65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "All Members are asked to be at their seats. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Craig Sweet, who is the Pastor of Sherman United Methodist Church in Sherman, Illinois. Pastor Sweet is the guest of Representative Poe. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Sweet: "Let us be in prayer. Oh God of our fathers and mothers, You have kept our nations and states growing life through the peril of our youth and the trials of our adulthood. We remember before You today with heartfelt thanks the blessings and truth that You have crowned our lengthening history before you with, for the courage and foresight of those who left their homes and friends to cross the sea of this great country for the steadfast endurance of those who fought to win our liberty and the wise council of those who shaped our laws, for deliverance in war and growth and years of peace, for our place of influence and the varied opportunities around us, for memories that are glorious and hopes that rest only upon Your favor. We bring You our joyful praise. Grant strength and good understanding to all who serve this state and our country, all who are in authority over us and make us all servants who can discern between all that people want and simply what we each need. Guide our hearts and minds that we may not be tempted to offend against You in pride or selfishness and leave us not to our own thoughts and ways in any hour of triumph or trial. Almighty God, You have given us this good land for our heritage. We humbly ask now that we may always prove ourselves as a people mindful of

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Your gifts and will. Bless our state with honorable industry, sound learning and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord and confusion, from pride and arrogance, from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one people united the great multitudes brought together out of many places and races and speech. Pour out now Your spirit of wisdom upon those whom we trust, the authority of our government that there may be justice and peace in each place. Grant all gathered here today, Oh God, a vision of our state and land, fair as she might be, a land of justice where none shall prey upon another, a land of plenty where vice and poverty may not spread or infest others, a land of fellowship where success shall be founded on service and honor be given to worth alone, a land of peace where order need not rest on force but on the love of all for their land, the great mother of our common life and welfare. Hear us now, Oh Lord, our vocal and silent prayers that in city, town and village we might together be more than we ever thought or imagined we could be, Amen."

- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Flowers."
- Flowers et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that not a single House Democrat is excused today."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present today."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 118 present, a quorum is established. Mr. Clerk."

"Committee Reports. Representative Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 92, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1584, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2106 and Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2332; recommends Motions... recommends be adopted Motions to Concur for Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 49, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1017, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 1247, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 1683, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 2787, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 2905, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 2947, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 for House Bill 3139, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 3157, Senate Amendment #2 for House Bill 3319, Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 3346, Senate Amendment #2 for House Bill 3359 and Senate Amendment #1 for House Bill 3380. Representative Will Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 206 and Floor Amendment #1

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

to House Bill 214. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 213. Representative Dunkin, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 208, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 210 and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 211. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 215. Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee of Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2454 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2720, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2720 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2721. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1191 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2661. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2363 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3049. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 772, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1010 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2754. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institution reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1674. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson form the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 28, recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2269 and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2647. Representative Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: do pass Short Debate for House Bill 3419, House Bill 3420, House Bill 3423, House Bill 3424, House Bill 3450, House Bill 3451, House Bill 3473, House Bill 3474, House Bill 3527 and House Bill 3528; do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 114, Senate Bill 1227, Senate Bill 1329, Senate Bill 1687, Senate Bill 1689, Senate Bill 1723, Senate Bill 1910; and do pass as amended Short Debate for Senate Bill 1920, Senate Bill 1961, Senate Bill 2155, Senate Bill 2221, Senate Bill 2335, Senate

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Bill 2378 and Senate Bill 2389. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture & Conservation reports the following committee action on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 733. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2382. Representative Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2649. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 406, offered by Representative Morrison. House Resolution 408, offered by Representative Kay. House Joint Resolution 44, offered by Representative Costello."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Ma'am."

Osmond: "I would like to ask the Members of the Assembly to welcome two guests from Antioch, Illinois. Bret Mumenthaler is the past president of the Antioch Rotary Club and with him is our exchange student Gerrit Sadau from Cologne, Germany."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I also have a point of personal privilege."

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

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Sandack: "Thank you. With me is Alex Sokalski. Alex, stand up please. It's the handsome, young man right there. Alex is my Page for the day. He came from Lombard. He attends Montini Catholic High School which... and he plays football which is a football juggernaut, Mr. Speaker. They're dynamite. Alex is here with his dad, Henry and I'm hoping we can give them a nice House welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A point of personal privilege. Next to Alex we have Nicholas, if he would stand up, Crouthamel and Nicholas is from Burr Ridge. He attends Avery Coonley School in Downers Grove where he is in fourth grade and his father Jamie is in the gallery today and they are from Burr Ridge."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Hurley."
Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Representative."

Hurley: "Please welcome Tish Williams. She is the daughter of Paul and Erma Williams. She is here from the 35th District serving as an Honorary Page."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Senger."

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

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

Senger: "We have a lot of wonderful young people here today,
Ashley Roudebush and Shruti Kansara are my Pages from
Hampshire, Illinois. If you would stand up and warm welcome."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Meier."

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

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

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Meier: "I would like everybody to please take a moment and say a prayer for one of the first five residents that was moved out of the Murray Center. Due to HIPAA laws, we are not sure if he is still in the hospital or not, but he was beat up in his CILA. So, please pray for him. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The Body please have a small moment of silence.

  Thank you. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Davidsmeyer: "A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. I am joined today by my mother, Kay Davidsmeyer and my nephew, Miles Alexander."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Members, we want to begin on page 4 of the Calendar. We're going to move some Senate Bills from Second Reading to Third starting with Senate Bill 56, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 56, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day.

  Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third. Senate Bill 104, Representative Franks.

  Out of the record. Senate Bill 21... excuse me, Senate Bill 1221, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1330, Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1330, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1495, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1495, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1664, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1968, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1772, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1772, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

day. No committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered
by Representative Turner."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Floor Am... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is simply a technical Amendment. And I'd just like to move it to Third."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 1493, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1550, Mr. Sandack. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1550, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1550 seeks to amend the Children With Disabilities Article of the School Code with respect to transition services. It provides that the first individualized education plan or an IEP for when a student turns 14 and a half must include measurable postsecondary goals based upon age appropriate transition assessments. In other words, the term 'where appropriate' is removed from the statute and it makes it a mandatory condition going forward. This is an initiative of the Illinois Association of School Social Workers and passed out of the Senate unanimously. I'm happy to address any questions."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

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

The Chair recognizes Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "Representative Sandack, do you know what IEP stands for?"

Sandack: "I think I just said it."

Pihos: "I'm just asking you again to clarify."

Sandack: "Oh, yes."

Pihos: "And could you tell us what that is?"

Sandack: "Yes. Individualized education plan."

Pihos: "Is this Bill a mandate?"

Sandack: "It is."

"Okay. And please listen... listen carefully, Ladies and Pihos: Gentlemen. Forget that it might be an unfunded mandate because we should be giving services to special education students, but it's an instructional mandate. This is the beginning of a very dangerous precedent to start adding instructional mandates to a special education student's individualized educational plan. It exceeds the federal standard and would require that an assessment be performed and measurable goals be written regarding independent living skills for every student with an IEP whether their unique needs require such services or not. For example, when I taught high school, I taught a gifted program. I had special education students through their IEP in my gifted program, but had this law been in place, because it was a short pull out gifted, students who are mandated to have this plan may not have been able to participate in my gifted program. In addition, it is the position of the Special Education Division that goals and

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

services delineated on a student's individualized education plan be specifically tailored to the children's unique needs and not be written with one size fits all, cookie-cutter approach. Why are we not trusting the local officials carefully selected for the IEP team in each school who know the students best, the teachers who teach the student, the social workers, the counselor, the school psychologist who works with the student and the parents to agree on the plan that suits a student's needs? We are not going to deprive any student who needs independent living skills of that opportunity. Who are we to presume that we know more than the professionals who work with these students every single day? Yes, we know it flew out of the Senate by the way and both the Sponsor's intentions are honorable, but I highly doubt that the Senate discussed the profound, unintended consequences if this Bill passes. It undermines and erodes the real intention of why individualized educational plans were created in the first place. In my opinion, we are doing our IEP students a great disservice by determining from Springfield an individualized curriculum that we feel will serve them best when we don't even know them. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. My conversations with the advocates for the Bill are that there are instances where the school simply needs to offer these as IEPs because the children with the disability simply doesn't have the life skills they need to prepare themselves and this is one area where there's a

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

lacking need for a policy change. The Gentleman's got a good Bill. I support it and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harms."

