legislative Day

- will determine the rate of return for the gas utility, just as they... as they've always done, Representative." Sullivan: "And... and Representative, the point I was... I was going
- with that is, there is not a guaranteed rate of return in this Bill, like we have in previous Bills. But we have let the ICC, the rate of return is what they have previously set
- 7 through the ICC action."
- 8 Phelps: "Absolutely."
- 9 Sullivan: "Okay. When we talk about cost, I believe the figure 10 for Ameren was about a penny a day?"
- Phelps: "The... and I'll go through these and these are on average per month. But yes, Ameren's about a penny a day. Peoples is, on average, about a dollar fourteen a month. Nicor, they're not in... they're in this Bill, but they have a... they have a three-year freeze agreement with the ICC and I don't think that expires until 2015, I believe. And theirs is going to be maybe 90 cents a month."
- Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, 18 19 when we come down here or when we're in our districts we talk 20 about creating jobs or creating an environment for businesses to create jobs, well, you get to do both. You get them both 21 22 here. By passing this legislation, we will allow these companies to actually hire people so your vote will create 23 jobs. But more importantly, and this is the function of this 24 Bill, is to create an environment where business says, hey, 25 we're trying to do good things here in Illinois. We really 26 27 haven't done that lately. We want to create an environment 28 for businesses to come here and invest and build their 29 buildings. This is also about safety. And if you go up to the

64th Legislative Day

28

29

5/27/2013

City of Chicago, as the Representative has said, we have so 1 2 many aging infrastructures that if one of those would explode, 3 there would be absolute Armageddon. We don't want that. We 4 need to move forward with this Bill and we need to pass it. Please vote 'aye'." 5 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost." 6 "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" 7 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." 8 9 Bost: "Representative, you know there was several... now... now, this 10 was not ... originally the Bill was ... was going to go quite a bit 11 further than this. Is that correct?" 12 Phelps: "That is absolutely right and we thought this was a smarter way to do it because of a Rider instead of formula 13 rates, which would have been a lot more expensive." 14 15 Bost: "And... and because of that that's why those rates are so low that we... that we just talked about. It deals strictly with 16 the construction side, the safety side and the implementation 17 18 of... of the new valves for that safety purposes, correct?" "Right. I mean, what we're doing is, is making it 19 Phelps: 20 definitely safer because you heard of what happened in San 21 Bruno, California, eight people died, left a huge crater. We 22 have pipes in Chicago, like I said earlier, that are as old as when President Lincoln was in office." 23 "Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I stand in strong 24 25 support of the Bill. I agree with the previous speaker because we do not want Armageddon. Please vote 'yes'." 26 "Ford." 27 Speaker Lang:

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

64th Legislative Day

1	Ford: "Representative, I have a few questions. One, could you
2	tell me the last rate increase each of the energy providers
3	received?"
4	Phelps: "Representative, I believe that rate case I'm going to
5	make a little bit of a guess here. I thought it was one of
6	the reason I don't know exactly how long ago. I will tell
7	you this, one of the reasons why we're doing this Bill is
8	because to align us with 28 other states, Representative Ford.
9	But the Illinois Appellate Court ruled that Peoples Gas case;
10	ICC didn't have authority, that's why we're mainly doing this
11	legislation, to give the ICC that authority."
12	Ford: "So this Bill, of course, is not an automatic rate increase,
13	it just gives the authority to the energy companies to go and
14	ask for a rate increase?"
15	Phelps: "Absolutely. And let me let me say this too. Not very
16	often do you have companies that want to that are here in
17	Illinois that want to put in infrastructure improvements. For
18	example, Ameren's willing to spend in infrastructure
19	improvements 330 million, Peoples Gas is willing to spend
20	almost 2 billion, a little over 2 billion, to be honest with
21	you, with a lot of jobs being created. So, you know, we're
22	welcoming that and I commend them for doing this because
23	they're taking a proactive approach."
24	Ford: "Do you think these companies that's asking for rate
25	increases are big businesses or small businesses?"
26	Phelps: "I You know, I would say, compared to the people they
27	hire or whatever, Representative Ford, you can make your own
28	determination. I would I would call them big business."

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

Ford: "Yeah. So, that's the problem that I have with the Bill 1 2 because we're here helping big businesses when small 3 businesses continue to struggle. And you know that when a small business would like to do improvements 4 neighborhoods at... at their local stores or restaurants, it's 5 6 very hard for them to get the support from community banks or 7 big banks. But in this case, we have an opportunity to provide the support for big businesses and the fact that we're doing 8 9 that, you said that there will be jobs created. My mission, as a Legislator, is to make sure that I provide relief and 10 11 support for families in a time of need and to provide the 12 best policy. So, if you could tell me how, as we support these big businesses, how will the benefits trickle down to the 13 individuals that have to pay the bills?" 14 15 Phelps: "Well, Representative Ford, like I said, you know, the Federal Government's going to require these companies do 16 this. Some of the smaller companies had an opportunity to be 17 18 in this Bill, Representative Ford, they chose not to at the time. So, we gave everybody a chance. But you know, I'm... I'm 19 very glad that they're creating jobs here. I'm very glad that 20 they're concerned and I think all of them should be glad that 21 22 they're concerned about their old pipelines. And you saw what

lose their lives because where you live, and I know some of my pipes are old, down where I'm from, but mainly yours, I