Harms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As a special ed teacher, I've been in many IEP meetings and we have a very extensive screening in place and every district should. Now, I can't speak for all districts, but if a kid is getting services just for math and he or she is completely functional in society, we're going to add an extra mandate to the child just because the team's not filling out their paperwork correctly. I... it is well-intentioned and a lot of the supporters on this Bill, the people that they represent, would already be required because they could not make it through the screening. So, the screening's there and we shouldn't... I don't feel we should add extra work that's nonbeneficial to the student."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, we had a debate about this in caucus, a discussion and by the way, my wife, who is a special ed teacher, shook her head when you brought the Bill up and where we come from is that the special ed teachers are trained and taught and certified to determine when these IEPs need to be filled out and when they might not need to be filled out. And we should rely on our special ed teachers and our administrators to determine that. To make a one size fit all blanket requirement for them to do this every time is not only a waste of valuable resources, but it might shortchange

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

the people that actually need these reports. So, if we're going to entrust our local school districts to hire teachers that are properly trained, let's give them the ability to make these decisions. Let's not make it a cookie-cutter, one size all fits mandate. And it was said that, you know, many times these kids don't have the life skills that are needed and we need this report. Let the teacher determine that. They're the ones that are with the student. They're the ones that have the report with the parent, hopefully and let them make the decisions as to whether or not this should be needed. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

.

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative Sandack, could you just explain...
so, this Bill seems pretty narrowly focused and it says that
it just removes the language of 'where appropriate' and kind
of tries to emphasize independent living skills with these
plans. Could you just kind of explain to the Body what the
genesis of this legislation was and how it's going to be
helpful to these kids?"

Sandack: "Yes, thank you. The genesis is this came from the Illinois Association of School Social Workers and they believe that requiring independent living skill goals, however incremental it may be, can increase chances to improve these children's independent living skills. And I'd like to make it known that right now the statute mandates whether it's a cookie-cutter or one size fits all. In fact, I would argue that this is all about providing discretion,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

professional discretion. We do that right now for training, education and employment and we say, we caveat independent living skills where appropriate. All we're doing is taking that caveat off and offering these professionals to utilize their professional skills in instances at offering incremental gains with independent living skills. So, it's actually not a one size fits all, cookie-cutter, but rather utilizing the professionals and their discretion in this one instance."

Mitchell, C.: "So, to be clear, it doesn't emphasize how they incorporate the living skills. It just says it must be done."

Sandack: "Precisely."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "To the Bill. I'd just like to say that this is very important legislation. Having worked with this part... population, when you're dealing with individuals with developmental and cognitive disabilities the problem is that they are not getting the skill sets they need postgraduation from high school. Many of them are still living in the homes with their fathers and their mothers. They're receiving Social Security benefits and they're being told that they can't work. What this will allow them to do is to go into vocational job programs. This will allow them to be able to take public transportation, things that they're being told now when they're graduating that they cannot do. This will allow them to be able to develop the skill sets that are needed, so they are not constantly being taken advantage of by other individuals. We want to make sure that we are giving

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

these students every opportunity possible to be successful and so they can have that quality of life. They shouldn't have to live at home their entire lives. They should be able to move out, get jobs and be productive. Let's not hold these students back. Let's give them the opportunities that they need. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative Sandack, a lot of things have been said in this discussion, but wouldn't you say that the fact that you say include measurable postsecondary goals is important. It's not amorphous postsecondary goals. It's measurable meaning using statistical analysis and having metrics to actually measure what's being happened... what's happening."

Sandack: "Representative, I would certainly suggest it is important that it be measurable, but I think any incremental improvement whether it's backed by some data or some observation of a professional is really what is at the core here of trying to get as much individual independent skills from these students as humanly possible."

Riley: "To the Bill. This is a good Bill. It is... it's just that.

Measurable goals, that's all that it does and I hope you give
it your overwhelming support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davidsmeyer: "Earlier you said this was a mandate, correct?"

Sandack: "It is."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Davidsmeyer: "What kind of funding is attached to this?"

Sandack: "There's no funding. I don't think it's a funding mandate. I think it's, as an earlier speaker said, a curriculum mandate or an institutionalized mandate. I don't think there's any funding implications here."

Davidsmeyer: "Can they currently do this?"

Sandack: "They can."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. They can. To the Bill. We keep hearing the terms 'offering a tool' or 'allowing something'. We have decided that this is a mandate on schools. I would urge a 'no' vote. We've heard from some special education teachers who have dealt with this, who have urged a 'no' vote and I agree with their expertise. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack to close."

Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. I appreciate all the questions and commentary. It's been spirited which is great. I will just close that the professionals that engage in this are supportive, Access Living, Arc of Illinois House, the Illinois Assistive Technology Program, Illinois Network of Centers for Independent Living and obviously the Illinois Association of School Social Workers. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "A point of personal privilege."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you. I would like to welcome Claire Duewer here. She's from... she's going to be a senior. She's from Waverly, Illinois and she's Paging with us today."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House. The Chair recognizes Leader Currie for a Motion."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirement so that Senate Bill 1341 may be heard in the House Agriculture Committee; Senate Bills 572, 1687, 1739 and 2187 in House Executive; Senate Bills 1454, 1756 and House Joint Resolution 43 in House Human Services; Senate Bill 1547 in Insurance; Senate Bills 115 and 1006 in Judiciary; Senate Bills 1659, 1816 and 2243 in Revenue; Senate Bill 1911 in the Rules Committee and Senate Bill 2381 in State Government. I know of no opposition and I'd appreciate your support for the Motion."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would request an immediate caucus."

Speaker Lang: "How long do you expect it will be?"

Bost: "About an hour. An hour, yeah."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in recess until the hour of 2:00 and the Republicans will caucus in Room 114. Democrats, enjoy your lunch. The House will be in order. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, appears House Bill 208, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 208, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly here in the House. I'd like for us to move to adopt Floor Amendment #1 for House Bill 208."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. And the Chair recognizes Representative Hammond. Representative, would it be all right with you if we adopted the Amendment and debated this on Third Reading? Seeing no objection, those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read House Bill 208 for a third time."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 208, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."
- Dunkin: "Yes, I would ask that we, now that we've adopted the Amendment, vote on the Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we begin the budget process, I think it's important that we offer an explanation of what occurred in the House Revenue & Finance Committee yesterday. At the beginning of the year when we adopted a

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

revenue estimate in a bipartisan manner, we relied on the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability to provide that number to us. It was universally accepted by all of the groups that came before our committee including the Department of Revenue, Office of Management and Budget, and many other groups throughout the state. Since the adoption of that Resolution, Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability, due to the paying down of the backlog of income tax refunds, has indicated that we need to adjust the income tax refund rates and the income tax refund fund. As a result of doing that, it's estimated that that would increase the revenue available to the State of Illinois by a number of \$350 million. That would increase the revenue estimate for the House of Representatives which was previously adopted which was relied upon by the information given to us by COGFA from 35.081 to 35.431. We relied on them for the original estimate. They have come back. They have said that given more information that they have now and changes in the forecasting with regards to this specific portion of the budget that this is a more accurate number and the one that we should be adopting. So, I believe that the appropriation committees are relying on that number in terms of balancing their budgets, living within the state's means and moving forward on these appropriation Bills. That's why I have been asked to speak to offer the explanation. I would anticipate possibly at some point that we would be asked or given the choice of officially adopting a Resolution to that effect, but at least for the moment whether that happens it's important to know that that

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

is the basis and premise for the moving forward with these appropriation Bills."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. As the previous speaker just mentioned additional revenues to the State of Illinois, folks, with \$7.5 billion in unpaid bills we don't have additional revenues. In addition, we don't have money for new programs within any line item. And in House Bill 208, there is additional spending that was not in last year's budget. I venture to say it wasn't in the budget two years ago. Some of these items go back to the stimulus program and we know how successful that program was. So, to the Bill. I think that we need to be responsible to our taxpayers, to the people in our district, pay down our back bills and address our pension situation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Was Amendment #1 adopted?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, what is the status of Amendment 1?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #1 was adopted."

Franks: "Thank you. And my problem is on my computer I have no analysis and I don't know if that's a problem that the other Members have as well, but I can't determine whether... some of the issues."

Speaker Lang: "Could LIS go to Mr. Franks' desk to see if you can help him? They're coming, Sir."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "We'll move on and come back to you."