think back in the 1860s. So, that would be a huge concern if

happened in San Bruno, California. I don't want people to

27 I was from Chicago."

23

26

28 Ford: "Well, thank you very much for your answers."

29 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

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

64th Legislative Day

1

_	erespo. Tham jou, speaker, with one speaker jietu.
2	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
3	Crespo: "Representative, let's go back to the cost per month or
4	per day. If I understand you correctly, you said Ameren
5	figures to add 30 cents a month; Peoples, a dollar fourteen
6	a month?"
7	Phelps: "Yeah. And then Nicor, because of the freeze which you're
8	very well aware of, they're they're guesstimating around 90
9	cents, something like that. But remember, a lot of this is
10	got to be approved by the ICC. They can't just automatically
11	do it, as you know. That's why we thought the Rider would be
12	the best way to go."
13	Crespo: "And according to our analysis, the Peoples increase is
14	around 2.5 percent, correct?"
15	Phelps: "Yeah and remember, here here's the safeguard we put in
16	here, because the maximum maximum amount a bill may increase
17	cannot exceed 4 percent on an average of two years. So, for
18	example, if the first year was 5 percent, the second year has
19	to be 3 percent and I think that was a very important
20	safeguard to put in this."
21	Crespo: "Now let let me ask you this. The 2.5 percent, is that
22	based on the entire bill or just the distribution portion?"
23	Phelps: "I believe that's the entire bill, Representative Crespo."
24	Crespo: "I I'm not sure about that 'cause as you, I'm not sure,
25	you probably know this, but on your gas bill or electric bill
26	there's two parts to your bill. There's the commodity itself
27	which is a cost that's passed on to the customer customer
28	with any markup, your transmission or distribution cost, it's

64th Legislative Day

1	a fixed cost and I believe the Rider addresses that fixed
2	cost, correct?"
3	Phelps: "I believe it does, yes."
4	Crespo: "So, that being the case it's more than 2.5 percent. The
5	2.5 percent is based on the entire bill, the commodity
6	fluctuates up or down. So the 2.5 is really a lot higher when
7	you factor that it only applies to the distribution."
8	Phelps: "Yeah. It's the delivery base rate revenues. And let me
9	say this, Representative Crespo, and I know you know a lot
10	about this. This is they just anticipate 2.5. I mean, you
11	know, it could be lower because that's going to be up to the
12	ICC as well."
13	Crespo: "I think, again, with all due respect, I think it's a lot
14	higher than that because it really should only apply to the
15	fixed cost or or the distribution. Now, according to our
16	analysis, Ameren intends to use the additional revenue to
17	apply investments to install advanced gas meters, correct?"
18	Phelps: "Yes."
19	Crespo: "And that seems like a new technology, something new in
20	the market."
21	Phelps: "Right. And you know, just like what we did with ComEd
22	and some of them, you know, the smart meters could eventually
23	lower the costs for the customers."
24	Crespo: "Okay."
25	Phelps: "They're bringing that modernization and that's one of
26	the reasons we're trying to do this as well."
27	Crespo: "So, let me ask you this. I can understand the Ameren
28	part and you mentioned the smart grid under ComEd. ComEd was
29	bringing the new product into the market. so they were looking

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

5/27/2013

for a way to recover their cost. I can see Ameren trying to do the same thing. I'm having such a difficult time understanding what Peoples is going to do. You talked about the fact that they want... move from low pressure to medium pressure, putting the meters outside, upgrade their pipes. This is their core competency. This is what they're supposed to do. We have a framework within the ICC to do that. Approximately four or five years ago, Representative, Peoples came before the General Assembly and they were looking at decoupling. It was a method to get creative on how to increase rates; it never went anywhere, so this is their second attempt to do that. So, you need to think long and hard. If they're having an issue with the ICC let's... let's talk about that. But for Peoples, I really don't understand they're asking us to do... help them do what they're supposed to do, circumvent the ICC process. The cost, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's not a 2.5 percent increase. Let's keep in mind that your customers, or your constituents are going to pay higher electric bills under the smart grid. Now, they're going to pay higher bills under this as well. So, I urge you to seriously consider what you're doing here. And with all due respect, Representative, you worked really hard on this, but I get Ameren. I could probably even vote if you were Ameren only. The Peoples part does not make any sense. There is a framework in place today to do exactly what they're supposed to do. So, I urge a... a 'no' vote. Thank you."

27 Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Several caucus members met with the rep... the Presidents and CEOs for Ameren, Peoples

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

1011

12

13

1415

16

1718

19

20

22

23

24

25

2627

28

5/27/2013

Gas and Nicor last night. It was a very informative meeting and what came out of that meeting is that this ... this build out on the backs of our constituents doesn't just pay for infrastructure upgrades it also pays for facilities. They're going to take taxpayer money to update their corporate offices, their satellite offices, possibly their corporate bathrooms. I don't think that we should be utilizing constituent money... constituent dollars for these purposes. There are very few jobs other than lobbyist jobs... there are a lot of chicken dinners that happened over the course, you know, while they were negotiating this Bill. However, there are no real jobs that are coming from this. Very few real jobs are going to be a result of this Bill. This is a very bad Bill. I don't think it's soup yet. They're not putting any investments back into the community. They haven't looked at the indigent individuals who cannot afford these rate increases. We just passed a rate increase. I don't think we should be forcing another one on the backs of our constituents. That is not why they sent us here. And I'm urging a 'no' vote. Thank you."

21 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, this is for the safety and reliability of our... for our customers, for the people we represent here in Springfield. I think, too, the Peoples Gas probably needs this more than anything just because of how old their pipes are. I'm not going to belabor this anymore. I think we all know how we're going to vote. But I want to commend these

64th Legislative Day

-1	
1	companies for taking a proactive approach and I just ask for
2	your approval."
3	Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed
4	'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all
5	voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sommer, Mr.
6	Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question,
7	there are 84 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no', and 1 voting
8	'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional
9	Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair is in
10	possession of a Motion by Mr. Turner to reconsider the vote
11	by which Senate Bill 2266 passed. Mr. Phelps moves to lay
12	that on the table. Those in favor of say 'yes'; opposed 'no'.
13	The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion by Mr. Turner is laid on
14	the table. Senate Bill 1470, Mr. Bradley. Please read the
15	Bill."
16	Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning
17	regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous
18	day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment
19	#2 is offered by Representative Bradley."
20	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."
21	Bradley: "Thank you. I'd ask for adoption of the Amendment and
22	debate it on Third."
23	Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr Excuse me, he withdrew
24	his light. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed
25	'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr.
26	Clerk."
27	Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
28	Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn
 2 Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the
- following committee action taken on May 27, 2013: recommends
- 4 be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1
- 5 to House Bill 3003."
- 6 Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1470. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- 7 Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act concerning
- 8 regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- 9 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."
- 10 Bradley: "Very simply, this allows the Environmental Protection
- 11 Agency to require PLAs on the LUST Fund. I'd ask for an 'aye'
- 12 vote."
- 13 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The
- 14 Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."
- 15 Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 16 Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- 17 Reis: "Representative, has Floor Amendment #2 been adopted to
- this Bill as well?"
- 19 Bradley: "Yes."
- 20 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, could you give us the status of the
- 21 Amendments?"
- 22 Clerk Hollman: "Committee Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.
- Floor Amendment #2 was adopted."
- 24 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."
- 25 Bradley: "Yes."
- 26 Reis: "Okay. Could you explain what Floor Amendment 2 does?"
- 27 Bradley: "Floor Amendment 2 is... give me a moment, please. I
- 28 believe Floor Amendment #2 is an initiative of the Department
- of Agriculture."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Reis: "Yes, it is. It's a pretty substantial Amendment..."
- 2 Bradley: "Well, you obviously have the answer in front of you.
- 3 Has notice and requirements with regards to meat and poultry
- 4 plants."
- 5 Reis: "Now does this include Type 1 plants or Type 2 plants or
- 6 both?"
- 7 Bradley: "What do you mean by Type 1 and Type 2 plants,
- 8 Representative?"
- 9 Reis: "It's your Amendment, Representative."
- 10 Bradley: "I... I'm asking you how you would define Type 1 and Type
- 11 2."
- 12 Reis: "Well, there's... it's in the Agricultural statute. Type 1..."
- 13 Bradley: "Well, it's my understanding that it would apply to
- all, but if you've got a different definition of Type 1 and
- 15 Type 2..."
- 16 Reis: "I don't think it applies to Type 2 plants. And I'm just
- saying, I mean, that's... you've got two very different Bills
- here that really aren't germane. If this was good for Type 1
- 19 plants..."
- 20 Bradley: "I... I'm sorry, Type 1."
- 21 Reis: "Okay. If it's good for Type 1 plants..."
- 22 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis, just let me quiet it down here. Ladies
- and Gentlemen, let's give these... let's give these folks your
- 24 attention, so that we can move through whatever business we
- have expeditiously, and then you can make all the noise you
- want. Mr. Reis."
- 27 Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And bear with me everybody, 'cause
- 28 this is a... this is two really Bills in itself. But the
- original Bill was to increase inspection and requirements of

64th Legislative Day

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

2829

5/27/2013

packing plants in the State of Illinois. But it does not affect Type 2 plants, which are predominately in Chicago. If this is a meat inspection and a consumer protection Bill, why would we apply those same standards to Type 2 plants and instead of just Type 1 plants?"

Bradley: "This is an initiative that came from the Department of

Bradley: "This is an initiative that came from the Department of Agriculture which they indicated was necessary due to recent federal changes made to the Federal Meat Inspection Act. I don't know why they've chosen Type 1. I assume that they're under the belief that they feel that this is necessary to comply with this specific issue with Type 1 plants."

"And I heard a lot from this as this Bill was originally introduced a long time ago. We heard a lot from our small state-inspected packing plants throughout the state that they just keep having to jump through more and more and more and more and more hoops. And they partially understand that, they partially don't understand that. What they're really upset about this Bill is that the Type 2 plants, which are predominantly in Chicago, don't have to adhere to all these standards on the E. coli testing and the things like that. So, I think if we're going to be fair, we should be fair across all measures and not just sock it to our small, predominantly downstate meat packing plants that are having a hard time competing as it is because they just can't move enough product through their plants to cash flow all this. So, I guess I would ask, can we amend the Bill to include Type 2 plants?"

Bradley: "I'm prepared to move the Bill now. Certainly, if the Bill does not pass, that would be under consideration, but as

64th Legislative Day

1	of right now I'm not prepared to make a commitment to amend
2	it."
3	Reis: "I have all the respect in the world for you, Representative
4	and I know you might hear from your packing plants when you
5	go home, but this is incredibly unfair burden that just is
6	applied to them when it should be implied to the the Type 2
7	plants in Chicago that are less than stellar record of
8	cleanliness and E. coli. You got chickens coming in, you got
9	rabbits coming in, you got all sorts of things. If anything,
10	they should be adhered to this before the Type 1 plants. Now,
11	I want to go to commitment Committee Amendment #1,
12	Representative. Why do we need to have a project labor
13	agreements on the LUST Fund?"
14	Bradley: "It's merely a policy decision on the State of Illinois.
15	If you're for PLAs in this context, vote for it. If you're
16	not, vote against it."
17	Reis: "Well, we all have that right, Representative. Bear with
18	me, I have all the respect in the world for you. So, will
19	this unionize the entire LUST cleanup project?"
20	Bradley: "It will require PLAs to be paid under prevailing wage."
21	Reis: "Which will in essentially require unionize this entire
22	process. I have a story to tell about what has happened with
23	this LUST Fund over the years and if we'd listen up, Ladies
24	and Gentlemen. Every one of you that buys a gallon of gasoline
25	or diesel fuel pays a small percentage of your price into the
26	LUST Fund to help clean up spills, leaking underground storage
27	tanks, things like that. Under Governor Blagojevich, he
28	simply didn't pay these invoices. Just simply didn't pay them.
29	We had a we had a company, a private company in downstate

64th Legislative Day

- Illinois in Salem... Mt. Vernon, that was owed \$16 million for 1 2 the work they did cleaning up underground storage tanks. And 3 I know how passionate many of you are about that issue. They had to borrow money to pay their employees. They had to borrow 4 money to pay for the utilities. They had to borrow money to 5 6 pay for their health care. On top of it, he had to pay income 7 tax on account receivable. He had 102 employees and went out of business because the State of Illinois didn't pay him for 8 9 the work that him and his employees did. Nineteen million dollars down the drain. Now, I bring this up because now we're 10 11 wanting to add more cost to it, higher labor costs. It doesn't 12 make sense. We all care about the environment. We all care about leaking underground storage tanks. Why do we dilute 13 something down that barely has enough money to take care of 14 15 the... the spills and leaks that we have now? So, with all due respect to my good friend and... neighbor Legislator to the 16 south, I think that both of these Amendments that become the 17 18 Bill are ill-advised at this time and I would encourage a 19 'no' vote."
- 20 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."
- 21 Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 22 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 23 Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I'm a little confused on the
- 24 Bill..."
- 25 Bradley: "I didn't yield."
- 26 Franks: "You didn't yield?"
- 27 Bradley: "I didn't yield."
- 28 Franks: "I've always hoping somebody would do that. I think that's
- awesome. But I got to ask you a question. I need your help.