Franks: "I didn't know if I was the only one. Thank you."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I think I have to rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "Thank you. I'm not actually addressing the Bill. I was hoping to speak shortly after the distinguished chairman of the Revenue Committee spoke to address the comments that he made regarding the additional revenue estimate or the additional revenue that might be coming in the State of Illinois and thus changing the revenue estimate. I'd like, first of all, to be clear about what the Gentleman said. He said COGFA has adjusted its revenue estimate. I don't think that's entirely accurate. I don't think they have adjusted their revenue estimate, but what they have said is that we have extra money in the refund fund that can be used. So, I agree with the Gentleman's point that above the 35.081 billion that we said was going to be the revenue for FY14 we very well may have an additional \$350 million available. However, let us not lose sight of the fact that just last year, one year ago, this House passed a revenue estimate of \$33,700,000,000 after COGFA had come in and said we think our revenue's going to be 33.9. That's what the testimony was in committee, but we, the House, wisely and judiciously said no, we want to be conservative. We're going to pass a revenue estimate of 33.7 rather than the 33.9 that COGFA said was going to come in. This year COGFA came in and said we think our revenue estimate's going to be 35.081. The House Revenue Committee said, you know, we're going to go along with that this year, 35.081. The House here passed a Resolution that

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

said our revenue estimate was going to be 35.081. So, now, just because we have potentially \$350 million, we're going to change the revenue estimate. Why, why? We were conservative a year ago and it served us well. Why do we have to raise the revenue estimate simply because the objective is to spend every single penny that comes in to our state coffers? That is not the right thing to do. You heard the Lady over here say we still have 7.5 billion in unpaid bills at the end of the fiscal year. Why do we have to spend every single penny? So, I was just addressing the Gentleman's remarks. We don't have a specific change in the Resolution on the floor. That may come tomorrow. We may debate it tomorrow, but as we... if we do that, let's remember we don't have to raise the revenue estimate just to accommodate more spending. Maybe we should cut back on the spending. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative Dunkin, as we worked through the Higher Education budget was there agreement as to how these various line items would be spent?"

Dunkin: "Yes, there was an agreement... with Democrats."

Pritchard: "So, in other words, you didn't want to hear any of the ideas we had on this side of the aisle?"

Dunkin: "Representative, friend and colleague, you and I have worked for two years on the Appropriations for Higher Education Committee with me as chairman. Every year it's been the same. I insisted on every Member to work on our budget line by line as we have done over the last two years. As a

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

matter of fact, last year you... your last Minority Spokesperson, Chapin Rose, crafted the budget alongside me, alongside us. Your handprint was all over it. As a matter of fact, you voted for it to get out of committee and you, Representative, voted for it on the House Floor last year, so absolutely. We're colleagues. We've known each other, we've shared inside and information on higher education and how we can solve our respective state's issues and taking our schools to the next level. You, as well, produce a performance review that all universities are adhered to at the state level and I support that legislation. So, you and your current Leadership have always had a chance and an opportunity..."

Pritchard: "But the point was..."

Dunkin: "...to work with us at the lev... at this level."

Pritchard: "...we had ideas that we wanted to interject. Every one of the Members of that committee on this side of the aisle said they wanted to go through those line items. We said that there were expenditures that we wanted to review. Under the House passed and the General Assembly passed Bills, we have a budgeting for outcomes. So, we are supposed to look at the results that we get from the various expenditures. Did your Members do that?"

Dunkin: "We didn't... Yes, absolutely. That's..."

Pritchard: "I wish you would have shared it with the rest of the committee."

Dunkin: "Well, Representative, that's in the Bill right now. We have another Bill right after this that speaks to..."

Pritchard: "You don't have anything in there talking about how the performance was whether we really got a dollar's worth of

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

investment out of the dollars that we invested. There's nothing in this Bill that talks about that. There's nothing in the information we got from the Board of Higher Education or some of these other institutions about how they did all of that."

Dunkin: "Representative, we allocated \$6.1 million to performance based outcome which and then... in turn, the Illinois State Board of Higher Education then made the allocations to the 11 universities."

Pritchard: "So, we'll talk about that under House Bill 210?"

Dunkin: "Correct."

Pritchard: "This is 208."

Dunkin: "Correct."

Pritchard: "And here we're talking about funding programs that we didn't evaluate. And we passed in the General Assembly an Act that said we're going to look at every budgeting dollar and make sure that we're getting the results. We're budgeting for outcomes. Agencies are supposed to tell us what their goals are and we're supposed to, as committees, evaluate that."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Pritchard: "And my disappointment is that we didn't allow that to work in the Higher Education Committee."

Dunkin: "That's not true, Representative. We've had every university, ICCB, ISA, organizations that are bridged from high school to higher education or a college or a university come before us and address every concern or most of the concerns that's in House Bill 208. You do recall that..."

Pritchard: "Certainly they came..."

Dunkin: "...correctly? So, we did discuss it, correct?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Pritchard: "...and they didn't come forth with the data that we needed."

Dunkin: "Well, Representative... Representative, it..."

Pritchard: "But we'll talk about that under the other Bill. I'm looking at the items in 208 that we've passed and it just seems odd that we've taken a Bill from higher education and transferring money into elementary-secondary education, some \$35 million. How was that discussion made and decision arrived at?"

"Representative, as the chair of the House Revenue Dunkin: Committee stated, we received additional revenue and our committee, the committee that you and I share, received \$66 million additionally... \$67 million additionally. We then gave \$35 million to the Elementary & Secondary Appropriations Committee to disseminate for early childhood education, state aid and transportation to downstate general transportation, mind you, as well. So, those dollars went to places and sources that all of us here in this chamber believe in, educating our young people in elementary and secondary education as well as early childhood education and the transportation to get them there. That's what this, House Bill 208, stands for."

Pritchard: "So, we can debate that a long time, I guess. We're not going to come to closure on the fact that we're taking dollars that should have been invested into higher education and transferring them to K-12. Is any of that money going to be used to make those students that are going to be entering higher education more qualified, more competent, more able to do the work of a college level?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Dunkin: "Yes, absolutely. That's in this Bill with some of the bridge programs that we talked about in committee and keep in mind, Representative, there's not one state university that has been reduced its funding since last year."

Pritchard: "I think I... we could point out two, but again, that's going to be in House Bill 210. So, we're also talking about \$500 thousand going to Chicago State University. It seems that that university is cropping up in a lot of different funding Bills. Are they really short of money at Chicago State?"

Dunkin: "Representative, I can only speak of the higher education.

All colleges and universities claim that they're under...

underfunded."

Pritchard: "Well..."

Dunkin: "But what we were..."

Pritchard: "...there's 500 thousand in this Bill..."

Dunkin: "...we were fortunate this year."

Pritchard: "...for Chicago State. There's 307 thousand for the General Professional Dedicated Pharmacy Program, 1.6 million for their education improvement fund and we don't really know what the education improvement fund is."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Pritchard: "Where did we talk about these in committee?"

Dunkin: "That is not higher education money. And keep in mind and I don't know why it is that we continuously want to highlight one particular school out of the entire state. Have you seen University of Illinois's budget, Eastern's budget..."

Pritchard: "Yes."

Dunkin: "...Northern Illinois's budget?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Pritchard: "Yes."

Dunkin: "Their budgets are twice as much as Chicago State University and less as diverse."

Pritchard: "I wouldn't say they're... well..."

Dunkin: "Oh, now."

Pritchard: "...they're more diverse. I agree..."

Dunkin: "Is that right?"

Pritchard: "...Chicago State is. But all of the universities are trying..."

Dunkin: "Well, why is Chicago State such a highlight,
Representative?"

Pritchard: "...and we've got good program funds to try to increase that more."

Dunkin: "As we do in all of our state universities, so I don't distinguish any particular university out other than when they're doing something great primarily. But somehow we're harping on this Chicago State for some reason."

Pritchard: "So, is any of this money that we're talking about for Chicago State going to improve their graduation rate?"

Dunkin: "Representative, you... the president of Chicago State University addressed our committee on more than one occasion. You should have asked him that question because I can't answer. What I'm trying to get resolved this afternoon..."

Pritchard: "Well, but we're talking about additional funding here for Chicago State that he didn't talk about."

Dunkin: "Representative, now you know as well... Representative..."

Pritchard: "And in fact, the education assistance fund isn't even managed by the university anymore."

Dunkin: "Representative, the..."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Pritchard: "They outsourced it."

Dunkin: "The \$1.6 million came out of the horse racing/casino money that was debated earlier this week, not out of our committee. We had nothing to do with that. This House Bill, 208, has nothing to do with that, Representative."