64th Legislative Day

- 1 I'm reading this and I'm not sure if this still deals with
- underground storage tanks or not."
- 3 Bradley: "Yeah. There's two..."
- 4 Franks: "It does?"
- 5 Bradley: "As... as he just... you weren't listening to Representative
- 6 Reis."
- 7 Franks: "I... I try to."
- 8 Bradley: "He just criticized the underground storage tanks part."
- 9 Franks: "You got to talk into your microphone."
- 10 Bradley: "He just criticized the underground storage tank part."
- 11 Franks: "I'm not even sure I... I'm not sure if that's... if it's
- good or bad."
- 13 Bradley: "It would allow the EPA in certain context to require a
- 14 project labor agreement in the context of cleaning up
- 15 underground storage tanks. These are tax dollars that are
- 16 collected from, I believe, fuel tax that are then used to
- 17 clean up potential environmental problems. It would require
- 18 prevailing wage in all context, but in certain context it
- 19 would require a PLA."
- 20 Franks: "And tax dollars are used for these cleanups?"
- 21 Bradley: "This is tax dollars that are being used currently, being
- paid to private business owners to clean these things up."
- 23 Franks: "Why are we amending the agricultural stuff with the
- 24 underground storage tank..."
- 25 Bradley: "What?"
- 26 Franks: "I'm not sure why we're amending the Bill to also have
- the agricultural..."
- 28 Bradley: "That was a..."
- 29 Franks: "...aspects of it?"

64th Legislative Day

27

28

5/27/2013

Bradley: "...that was an initiative of the Department of Agriculture 1 2 and my understanding is that all that does, plants that are 3 currently required to send notice, there's a change made to stay in compliance with changes in the Federal Law." 4 5 Franks: "Would there be any concern on your part on this violating 6 the single issue clause?" 7 "It is the opinion of our legal staff 8 understanding that this does not violate the Single Subject 9 Act; that this is germane. And so, obviously it's something that could come up in the future, but it's not anticipated 10 that it would be successful." 11 12 Franks: "Okay. Well, thanks. I just... I couldn't really tell what was happening on this Bill and I appreciate your answers." 13 14 Bradley: "I appreciate your inquisitive questioning." 15 Franks: "Oh, thank you." Speaker Lang: "There are still six speakers on this Bill. The 16 Chair has... It's not on Short Debate, so the Chair will 17 institute a five-minute limit. The timer will be on. The next 18 speaker is Mr. Bost for five minutes." 19 Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? In your 20 last conversation..." 21 22 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields." Bost: "...you know, you... you had said that you didn't feel like 23 this violated the single subject rule. Who... Is that your 24 opinion, staff's opinion? I mean, you're really going to two 25 different areas here." 26

Bradley: "Yeah, I know it's loud in here, Representative, Leader.

It's my understanding that that's the opinion of legal staff

that has looked at it, that this does not violate single

64th Legislative Day

1

26 27

28

29

5/27/2013

2	subject"
3	Bost: "And let me tell you the reason why I'm specifically asking
4	this, because when we're talking about this Amendment #1, I
5	was around here when we had to actually increase the fee.
6	Okay, and we increased the fee, everybody was afraid of the
7	fee, and and we know how that is around here. And so what
8	they did was they tied the LUST Fund with a child sex abuse,
9	okay. And then put the tie and tried to claim that because of
10	the acronym. That didn't hold up in court. Okay? I don't know
11	where this labor agreement with the LUST Fund and I I don't
12	know what what their legal authority is, I think they're
13	kind of stretching it, to go with meat and poultry. I just
14	don't get that."
15	Bradley: "I I'm a lawyer, as you know."
16	Bost: "Yeah, I don't even play one on TV."
17	Bradley: "I am relying on the opinion of staff that this will be
18	constitutionally acceptable."
19	Bost: "Right. And and I guess only the courts will tell."
20	Bradley: "It it appears it appears to me just from first glance
21	at it that it's likely to, but I'm not rendering a legal
22	opinion, personally, other than reliance on what's been
23	conveyed to me by staff."
24	Bost: "Okay. I I have a feeling that that may pan out, but it's
25	the courts that will make that decision. But the real question

now is, is that, as we have, and both you and I in our

districts and all around this state, we have many areas where

we still have the problem to cure with leaking underground

storage tanks, by putting this labor agreement in place,

64th Legislative Day

- doesn't that reduce the overall amount of funds that can be 1 2 used to try to clean these messes up as this goes forward?" 3 Bradley: "I don't believe it will. EPA is going to have discretion 4 to determine when a PLA is appropriate and I would hope that 5 they were paying a reasonable wage on this very important 6 type of work that's going on currently and I would hope that 7 this would ensure it. So, Representative, my hope is that that would not be the case." 8
- 9 Bost: "Okay."
- 10 Bradley: "And potentially this could open it up to additional local businesses that might have an interest in this that currently aren't in it."
- "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Basically, the ... the 13 concern I do have is, is that it will not allow for as many 14 15 of these projects to be done, even though I believe they pay a fair wage. The problem and concern that I have is, the more 16 we direct these revenues into a situation where the cost goes 17 18 up, fewer and fewer of these brownfields and/or leaking underground storage tanks problems get cured. I do have a 19 concern about whether it violates the single subject rule. I 20 21 don't see how you put the leaking underground storage contract 22 agreements with poultry and meat. Now, as far as the poultry and meat side, you know, I... I can't do anything but listen 23 to... to Representative Reis on that. That is his expertise. 24
- And... but I would encourage a 'no' vote."
- 26 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino for five minutes or less."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Message received and noted. And I just rise to support the Gentleman's legislation. Amendment 1 amends the Meat and Poultry Inspection Act. What this is designed to

64th Legislative Day

1	do is simply notify the director of the Department of
2	Agriculture immediately if contaminated or mislabeled meat
3	has entered commerce. There's a Federal Law which requires
4	this. We do not have that within the State of Illinois and it
5	sets up steps in reporting for recall and if mislabeled or
6	contaminated products are being sent out into commerce to the
7	general public. So, that's the idea behind the Bill itself.
8	And I just simply rise to support the Gentleman's effort."
9	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia for five minutes."
10	Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bradley, I heard
11	you say that the moneys for this come from Motor Fuel Tax. Am
12	I not correct in saying the moneys come from the ownership
13	involved in Well, let me ask you to answer that question
14	first, Sir."
15	Bradley: "It's loud in here. Could yo… and you're speaking up,
16	but I could you repeat the question, please?"
17	Sacia: "I sure will. I'm under the impression that the moneys for
18	the LUST Fund come from the private entities involved and
19	that's why the petroleum marketers and the Chamber and all
20	other business organizations are in opposition?"
21	Bradley: "Representative, it's my understanding that the moneys
22	from in the LUST Fund come from public tax dollars."
23	Sacia: "Well, somewhere along the line I I've gotten some let
24	me make my point. The point is, we're trying to establish a
25	minimum fee, a prevailing wage, if you will. In other words,
26	everybody in here is concerned about environmental issues,
27	nobody doubts that. But if I don't pay prevailing wage, if
28	you hire the local guy that'll do it for \$20 an hour rather
29	than the prevailing wage of, say, \$40 an hour, you're going

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

to do twice the amount of cleanup that you would otherwise. 1 2 Just... why must this be a prevailing wage Bill?" 3 Bradley: "I thought you were making a statement, I'm sorry. The question component of that was?" 4 5 Sacia: "Well, I... maybe it ended up being rhetorical, I... I don't 6 know. But my question is, why must we create prevailing wage 7 on something that in... from my point of view is paid for, at least in large part, by the private entities involved? Now, 8 9 if I'm incorrect on that I will happily stand corrected. Just give me one moment. The reimbursable part of the fund is paid 10 11 for from the fees of the private owners. Now, I believe that 12 is correct, Representative, and if that is in fact the case..." Bradley: "No. I..." 13 Sacia: "...why are we..." 14 15 Bradley: "We... we have a disagreement on that. There... and let me, let me amend my statement as well, which is..." 16 Sacia: "Thank you." 17 "...there is a private portion, there is a public tax 18 Bradlev: 19 portion. It's my understanding that it's not solely the 20 private portion. This is a public policy. And I respect your views and I know you respect mine..." 21 22 Sacia: "Sure." 23 Bradley: "...it's a public policy decision as to whether or not 24 we're going to have prevailing wage on the LUST Fund and those that aren't for that, vote against it; those that are for it, 25 vote for it." 26 27 Sacia: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for verification should it obtain the necessary or the requisite number of votes. 28

Representative, you know, this Bill has ended up being very

64th Legislative Day

1	convoluted. We're we're throwing a livestock issue in with
2	a with a with a very important prevailing wage issue.
3	Certainly, the prevailing wage issue needs to be killed and
4	and to try to put them together to make something good, it's
5	kind of like making a silk purse out of a sow's ear. You can't
6	do it. Ladies and Gentlemen, I encourage a 'no' vote. Thank
7	you."
8	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer for five minutes."
9	Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
10	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
11	Davidsmeyer: "I just wanted to know if there was some excess money
12	in this LUST Fund, currently."
13	Bradley: "I'll try to get an answer for you as to what that is,
14	but I don't have it currently in front of me. I'll try to get
15	that for you."
16	Davidsmeyer: "Okay. The next question, do you know what the
17	current prevailing wage is for projects of this type?"
18	Bradley: "I would think that it would vary depending on the area
19	of the state. But again, there's an index somewhere, I think
20	with the Department of Labor, and that would be as accessible
21	to you as it would be to me."
22	Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Do you know how the prevailing wage is
23	figured?"
24	Bradley: "Again, I think that is a calculation that's made by
25	the Department of Labor. And again, there should be a chart
26	or index which was readily available to all Members of the
27	General Assembly and depends on the area of the state, I
28	believe."

64th Legislative Day

1	Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Just just to let you how the prevailing wage
2	is figured. They use prevailing wage work to decide what the
3	prevailing wage will be. They don't use any private work of
4	similar sort. They use just state work, prevailing wage work,
5	to decide what the rate's going to be. The have we had any
6	problems with the any contractors in use of this fund?"
7	Bradley: "I'm not aware of any specific issues; can't say there
8	are, can't say there aren't. Simply making a policy decision
9	here for the state."
10	Davidsmeyer: "It's it's my understanding that the people who do
11	this kind of work are highly trained and we have not had any
12	problems with this work. I don't understand why we're going
13	this direction?"
14	Bradley: "If they're highly trained, then they're probably they
15	should be getting paid a good wage and there shouldn't be an
16	issue."
16 17	issue." Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's
17	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's
17 18	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been
17 18 19	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA"
17 18 19 20	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion
17 18 19 20 21	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion of the EPA, where appropriate, to determine whether or not
17 18 19 20 21 22	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion of the EPA, where appropriate, to determine whether or not there should be a PLA. Prevailing wage would apply across the
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion of the EPA, where appropriate, to determine whether or not there should be a PLA. Prevailing wage would apply across the board which, as you've indicated, these are higher trained
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion of the EPA, where appropriate, to determine whether or not there should be a PLA. Prevailing wage would apply across the board which, as you've indicated, these are higher trained specialties. That shouldn't be a huge issue. EPA will
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Davidsmeyer: "And and that's not necessarily the issue. There's a number of people that probably are not union that have been highly trained to do this work, so the pre the PLA" Bradley: "So it will be up to it will be up to the discretion of the EPA, where appropriate, to determine whether or not there should be a PLA. Prevailing wage would apply across the board which, as you've indicated, these are higher trained specialties. That shouldn't be a huge issue. EPA will determine if a PLA's appropriate or not."