Pritchard: "Well, the \$500 thousand is GRF and that's one of the items I was just talking about. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The biggest disappointment we had is a committee that was willing to go through these line items and come up with a bipartisan Bill and we were never given the opportunity to do that. Over the last two years, as the Representative mentioned, we've worked in a bipartisan fashion. I just wish we would return to that process. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin to close."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 208. Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ford, Mr. Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1912, Mr. Sims. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Amendment 2 was adopted previously. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1912 amends the Code of Civil Procedure. It covers settlements dealing with personal injury, property damage, wrongful death and tort actions. This Bill serves to treat settlements in the same vein as judgments for the purposes of the payment of the proceeds between parties. It's a wonderful Bill and I ask for adoption."

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

The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, can you kind of tell me who the Sponsor of the Bill is and who sought this new legislation?"

Sims: "Mr. Sandack, I'm the Sponsor of the Bill."

Sandack: "Who's the initiating party?"

Sims: "There are proponents of the Bill. They are the Illinois Trial Lawyers."

Sandack: "And is there any metrics or information, documents, data that I could look at that would substantiate why this is necessary legislation?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Sims: "Well, as I said in my opening remarks, this treats settlements similarly to judgments. In statute, currently, we have judgments that when a judgment happens parties are... they're required to pay. Under this Bill, you would treat settlements in the same vein."
- Sandack: "But judgments and settlements aren't the same, are they?"
- Sims: "They're not."
- Sandack: "In fact, the judgment is an award either from a jury or a bench trial. Someone owes someone money because someone did something wrong or is being held liable, correct?"
- Sims: "Well, in this Bill... this Bill deals with when parties settle, they come to an agreement between those two parties. This says that when those parties agree, if they're going to live by the tenets of the agreement, this Bill encourages that."
- Sandack: "Well, we'll get to the documents in a second, but I think there's a distinction between judgments and settlements, because in most settlement agreements there is usually a specific clause that says the parties deny any wrong doing and are basically entering into a settlement to conclude litigation and not have to go through a trial."
- Sims: "Mr. Sandack, this... the language in Senate Bill 12... 1912 specifically says that the parties have to agree."
- Sandack: "Right."
- Sims: "That the agreement that any action that takes place happens after an agreement between the parties."
- Sandack: "All right. Well, let's talk a little bit about your legislation. Is there a requirement that there be a written

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- settlement agreement before any of the time requirements kick in on your Bill?"
- Sims: "As the language of the Bill says, the parties have to tender... have to have a tender within 14 days. After the tendering of the payment, within 30 days after that time, then payment has to be made."
- Sandack: "Yes."
- Sims: "So, a total of 44... a total of 44 days between the time... minimum of 44 days between the time the agreement starts and ends."
- Sandack: "I'd like to focus in on one factor, right now. Yes or no, is a written settlement agreement required prior to the timing components of your Bill?"
- Sims: "A require... it's an agreement between parties is required."
- Sandack: "A signed, fully executed settlement agreement, Sir?"
- Sims: "If there is no written agreement, no agreement between parties, and as you look at the language, there was accommodations made to make sure that we outlined what was a written communication. So, we clarified that."
- Sandack: "Does your Bill require that both the plaintiff and defendant sign a settlement agreement before the timing requirements?"
- Sims: "Mr. Sandack, I believe you asked that question and I answered that question."
- Sandack: "Is that a yes or a no, Sir?"
- Sims: "Mr. Sandack, you asked that question. I answered that question."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Sims: "Under this Bill, dealing with settlements between parties, as I've indicated before, unless the parties... when the parties agree, they can move forward with a settlement under this case. That is what Senate Bill 1912 calls for."

"To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. With all due and respectful Sandack: acknowledgement of the Sponsor, the Bill does not say that. The fact of the matter is, this is a Bill that seeks to solve a problem that doesn't exist. What we're talking about here are plaintiffs and defendants in court that have a settlement and if they have a settlement that's memorialized in a document. But what this legislation seeks to do is impose upon the parties that are represented by attorneys' 90-some odd percent of the time, accelerated payment requirements that don't otherwise exist. And let's make sure we're clear on something. A settlement and a judgment are not the same and they shouldn't be treated the same and this will absolutely stifle settlement opportunities because in the Bill also is a judge... interest component. So, interest is going to compound even before a settlement agreement is fully attained by signed... by the parties signed in the deal. This is bad legislation. It is a solution in dire search of a problem. Folks, look at the Bill. This is not a good Bill. I highly recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, before I inquire of the Sponsor, I'm going to ask for a verification if this were to receive the requisite amount of votes."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir."

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

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, there are a number of groups, the Chamber, Insurance Association, State Farm and others that are opposed to your legislation. What were... what was their opposition based from?"

Sims: "Their opposition was based... there were a number of opp... points of opposition. We've attempted to work through those and I think we've done that in a number of cases. There were issues raised with whether there was a... what was a written communication. We addressed that with one of the Amendments. There was an issue raised with timing as the Bill came from the Senate. We've addressed that to address their concerns. That's why you will see that the Illinois Manufacturer... Illinois Retail Merchants are now neutral on the Bill because we've worked to address their opposition."

Reboletti: "But all the opposition has not been removed from your legislation, has it?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "Would it be fair to say, Representative, that what...
where would the incentive be now to settle a case if you have
to start paying 9 percent interest almost immediately? Isn't
one of the major problems that the opponents say is that these
time frames to make good on the settlements is unrealistic?
What if... what if you have five different defendants that are
going to settle?"

Sims: "Well, first off, Representative, you won't have to pay the interest immediately, but let's also... let's talk back through how this process plays out. When we have these parties to a settlement, these are parties who have agreed to settle this

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

case, so we're not forcing them to do anything that they're not already doing. These parties have agreed to settle a case to move the process forward. This Bill helps to maintain the integrity of our process."

Reboletti: "What if I have... you have five different defendants that are going to... are prepared to settle, but not... each one of them does not enter into that agreement right away? If I'm party number one that agrees to a settlement do I have to start paying on that immediately or do I start paying when the other four defendants... codefendants come on in and start to pay theirs when the final settlement agreement is reached?"

Sims: "The essence of a settlement is there's no agreement until there is an agreement."

Reboletti: "So, assuming right now, if this were not to pass and I have settled a case as a plaintiff's attorney and now the defendant or defendants have not made good on the settlement. What is the mechanism to enforce that settlement that has been agreed upon?"

Sims: "Right now there is no mechanism. That's why Senate Bill 1912 is necessary because there's no mechanism right now to enforce settlements."

Reboletti: "Would it be..."

Sims: "So, we... so, we are... I'm trying to answer your question,

Mr. Reboletti. We are trying to make sure that if you enter

into a settlement that the tenets of that settlement are

agreed to and lived by, by all parties."

Reboletti: "Wouldn't the appropriate remedy right now be to file a motion to enforce the settlement, go to court, then you could ask for the fees if they were appropriate and say hey,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

look, we settled this case. You're supposed to pay. You're not paying and ask the court to make... to enforce that settlement. Why can't that happen right now?"

Sims: "But Mr. Reboletti, I think you just proved my point for why Senate Bill 1912 is necessary. What you just... what you just acknowledged is that the part... the complaining party has to incur additional legal costs, go back into court to enforce an agreement that the parties agreed to. That is why we're... that's why we're trying to make... that's why we're trying do 1912."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, this is going to discourage people to settle. You set up unrealistic time frames in which to bring parties into compliance with the settlement. You may as well go to trial and take your chances and then the defendants won't be compensated until much later into a case. So, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Representative Sims, in just reading in our analysis it says that there is an exemption to this, that the parties in their negotiations could agree that these provisions do not apply. Is that still correct?"

Sims: "That is correct."

Martwick: "So, let me get this straight. They're negotiating a settlement and these rules are in place that would say that they must pay within 30 days or they would face interest, but they could agree in the settlement that the provisions of

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

this law do not pertain to this settlement that they're negotiating."

Sims: "That's absolutely correct. As... Mr. Martwick, as you rightfully acknowledged, unless agreed to by the parties is in the Bill. So, if the parties enter into a settlement agreement and they somehow say I cannot pay you within the 30 days, but we can agree to pay you over a three months or six months or nine month period then the can agree to that. It's driven by the parties."

Martwick: "Thank you. That's all I have."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm following up on Mr. Martwick's comments. So, this is not a mandate. This is... allows... it's just another avenue for the parties to come to a settlement, isn't it?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Franks: "The problem that I think you're trying to fix and one of the previous speakers said that this is really a solution in search of a problem, but that's not true. I think the problem is when there is a settlement and then for some reason it's not paid and then it's laid out there for quite some time and the injured party is not getting what they've been promised. Isn't that the problem you're trying to fix?"