64th Legislative Day

1	Bradley: "Well, I'm not I'm not willing to necessarily accept
2	that this is going to increase the cost of every project or
3	any project. And so, if you want me to answer questions based
4	on your own assumptions, I'm not going to do that. I'll answer
5	direct questions, though."
6	Davidsmeyer: "I'm just So, do you believe that currently people
7	are paying more than prevailing wage?"
8	Bradley: "I don't know the answer to that. But based upon the
9	statements you've made, I would guess that they're probably
10	in that range currently."
11	Davidsmeyer: "I don't know. They could be a little bit lower."
12	Bradley: "Could be higher."
13	Davidsmeyer: "I would say if we're if we're looking at doing the
14	right thing and fixing these environmental problems, we need
15	to make sure that our money's going as far as it it will go
16	and we need to look at, you know, paying a good wage, but the
17	prevailing wage isn't necessarily that wage."
18	Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rosenthal."
19	Rosenthal: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
20	Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
21	Rosenthal: "First question, you stated a while ago that the money
22	in the LUST Fund is taxpayer money."
23	Bradley: "Well, and then I I amended that statement. There is
24	a component which has to do with an impact fee. The large
25	part is public money."
26	Rosenthal: "The majority of that money the owners of the tanks
27	pay 1.1 cent per 8 thousand gallons that go through their
28	tank and that's where the money is generated. There's no
29	taxpayer money in that."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Bradley: "That's not my understanding. There's motor fuel tax
- 2 that goes into LUST Fund as well. That's what I'm being
- 3 advised by staff."
- 4 Rosenthal: "I don't think that's accurate."
- 5 Bradley: "Okay."
- 6 Rosenthal: "It's... it's their money that they pay in the fund. I
- 7 think, do you know how much money's been swept out of that
- 8 fund?"
- 9 Bradley: "I don't have an answer to that."
- 10 Rosenthal: "I think the last thing I heard was 58 million and
- that's about how far they're behind."
- 12 Bradley: "I know that... I know that in the past we've stood
- together in a bipartisan manner to try to stop that."
- 14 Rosenthal: "Right. Do you know... currently, in order to be
- 15 qualified to... to do the cleanups, can you hire local people
- or where do you have... where do those people come from?"
- 17 Bradley: "I don't know what you're..."
- 18 Rosenthal: "Do they have to be certified by the Fire Marshal?"
- 19 Bradley: "...I don't know what you're asking exactly."
- 20 Rosenthal: "Anybody to do a cleanup job, do they not have to be
- certified by the Fire Marshal?"
- 22 Bradley: "It's my understanding there has to be some type of
- certification. I mean, this is..."
- 24 Rosenthal: "Okay."
- 25 Bradley: "...this is something that's very important."
- 26 Rosenthal: "Well, if this Bill is passed, who is going to submit
- the bids and who's going to process the bids?"
- 28 Bradley: "I don't think it changes the process of submission of
- bids or the processing of bids. It's my understanding it's

64th Legislative Day

29

5/27/2013

1	handled by the Environmental Protection Agency. Prevailing
2	wage would apply and the Environmental Protection Agency can
3	make a determination if they think it's appropriate to require
4	a PLA. But it's up to their discretion. I don't"
5	Rosenthal: "You know"
6	Bradley: "the Bill doesn't change that, to my understanding.
7	Now, there was a previous version of the Bill which was much
8	more draconian and that is no longer the case and this is
9	this is been taken back several notches to require prevailing
10	wage and PLAs where appropriate."
11	Rosenthal: "Well, are you aware the Pollution Control Board
12	controls both the payment rates and the reimbursement rates
13	and how would this affect that?"
14	Bradley: "It doesn't affect it's my understanding it doesn't
15	affect the reimbursement rates."
15 16	affect the reimbursement rates." Rosenthal: "I think it does."
16	Rosenthal: "I think it does."
16 17	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay."
16 17 18	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's
16 17 18 19	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and
16 17 18 19 20	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?"
16 17 18 19 20 21	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?" Bradley: "I don't think that's what I said. I think I said, what
16 17 18 19 20 21	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?" Bradley: "I don't think that's what I said. I think I said, what this Bill does is that the Environmental Protection Agency is
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?" Bradley: "I don't think that's what I said. I think I said, what this Bill does is that the Environmental Protection Agency is going to require prevailing wage and has the ability to
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?" Bradley: "I don't think that's what I said. I think I said, what this Bill does is that the Environmental Protection Agency is going to require prevailing wage and has the ability to require a PLA where they have deemed as appropriate. Now,
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	Rosenthal: "I think it does." Bradley: "Okay." Rosenthal: "So, you're you're saying that there's no there's not going to be any change on the preparation and documentation of the bidding process with this Bill?" Bradley: "I don't think that's what I said. I think I said, what this Bill does is that the Environmental Protection Agency is going to require prevailing wage and has the ability to require a PLA where they have deemed as appropriate. Now, that may have some impact, but it's not changing the whole