Sims: "That is absolutely correct, Mr. Franks."

Franks: "And this also helps, I think, let's assume we're talking about a medical malpractice case. This would also help the doctors because there would be some finality here, correct?"

Sims: "That's correct."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Franks: "And also it would help the doctors because then there wouldn't be a judgment necessarily against them that there could be a settlement where they wouldn't necessarily have to agree that they were negligent, correct?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Franks: "'Cause what happens now sometimes if there's a settlement and the insurance company doesn't pay even though the doctor directs them to and the insurance company doesn't pay what could happen now is that the harmed party can then go to the judge and say, you know what, they never paid, let's open this suit and I want a judgment against that doctor, correct?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Franks: "So, that would take away... this would actually help them because of the finality..."

Sims: "Absolutely."

Franks: "...correct? Now, this interest rate deal, that's 9 percent, that would only kick in as if there was a settlement, it was signed, that it was agreed to and then for some reason the insurance company didn't pay, right?"

Sims: "That's correct."

Franks: "But in no other circumstance would this go into effect."

Sims: "That's correct."

Franks: "And there's also the opportunity for the parties to say, you know what, we don't even agree to that. We're not going to pay any interest and instead of paying you in 30 days we can't get you the money that quick. It's going to be 120 and they can agree to that, can't they?"

Sims: "That is correct."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Franks: "Okay. I can't understand why anybody'd be against this Bill."

Sims: "Your confusion goes with mine, Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Okay. Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I believe this is a Bill that helps injured parties get what they deserve because I've seen all too often when there's been a settlement that the insurance company just doesn't pay. Insurance companies don't make money by paying settlements. They make money by delaying in paying settlements. And those folks who are harmed are entitled to be made whole. This is... there's enough procedural safeguards in this Bill to allow the parties to opt out and I think most insurance companies are very good actors. I think what you see here are the fly-by-night companies who are the cut-rate insurance ones who aren't paying. And as a result, everybody's harmed and it also puts the physicians at risk because then it opens them up to additional liability through judgments. This is a commonsense Bill that'll help everyone and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am the first nonattorney to stand and speak against this Bill and I will speak against it. We've heard some very, very good language, some articulation, but a lot of it is legal gobbledygook to those of us not totally familiar with the legal profession. To my good fortune, I had the opportunity to work with lawyers for many, many years, but the only sensible comments I've heard thus far are from Representative Sandack and Representative Reboletti. This is a solution in search of a problem. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the kind

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

of law we're going to go back home, talk to our constituents and they are going to say to us, how did you let this happen? Look at the opponents to this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, look at the opponents. This legislation... when you have the trial lawyers... trial lawyers making the following reason for a change, the Trial Lawyers Association has run into situations where insurance companies settle with plaintiffs, but do not pay settlements in a timely manner. They feel this legislation is necessary to enforce settlement agreements. You get to pay, folks. You get to pay. Your constituents are not going to be happy with this legislation. Look at the opponents, look at the proponents and vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based on the most recent analysis,

I believe I have a potential conflict of interest. I'll be
voting 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Representative, first off, let me tell you I'm not an attorney. I don't play one on TV, never claimed to be one, but I do claim quite often if we have any Bills that deal with cosmetology because my wife and I, we own a beauty salon and any Bill like that I feel that's a conflict of interest. Don't you think it would be appropriate that anybody that practices in this area of law here on the floor should also claim that conflict of interest and say vote 'present'?"

Sims: "Well, Mr. Bost, as you... since you're not an attorney, let me talk to you a little bit about our professional Code of

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Ethics. You have to... if you have a conflict of interest, it is up to you to acknowledge that conflict and make that conflict known."

"Well, you know, I think that's kind of maybe 'cause I Bost: remember though I didn't serve here with a man that dealt quite often with condominium law. And each time... and each time he'd come back here the stories were told about how he'd switched the law back and forth and back and forth and then he'd go and be able to work those and he would always stand up and say, I may have a conflict of interest here, so I'll be voting my conscience and he always voted for the Bill. So, obviously what you've said is, is that I should declare a conflict of interest in my business, but attorneys shouldn't necessarily declare a conflict in theirs. So, I have a little concern. I have a tremendous amount of respect for you. We've worked well together in the short time period that you've been here, but it's kind of been a double standard when we move forward legislation like this especially when we start talking about the pocketbooks of our constituents. So, I do have a problem with it and I hope that people will... that are and can benefit from this would follow like your seatmate and say there would be a conflict of interest, vote 'present' and let the others decide on where this Bill should go."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, the other day in committee we had a little opportunity to discuss this Bill, maybe not at as much length as we should have, but I'd like to go back and

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

I'd like you to ask you the question in the context of this Bill, this legislation you have, how you foresee a lien being perfected particularly maybe a Medicare lien?"

Sims: "Representative Kay, as you know, at the federal level there have been changes... there's been... the Federal Smart Act will allow for certain changes to occur. We talked about this in committee a little bit. So, that was one of the reasons why we mo... we changed the effective date from an immediate effective date to an effective date of January 1. There are supposed some changes in the Smart Act coming into place in October of 2013, so in recognition of that we moved the effective date to January 1."

Kay: "Okay. But, typically, wouldn't you agree, Representative, that affecting a Medicare lien is a very long and cumbersome process that doesn't happen typically in the time frames that you have spelled out in your Bill?"

Sims: "I'm sorry, Representative."

Kay: "Okay, yeah."

Sims: "Could you repeat that?"

Kay: "Let's just pull back to today. Isn't it true that today it would be very hard if not almost impossible to perfect a Medicare lien in the time frames that you have stipulated in your Bill?"

Sims: "No, I would not agree with that."

Kay: "Okay. Let me ask you a different question. How, under your
Bill, could a lawsuit be revived?"

Sims: "If the parties... if the parties do not live by the agreement, they could go back into court and seek to reinstate the lawsuit."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Kay: "Okay. So, you don't see any problem with the revival issue?"
Sims: "No."

Kay: "Okay. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me and with all due respect to my colleague, who is a good friend and a lawyer at the same time, it seems to me like what we're talking about today is most preferred status for attorneys. And as I look at this Bill, I can only think that the most powerful people in the State of Illinois are trial lawyers. They pretty well have their will and their way whenever, wherever and with whomever. And it would seem to me like for us to say we need prompt pay for attorneys is simply pretty silly and again, that's all due respect to the Sponsor because I think you're a good person. I understand you're a very good lawyer, but this is not a piece of legislation we need. It does send the wrong signal. Again, it just says with respect to the reputation that we have in this state and four or five counties that stick out nationally that we just want to perpetuate that. So, I'm going to be a 'no' vote, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sims to close."

Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to thank all the Members on both sides for the wonderful debate we've had, but let me clarify a couple of points. First, this is a Bill for your constituents. This is a Bill that will make settlements easier. Two, this Bill, for those who are confused, there is a hostile Amendment that was filed. The hostile Amendment is not a part of the language of this Bill. Third, if the… I cannot stress this enough. If the parties agree, if they are living by the tenets of the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

agreement, then this changes nothing. If they are living by the agreement that they've agreed to and they are participating in that, this Bill helps that process. Vote 'aye'."

'no'... Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, just a reminder. Mr. Reboletti has asked for a verification. Members will be in their chairs 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? DeLuca. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Mr. Reboletti, do you persist? Mr. Reboletti has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative vote."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative: Representative Acevedo; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Bradley; Representative Daniel Burke; ; Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia; Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Crespo; Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis; Representative Dunkin; Representative Representative Farnham; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Representative Franks; Representative Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth;

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hernandez; Hoffman; Representative Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson; Jefferson; Representative Representative Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Representative Mell; Representative Christian Mitchell; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Nekritz; Representative Riley; Representative Representative Scherer; Representative Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Smith; Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Verschoore; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I almost felt like we were the General Assembly before the cutback Amendment with about 177 Members. So, with that, Representative Rita."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Reboletti: "Thaddeus Jones."

Speaker Lang: "Wait, one... one at a time, Sir."