Bradley: "The people that process the bids are the same."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Rosenthal: "Currently?"
- 2 Bradley: "I think we're talking about two different things, but
- 3 I'm listening."
- 4 Rosenthal: "Okay. Well, I'm like the previous speakers. To the
- Bill. I don't think that we should be including livestock,
- 6 LUST Fund, environmental issues in the same Bill. And I urge
- 7 a 'no' vote."
- 8 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."
- 9 Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 10 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 11 Cavaletto: "I have worked with the LUST Fund people for about
- five years and when I first ran for office to get involved.
- I do know that there was a lot of people in trouble, losing
- money. Bills were not being paid. People went out of business.
- 15 And the EPA were the ones who were in charge of the agency.
- I do know this, that there are about 8 thousand parcels of
- 17 the land in the State of Illinois that needs to be cleaned
- up, over 8 thousand parcels. Those are tax dollars that should
- be... the land should be cleaned up and those properties put on
- the tax payrolls for the people of the State of Illinois and
- 21 that's not being done. And it, from what I... from what I
- 22 understand, 0.08 cents per gallon of gas at the pump goes to
- 23 the LUST Fund. And that fund was raided, again, back several
- years ago and a lot of companies went busted, the one down in
- my area, and it wasn't 16 million, it was \$20 million and 103
- 26 employees. So, we lost a lot of jobs through that. A lot of
- people paid a high price. I do know there's about 7 to 10
- 28 companies in the State of Illinois that do this work and I
- think they've done a yeoman's job of doing it. And I don't

64th Legislative Day

- think they're overpaid for... for the job they're doing. So, I don't understand, if we have the money and I know we do have the money and it is about 58 million in that account now to pay the people to continue to do the job as there is. So, again, I urge a 'no' vote. And I think the EPA needs to take care of it like they have in the past and the people who've been doing the work continue to do it. Thank you."
- 8 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."
- 9 Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 10 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 11 Reboletti: "Representative, I want to focus a little bit about
 12 the Amendment addressing the meat and poultry inspection. Why
 13 is there a difference in how we treat downstate inspections
 14 versus how we treat those in the Chicagoland area?"
- 15 Bradlev: "So, my understanding... the Department of Agriculture is here now... my understanding is that the Federal Government 16 came down and made changes to the procedure for inspection 17 reportings in Type 1 facilities. That if we don't make this 18 change and certify... get certified by the Federal Government 19 that we'll lose \$12 million. So, my further understanding is 20 21 this only applies to Type 1 facilities currently subject to 22 inspection. It's a procedural change that the Federal Government is requiring us to do in order to continue to be 23 certified and to get the federal funding of \$12 million." 24
- 25 Reboletti: "I can appreciate that, but I would hope that all these 26 facilities would be held to the same type of standard because 27 obviously food quality shouldn't matter depending on what 28 region you live in. And I know, Representative, you're… you're 29 well versed in the PLA community. Can you explain to me how

64th Legislative Day

29

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

1	this program works? How how do the folks how is this paid
2	for? How is the LUST Fund get revenue? Where where does it
3	come from?"
4	Bradley: "The LUST Fund revenue comes from a combination and I
5	amended my statement previously"
6	Reboletti: "Speaker, I I can't hear. Mr. Speaker. Thank you,
7	Speaker."
8	Bradley: "The LUST Fund money, and I amended my previous
9	statement to reflect this change, comes from fuel tax and
10	environmental impact fee which are collected at the pump."
11	Reboletti: "So, my understanding is that the I thought it was
12	paid by every time that the fuel is delivered that there's a
13	certain fee that is paid per tank or tanker. That's not
14	correct?"
15	Bradley: "Again, it's a combination of fuel tax, environmental
15 16	Bradley: "Again, it's a combination of fuel tax, environmental impact fees."
16	impact fees."
16 17	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is</pre>
16 17 18	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?"</pre>
16 17 18 19	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner</pre>
16 17 18 19 20	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump."</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump." Reboletti: "As I was talking to our staff, that's not our</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump." Reboletti: "As I was talking to our staff, that's not our interpretation of the law. When they let's assume you're</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump." Reboletti: "As I was talking to our staff, that's not our interpretation of the law. When they let's assume you're assessment's correct. When they collect all these fees, is it</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump." Reboletti: "As I was talking to our staff, that's not our interpretation of the law. When they let's assume you're assessment's correct. When they collect all these fees, is it fair to say that when they determine that the correct fee or</pre>
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	<pre>impact fees." Reboletti: "But the fees are actually on the private owner. Is that is that fair to say?" Bradley: "I think it's a combination of a fee on a private owner and a fee at the pump." Reboletti: "As I was talking to our staff, that's not our interpretation of the law. When they let's assume you're assessment's correct. When they collect all these fees, is it fair to say that when they determine that the correct fee or what the fee should be, that did not contemplate that a PLA</pre>

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Kay: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- 2 Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- 3 Kay: "Representative, first of all, let me just see if I
- 4 understand this correctly. A Type 1 service or a Type 1
- 5 category... well, that's going to pretty much apply to the small
- 6 guy down in southern Illinois?"
- 7 Bradley: "I don't ... I don't know that. I don't ..."
- 8 Kay: "Well, it does. Type 2 applies to the bigger guy that's up
- 9 north."
- 10 Bradley: "Okay. Well, if... if you're certain of..."
- 11 Kay: "So, let me ask this question about..."
- 12 Bradley: "Hold it. If you're certain of that... if you're certain
- 13 of that..."
- 14 Kay: "...let me ask... just a minute... about prevailing wage. I..."
- 15 Bradley: "...then don't ask me the question."
- 16 Kay: "It's my turn, John. It's my turn, my turn. We are saying
- that a prevailing wage should apply across the state. I guess
- my question is, why wouldn't safety apply across the entire
- 19 state? What you're doing here is penalizing southern
- 20 Illinois, small businessmen, and telling the guys in Chicago,
- 21 you know what, we don't care about safety up there. And that's
- 22 not right."
- 23 Bradley: "That is an unfair characterization."
- 24 Kay: "No, it's not. It's not an unfair characterization. It's
- exactly right because prevailing wage, if you... if you want to
- 26 make this Bill..."
- 27 Bradley: "Whoa, whoa. Let's talk about..."
- 28 Kay: "...what you think it is..."

64th Legislative Day

- 1 Bradley: "...one thing at a time. You're still talking about the
- 2 poultry, that's not prevailing wage. If you want to criticize
- 3 the second part of this Bill, which is prevailing wage..."
- 4 Kay: "Well, I can criticize both of them."
- 5 Bradley: "...then at least tell us when you're going to shift
- 6 gears."
- 7 Kay: "I'm just saying... I'm just saying add some..."
- 8 Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen."
- 9 Kay: "...add some continuity to your Bill."
- 10 Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen. We're not going to do this while I'm in
- 11 the Chair. One at a time."
- 12 Kay: "I was asking questions, Mr. Speaker."
- 13 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley, would you please answer his question?"
- 14 Bradley: "I don't know what it was."
- 15 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, will you please repeat your question?"
- 16 Kay: "Yeah. My question is... is just this, how is it that we apply
- 17 project labor agreements throughout the state and safety to
- only southern Illinois when it comes to category 1... category
- 19 2?"
- 20 Bradley: "Again, I'm not accepting that this is directed only at
- 21 southern Illinois. The Department of Agriculture... the
- Department of Agriculture has come to us and said Type 1
- 23 plants, which already are subject to reporting inspections,
- that there's been a law change at the federal level. And that
- 25 if we don't make a procedural language change with regards to
- that, we're going to lose the federal money that directly
- 27 benefits the plants that are subject to this because of the
- federal dollars coming in with regards to this program."
- 29 Kay: "But that..."

64th Legislative Day

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

27

28

29

5/27/2013

Bradley: "And so, again, I'm not saying you're wrong, I'm not 1 2 saying you're right. But it doesn't say downstate farms; it 3 says Type 1." Kav: "Which..." 4 Bradley: "And Type 1 farms already subject to inspection, already 5 6 subject to reporting those inspections, the feds have changed 7 the procedure. We have to change the law to reflect that or we lose the money which benefits the state with regards to 8 9 this program that we're required to do." Kay: "But see, what happens, Representative, is in this scenario 10 11 and I'm not being critical of you 'cause I understand that 12 you're just following a procedure here, but when you put two things together that are this confusing, you convolute both 13 issues and it's pretty clear to me that you can't argue 14 15 successfully that you're carving out something for northern Illinois while you're expecting the entire state to follow 16 project labor agreements. And I don't think you can deny that. 17 18 So, I'm not going to belabor it. I know the ... the Speaker's probably very upset by this point in time, but I'll just 19 simply say that it would be better if you'd pull the Bill. We 20 21 could probably get accomplished what we need to do if you 22 just file two separate Bills, we debate those Bills and we have a fair hearing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker." 23 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Halbrook." 24 "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to 25 26 Representative Sacia."

09800064.doc

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Mr. Halbrook. Ladies

and Gentlemen, there's some very, very, very important issues

64th Legislative Day

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

1718

19

20

5/27/2013

before us here in this Bill. Both sides of the aisle should recognize that this is an environmental potential catastrophe because of the unbelievable increased cost that we never, ever should have to deal with. The Sponsor, I know, is well meaning and his intention is good. The downside of this is though he has stated over and over the funding comes from tax money that is not correct. The vast majority... the vast majority, Ladies and Gentlemen, comes from the private sector, the owners of the tanks, those that have paid in. And those of you that are environmental... very environmentally concerned and are concerned about these spills where tanks have leaked over the years, you are going to increase your cost so significantly with project labor agreements. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Illinois Petroleum Marketers, IRMA, the Illinois Retail Merchants, the Illinois Chamber, Associated Builders and Contractors, the National Federation of Independent Business oppose this legislation and it is going to be a significant cost. If you are concerned about environmental issues, vote this Bill down and put something together that makes sense. Thank you."

- 21 Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."
- 22 Bradley: "It's been thoroughly debated. I'd ask for an 'aye'
 23 vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Mr.

 Sacia has asked for a verification of the vote. So, Members

 will be at their own desks and vote their own switches. Those

 in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting

 is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this

64th Legislative Day

1	question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', and 1
2	voting 'present'. Mr. Sacia withdraws his verification. This
3	Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby
4	declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
5	Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 403, offered
6	by Representative Durkin. And House Resolution 404, offered
7	by Representative Lang."
8	Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed
9	Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The
10	'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.
11	Members, please listen to the Clerk. Committee
12	announcements."
13	Clerk Hollman: "The following committees meeting this evening
14	after Session: the Executive Committee is meeting in Room
15	115, Revenue & Finance is meeting in Room 114, Personnel and
16	Pensions is meeting in Room C-1."
17	Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk,
18	Leader Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned 'til
19	Tuesday, May 28 at the hour of 12 noon. Those in favor say
20	'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does
21	stand adjourned 'til Tuesday, May 28 at the hour of 12 noon.
22	Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Sacia has an announcement, I
23	believe."
24	Sacia: "Thank thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. This is on a
25	personal issue. Many of you are aware that there was a big
26	event planned at Boone's this evening where our good
27	Representatives Tryon and Hays and others with significant
28	talent were going to perform, but due to inclement weather
29	Were you in on that, too, Rob?that it's all postponed until

64th Legislative Day

5/27/2013

tomorrow night at 7:00. But Boone's will be the place tomorrow 1 2 night and if you just want to go drink, it will be tonight as well." 3 Speaker Lang: "And on that note, the House stands adjourned." 4 "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. 5 Clerk Hollman: 6 Committee Reports. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from 7 the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee action taken on May 27, 2013: do pass Short Debate 8 9 is Senate Bill 1245; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1584. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the 10 11 Committee on the Executive reports the following committee 12 action taken on May 27, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate Senate Bill 1495, Senate Bill 1664; recommends be adopted is 13 the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House 14 Bill 996, House Joint Resolution 38. Introduction and First 15 Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3635, offered by 16 Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning 17 18 regulation. This is referred to the Rules Committee. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 1495, a Bill for an Act 19 concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act 20 21 concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act 22 concerning employment. Senate Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. These Bills will be held 23 on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further 24 business, the House Perfunctory Session will 25 26 adjourned."