Reboletti: "I was just seeing if they were together."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Reboletti: "He's not in his chair."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita's right here in the front, Sir. And he's with Mr. Jones."
- Reboletti: "I'll withdraw my verification, Mr. Speaker, but I have a lot more to come."
- Speaker Lang: "On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to page 3 on the Calendar, Senate Bill 1817, Representative Tracy. Representative Tracy. Out of the record. I skipped one. Senate Bill 105, Mr. Phelps, Mr. Phelps. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1830, Mr. Rita. 1830. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1842, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2136, Mr. Davidsmeyer. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2136, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is just the... it deals with autodialers and the do not call list and as well as cell phones. It puts a little bit more bite into the... into violations. So, if autodialers violate the do not call list or call cell phones, they may be required to pay damages to the individual of \$500 and the court may award this. This is not a requirement on the court, but the court has the option to award these damages. It also deals with a one year statute of limitations and records have to be maintained by the auto dialers for up to... for 24 months. I ask for its passage."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the pa... Excuse me, Representative, I thought you were finished. The Gentleman

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill receive the requisite number of votes, I request a ver... I'm just joking. Just joking."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Beiser, Davis, Harris, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2154, Representative Hurley, who is standing and ready. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2154, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Today I am presenting Senate Bill 2154. Senate Bill 2154 adds the offense of reckless driving while in a funeral procession and driving in a reckless manner that interferes with a funeral procession to the list of Illinois Vehicle Code violations that could employ impoundment proceedings. This Bill was cosponsored in the Senate by Senator Cunningham, Senator Emil Jones, Senator Ira Silverstein and Senator Jacqui Collins. I am open for questions and would appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, you and I have talked about this Bill before. I'm just amazed. So, you say

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

that in your district people get into funeral processions and drive recklessly. Is that correct?"

Hurley: "In my district and in the southwest side of Chicago, yes."

Bost: "Is it... is it some kind of a statement they're trying to make? Do they have too much to drink before the funeral starts? What exactly is going on?"

Hurley: "I am not sure the reason behind their behavior."

Bost: "You just know that they're doing it. And is it... how common is it?"

Hurley: "Every Saturday and Sunday you will see this behavior."

Bost: "Every Saturday and Sunday you'll see this behavior."

Hurley: "Correct."

Bost: "Well, we see that down south too, but it's not... on Saturday and Sunday, but not usually in a funeral procession."

Hurley: "Saturdays, Sundays and funeral processions usually."

Bost: "So, it's Sunday... Saturday and Sunday nights. That's why we have those laws and everything to stop that."

Hurley: "Okay."

Bost: "But I never... you know, I'm amazed by the diversity of our state because I'm pretty sure in our area... you know, we have a thing that we do is we pull over and stop when a funeral procession comes by and I've been in a lot of parts of the state where they don't do that. The traffic's just too thick and you can't do that, but I've never had one where they said, okay, now everybody weave."

Hurley: "I don't think everybody weaves, but there is participants in funerals who do weave, who drive into oncoming traffic,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

who drive at accelerated speeds and who drive across crosswalks and pedestrian ways."

Bost: "And I'm not... I'm amazed by this Bill, but right now are the police trying to just charge them with reckless driving or is there anything that they can do in that respect?"

Hurley: "We have talked to the Cook County Sheriff's Department, the Chicago Police and they are using this as another tool to stop this behavior. They have issued tickets, but it doesn't seem to be working."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Brady: "Representative, in talking to Senator Cunningham who used to be at the Cook County Sheriff's Department and who I've worked with before and Sheriff Dart, also, and I think maybe to the Representative's concern which is very legitimate here at times the funeral procession depending on potentially who the deceased may be attracts some type of individuals who are less than respectful of the law and less than respectful of the established statutes as it pertains to how you yield by law to a funeral procession as long as that funeral procession is exhibiting the proper lighting and things that are spelled out in that statute. So, I stand in support of the Lady's legislation. It's hard to comprehend, in my particular area where I'm from and as a funeral director that these type of things have to be dealt with from a legislative standpoint. But the reality of it is, it's a big, different state and I support the Lady's Bill. Thank you."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Davis, M.: "Yeah. Representative Hurley, are there other instances in which vehicles are taken away from people?"

Hurley: "The Illinois Vehicle Code has 12 other incidences. You can... I can list a few."

Davis, M.: "Would you?"

Hurley: "Certainly. Soliciting a prostitute, driving with..."

Davis, M.: "Hold on, hold on. Now, if you're soliciting a prostitute, we can take your car?"

Hurley: "Yes, you can, according to the Illinois Vehicle Code."

Davis, M.: "Okay. I'd like to know how many times that happens, but go on."

Hurley: "Okay. An attempt to... wait, hold on. A suspended driver's license, driving under the influence, operating a motor vehicle in attempting to commit a felony and 12 others. And recently, a few weeks ago, we passed another Bill out of the House that if you are... if you participated in a fraud that you can... home repair fraud, that they can impound your car for that as well."

Davis, M.: "What do they do with these cars that they impound?"

Hurley: "You have an administrative hearing."

Davis, M.: "They have an administrative hearing and then does the person have to pay storage and towing and all of that?"

Hurley: "That's a possibility, yes."

Davis, M.: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I will support this Bill truly against my better judgment because sometimes people who are driving a car in a funeral they're driving

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

someone else's car. Frequently there may be a son who's driving the mother and the rest of the family. There may be a nephew or a cousin and actually there are a lot of laws on the books for all the behavior for which we want to take these cars. There's a law on the book against drinking and driving. There are laws on the books against endangering other people and driving. I mean, there are really... there are laws already there for all of this behavior that we want to capture. So, I'm really concerned that we're just changing something perhaps that we should just enforce the laws that are on the books. Those laws on the books should be enforced and they shouldn't wait 'til they get to the funeral... to the cemetery to enforce them. They should enforce them if this behavior is happening on the street on the way to the cemetery. So, because the people that send me here want this Bill, I will vote for it, but I really think it's bad legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Dunkin: "So, I'm curious. Representative, where did this Bill come from? Was this from a particular municipality or is this another one of our great ideas down here?"

Hurley: "This great idea came from the Cook County Sheriff's

Department and also a discussion with the Chicago Police

Department, Senator Cunningham, our local aldermen and local
funeral directors."

Dunkin: "Okay. So, the... what about the Illinois Municipal League?

Did they chime in on this?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Hurley: "I have not heard that, no."

Dunkin: "I think you and I talked briefly about this particular issue. You probably get one or two individuals who would do something like that. I think that's pretty dangerous, but how would we enforce this? So, this'll be State Law or would this be city law, local law?"

Hurley: "It's for municipalities, but it would be throughout the state."

Dunkin: "I'm sorry."

Hurley: "It's for municipalities, but it will be throughout the state."

Dunkin: "What about the County Sheriff's Association or the various police leagues? Where are they with this here?"

Hurley: "Currently, it's just municipalities."

Dunkin: "Is there a cost associated with this?"

Hurley: "If your car is impounded for reckless driving in a funeral procession, of course, you'd have an administrative hearing."

Dunkin: "So, the tow truck companies would make a nice, little windfall."

Hurley: "Possibly."

Dunkin: "So, my colleague, Representative Monique Davis, Monique D. Davis stated that law's already on the books for this here. Is this... do we expect a drastic change as a result of this here in activity of arrests with various police?"

Hurley: "We're looking for another tool to combat this behavior and they're hoping that this will have a dramatic effect on the behavior of the participants in the funeral processions."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Dunkin: "So, if this doesn't pass, can a municipality impose this type of ordinance on the books to deal with those erratic drivers who are driving reckless and dangerous in these funeral processions?"

Hurley: "The alderman would look for a local ordinance originally, but was told that the General Assembly would have to pass enabling legislation first."

Dunkin: "Wait, the alderman did what now?"

Hurley: "He wanted to write an ordinance regarding reckless driving in a funeral procession and he said it had to be... was told that the General Assembly would have to pass enabling legislation first."

Dunkin: "Now, who told him that? 'Cause I didn't realize that aldermen had to come to us to write particular ordinances on a traffic or a moving violation."

Hurley: "Alderman O'Shea from the 19th Ward was down here and testifying in the Senate Committee."

Dunkin: "Did he present statutory information validating that statement? I've never heard of that. I know a couple of aldermen myself actually and they really come to me and say, hey, I need some statutory green light to make this happen. Or was he just saying that he think... he thought that's what the case was? That's a question."

Hurley: "Can you repeat the question?"

Dunkin: "Repeat the question?"

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "Your staffer said that?"

Hurley: "No."

Dunkin: "Did you hear her staffer?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Hurley: "That was she said something else and I didn't hear you because you said something else."

Dunkin: "She's a sharp knife too, right?"

Hurley: "Too?"

Dunkin: "So, did the alderman reference or cite an Illinois

Administrative Code statute that said he or she had to come

down here in order for this to pass?"

Hurley: "I wasn't in the Senate Committee hearing."

Dunkin: "Do you know, Representative, the mayor right there? Let me see. What's his name? He's out of Des Plaines. Representative Mahoney. Am I saying that right? Moylan, Moylan. Representative Moylan, maybe he can answer that. He was a mayor of a city in this great state. I wonder if he can enlighten us. In order to pass a traffic violation they need to come down here and engage us."

Hurley: "It's the Illinois..."

Dunkin: "And where in the statute does that exist?"

Hurley: "It's the Illinois Vehicle Code. Okay. That's..."

Dunkin: "Okay. What Section? Let me pull up the Illinois..."

Hurley: "11-503."

Dunkin: "...Vehicle Code on my computer. What? Say that Section again."

Hurley: "11-503."

Dunkin: "Can you read that to us on..."

Hurley: "I could."

Dunkin: "...for the record. Before you read that, are you a lawyer?"

Hurley: "I am not."

Dunkin: "Neither am I. Do you play one on TV?"

Hurley: "I do not."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Dunkin: "Why not?"

Hurley: "I don't like TV."

Dunkin: "You don't like TV?"

Hurlev: "No."

Dunkin: "We don't have cable either at home, just so you know. We have regular television. Okay. You were saying counselor, lawyer, lawmaker. Can you... I thought you were going to read the... the statute... statutory that says they have to come down here to pass a driver's license... a moving violation in the big city."

Hurley: "It's the Illinois Vehicle Code. And it says in, a) any municipality may consistent with this Section provide an ordinance procedure for the release of property, impounded vehicles and for the imposition of a reasonable administrative fee. And then it continues with the list of 12 Vehicle Code issues that we can impound a car. Not we, but the municipalities."

Dunkin: "It's says that in the... you're sure."

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Dunkin: "All right. So, when was that last amended statutorily?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Dunkin: "Sure. This is good stuff here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "It certainly is, Sir."

Dunkin: "You're a lawyer as well, right? I'm just trying to get our moving violations in order here statutorily."

Hurley: "97th General Assembly."

Dunkin: "What'd it say?"

Hurley: "97th General Assembly."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Dunkin: "What year was that?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin, can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Dunkin: "Thank you for your wonderful answers, Representative."

Hurley: "Thank you."

Dunkin: "Appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "That's it? You're done? Okay. Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I'm looking forward to asking the next budget Sponsor of a Bill to read that entire Bill before we... I ask questions, so I'm looking forward to that. So, will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields gladly."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Representative, there's been issues in the neighborhood with respect to people who are reckless driving near cemeteries when rival gangs are meeting because one gang member is being buried and the other ones from the rival gang are initiating shots fired, loud music, gang signs being flashed. It's not a normal funeral procession honoring the deceased. This obviously becomes much more than that. Is that fair to say?"

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "And the Illinois Vehicle Code does not allow for the impoundment of the vehicle for the local municipalities and so you're trying to fix that, right?"

Hurley: "Yes, Sir."

Reboletti: "And that it's also fair to say that in order to charge reckless driving you have to have a willful and wanton behavior. It's the only part of our Vehicle Code that requires the mental state, right?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Hurley: "Correct."

Reboletti: "See, these questions were a lot easier than the previous questioner, but Ladies and Gentlemen to the Bill. It's obviously a very serious situation and when these are more frequent, there's a lot of problems in people's neighborhoods near the cemetery and it's very easy for more violence to erupt. All we're going to do is allow a local municipality the opportunity to impound a vehicle which we already let them do for 12 other offenses including DUI or possession of alcohol by a minor and a few others. So, this makes good sense. If you want to reward gang members for intervening in a rival gang member's procession and not seize the car, then vote 'no'. It's not a bad piece of legislation. Actually, you should seize the vehicle and not give it back to them because it's an instrument of the crime. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hello, almost seatmate. I should tell your constituents that you do a wonderful job in Springfield and are you wearing black because of the Bill?"

Hurley: "In honor of funerals and death with dignity and the respect, yes."

Ford: "All right. Have you ever heard of the term from the cradle to the grave?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Ford: "Do you know the definition?"

Hurley: "No."

Ford: "So, the definition is from birth to death the government's promise to take care of us from the cradle to the grave. You

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

can feel secure and well-protected from the cradle to the grave. And that's what your Bill does. Congratulations. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "My name was used in debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Davis, M.: "And I want to ask a question of the Sponsor. When you take the vehicle will you also take their driver's license?

And the second part of that is suppose the vehicle doesn't belong to them, but they're driving for a family member."

Hurley: "I don't believe we take the driver's license, but I'll get back to you on that and if the car is borrowed, you still have the responsibility of the car ownership, yes."

Davis, M.: "So, this is unique legislation for a unique part of our city. There's nothing like it and I'm sure, as Ken Dunkin has stated earlier... where's Representative Dunkin? As Representative Dunkin stated earlier, this is the kind of legislation that is specific and we're micromanaging the 19th Ward. So, we can micromanage the 19th Ward which I'm a part of, proudly so, but I just am concerned when we have all of these laws on the books for drinking and driving, a nuisance, reckless driving, gang behavior, shooting. Is it illegal to shoot at somebody? It's already against the law. But anyway, because I'm also from the 19th Ward I will have to vote for this Bill, but I do not urge anyone else to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair is confused. Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Hurley, I would like to be added as a cosponsor and I have

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

unfortunately given many of funeral escorts. This does not just pertain to the 19th Ward; this pertains to Rockford and every other community in this state. Even though you give these escorts you have your lights on, you have a car... a police car in the front, you have a police car in the back depending on how long the funeral service is. You have lots of different major intersections and unfortunately, that still does not deter some of the criminal element. We have a group called the Hood Ryders in Rockford who will overtake the streets, overtake squad cars by doing circles around them and this is going to help the police. And please remember that the funeral procession is part of the honoring that we do to the dead and is part of the closure process. So, again, I would like to be added as a cosponsor, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan would like to give his time to Mr. Reboletti. All you needed to do is say his name in debate. He'd speak forever."

Reboletti: "Well, he's over there, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I'm very confused as to why people would say it's a bad Bill, but they live there; then they're going to be for the Bill, but it's bad. I'm a little bit confused right now, but I think it's very simple that people come down here all the time with issues in their district and they try to seek a solution. Why is this so different than the other 3 thousand Bills that have been filed in this particular Session that... and the 1500 across the street? Why is this any different? Every other General Assembly deals with new issues all the time. I don't understand why we spent an hour on this

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

legislation, but if it's necessary then sobeit. So, with that, I think the Lady has a good Bill and it's very simple. You know, I'm a former state prosecutor, but I don't know much about these things. But I will tell you this is that it's a good Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays, if you'd indulge me, there's only one more light on. Representative Burke."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Burke, K.: "Representative, you and Senator Cunningham and Alderman O'Shea have gone to extensive lengths to try and curb this problem before resorting to seeking legislation. Is that correct?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Burke, K.: "You've talked to the funeral directors in the area, you've talked to the cemetery that is the particular problem and to no avail these processions continue endangering the lives and property of people along the procession route into the funeral home or to the cemetery. Is that correct?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Burke, K.: "While your particular cemetery is not in my district, I do have numerous other cemeteries in my district. This sort of behavior has not happened there yet, but I can anticipate that someday it might and I think we... I would be very glad to have this law in effect. I think it's a good Bill. I support it and I thank you for bringing it to the floor."

Hurley: "Thank you."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley to close."

- Hurley: "Thank you everyone for your comments, questions and concerns. This law already allows for impoundment in more than a dozen incidences as I mentioned before. This is a commonsense solution to a very dangerous situation that is not only a threat to public safety, but an insult to the family members of the deceased who just want to bury their family members in peace. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Davis. Please take the record. On this question, all 118 Members of the House, including Representative... (unintelligible), voted 'yea', 0 voted 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Roth will be excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Senate Bill 2234, Mr. Zalewski. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2234, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We dealt with this matter earlier in the spring, but it's back with a change. It simply allows for the portability of value upon a voucher under the state's video gaming law. Additionally, we are adding some language that would allow for some cost savings potentially by creating a larger pool of companies that can test,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

laboratory test video gaming machines. If the Gaming Board feels that they need a larger pool to compete for this work, they'll be able to under this statute enactment. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

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 vote your switches, Members. Fine, Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2255, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2255, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Department of Natural Resources and it creates a mine electrician competency exam so that the state can certify mine electricians. Currently, they do... the state doesn't certify rather the electricians are certified through Mine the Federal Government's Safety and Health Administration. What this would do... and that test that I just alluded to from the Mine Safety and Health Administration, the test that we propose is nearly identical, but it adds an additional 30 questions that only pertain to Illinois laws and regulation. So, I'd ask for your favorable consideration. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, 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 yourselves. Mr. Cabello. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2268, Mr. Kay. Mr. Kay. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2326, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2326, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We have Currie: long had a sales tax exemption for rolling stock. That is to say buses, trains, trucks, limos used in interstate commerce. The standards, however, are not totally uniform and this measure, as amended, would bring boats and aircraft into the same definition of what counts as interstate commerce as already applies to trucks and to other forms transportation. The effective date would be January 1, 2014. That is to say new boats and aircraft bought after that time would have to meet the same tests that currently apply if it's the other kinds of rolling stock. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions. And I'd appreciate your support for uniformity and fair play in the Illinois sales tax law."

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

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Spons... will the Majority Leader yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields. She yields."
- Franks: "Representative, I appreciate... you've spent a lot of time on this and you and I have had many discussions and for the purpose of legislative intent, I'd like to read a few questions, if I may. This Bill provides that use as rolling stock is to be calculated on a 12-month period. How is that 12-month period determined?"
- Currie: "It would be the date the aircraft or the boat is titled. So, the 12 months following that date would be the appropriate length of time."
- Franks: "Thank you. The next question I have, is the Bill provides that for aircraft flight hours may be used in lieu of miles. This means that as long as aircraft owners keep records of flight hours they don't need to keep track of actual miles. Is that correct?"
- Currie: "Correct."
- Franks: "If an aircraft owner elects to use the trips method, can you explain how a trip is determined?"
- Currie: "It's based on the manner in which the customer's invoiced. So, each invoiced flight will constitute a trip."
- Franks: "What about a personal use by the owner? For example, if an owner takes a personal trip to Las Vegas and back, how many trips will that be considered?"
- Currie: "That'll be one trip. Round trip flights by the owner are considered one trip."
- Franks: "Thank you very much for that legislative intent and to the Bill. I appreciate the Majority Leader's work on this. I

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

think it brings fundamental fairness and consistency to our Tax Code and I stand in support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And due to a potential conflict of interest, I'll be voting 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Moffitt: "Representative, in looking at the analysis, I noticed that there were several opponents and that with one of the Amendments that removed some of the opponents."

Currie: "In fact, it removed all of the opposition."

Moffitt: "All of it?"

Currie: "This Bill is now agreed to because it only applies to these items that are bought after January 1, 2014. So, people who bought something under one interpretation of the tax consequences will not be stuck with a retroactive Bill. And with the Amendment, there is no opposition from anyone as far as I know."

Moffitt: "Okay. Even there was one city, I think, that had been opposed to and there was quite a list. But you said all removed. It's an agreed Bill."

Currie: "That's my understanding."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to confirm what the Sponsor said. This Amendment, because of the prospective nature of it starting on January 1, was a significant change and a beneficial change for anyone who might already own an

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

aircraft. Had this been applied retroactively there would be a possibility of having to redo depreciation schedules and the like, but since we've now made it prospective as of January the 1st, as the Lady said, the opposition has been removed. And it is a Bill which is a fair and equitable Bill for tax purposes and I encourage a 'yes' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? Davis, Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2371, Mr. Hays. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2371, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2371 seeks to clarify the video gaming Bill that was passed in this chamber a few years ago specifically to allow both for-profit and not-for-profit entities to have the gaming machines. Thank you."

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

Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Flowers, Kay. Mr.

Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 76

voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to page

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- 7 of the Calendar under Concurrences. Please check this Calendar and if you have a Bill on Concurrence where your Motion has come out of Rules, please be ready so we can move through these expeditiously. There are quite a few of them. So, I would appreciate it if you were ready, so would the rest of the Body. House Bill 49, Mr. Franks. Please read the Bill. Oh, excuse me, it's on Concurrence. Please proceed, Sir."
- Franks: "This is a Bill we had passed unanimously. The Senate Floor Amendment, I move to concur with, which is just a technical Amendment."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Moylan, Sommer, Tryon. Mr. Sommer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 49. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 83, Representative Dan Burke. Please proceed, Sir."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It removes the time associated with the prohibition on tethering of a dog. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Harris, Hatcher, Hays, Tracy. Representative Tracy.

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Please take the record. On this question, there are 83 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 83. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 26, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 206, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 213, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 214 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 215; recommends be adopted Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1225."
- Speaker Lang: "Moving down the Calendar. House Bill 100, Mr. Costello. Mr. Costello. Out of the record. House Bill 189, Representative Cloonen. Out of the record. House Bill 513, Mr. DeLuca. Please proceed, Sir."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 513. When I presented this Bill originally, I had stated that there was going to be a change made in the Senate to make it more specific. That change has been made and I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 513. And this Bill, having received the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 100, Mr. Costello. Please proceed."

- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. I would ask that the House concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 100. Senate Amendment 1 just makes the reporting a little more strict than it was before and also takes away the opposition from Equip from Equality... for Equality. Excuse me. Senate Amendment 2 just adds the word 'medical status'. It's a technical change. Thank you. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 100. Those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ford, Osmond. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 100. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 595, Representative Nekritz. Please proceed."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. The underlying Bill is a licensing for condominium managers and those that... and the offices in which they work. There was a higher education requirement for those who had a supervisory license and what the Senate Amendment does is for, say, for those real estate brokers who already have the additional licensing, comparable licensing for real estate brokers, that they don't have to take the additional education for a... to be a supervisor for the condo manager license."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Bellock. Please take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 595. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 702, Representative Mayfield. Please proceed, Representative."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. This is an agreed upon Bill. When it passed out of the House, we had talked about... there was the agreement that they would amend it in the Senate and then bring it back over here. Basically, what this Bill does it deals with the issue of the sharps and how they are disposed of. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency actually wrote the Amendment. There is no opposition to this Bill and it actually addresses issues from a couple companies... from a company specifically in my district and another company just to the north within Rep... Osmond's district. I'm open to any questions. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves to concur in the Senate Amendment.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "In the underlying Bill, Representative, the IEPA was an opponent. Now, are they for the Bill?"

Mayfield: "Yes, they wrote the Amendment."

Franks: "Okay. So, that took away their concern?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Mayfield: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Are there any fees in this? I know there were some in the first issue..."

Mavfield: "No."

Franks: "...thinking there was some question of the transportation of the sharps. So, there's no additional cost?"

Mayfield: "No, the transportation of sharps has to be done by the facility that is rendering them noninfectious."

Franks: "Okay. Well. I appreciate your work on this to making a better Bill. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Harris, Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 702. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 827, Mr. Moylan. Please proceed."

Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Floor Amendment #1. Senate Floor Amendment #1 fixes a technical problem with the Bill as it left the House by adding the word 'member' in a place where it was accidentally left out."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting... 103 voting 'yes', 13 voting 'no', 1 voting

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 827. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1017, Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you. I Motion to Concur on Senate Amendment #1. This is a Amendment that essentially makes technical changes to some of the provisions of this underlying Bill regarding the Illinois Health Information Exchange. A few issues that were up for question were resolved. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1017. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1247, Mr. D'Amico. Please proceed."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur with Amendment 1 to House Bill 1247 over in the Senate. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Well, perhaps you could briefly, just briefly, explain the Amendment to us, Sir."
- D'Amico: "I took a chance, Mr. Speaker. Basically, what it does is the first stop is not a moving offense. Every stop after that when using a cell phone will be."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks on the Motion."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Franks: "So, what exactly, to remind the folks, it's been a while since we voted on this. What does this Bill do?"
- D'Amico: "It bans the use of handheld cell phones while driving a car."
- Franks: "Okay. And then this would, the Amendment, would lessen some of the fines that you had previously put in the original Bill?"
- D'Amico: "It would lessen... it would lessen the... it's no longer a moving violation when you get... for your first stop."
- Franks: "And any second or subsequent offense would be a moving violation?"

D'Amico: "Yes, that's correct."

"Okay. Philosophically, I know you and I have had Franks: disagreements on this, I'm just wondering why we don't have an enhanced standard for people who are driving while distracted versus trying to legislate individual behaviors. And I'll give you an example and I alluded to it briefly the other day. We got out of here on Friday and I stopped for gas and then I was near a Wendy's and I got a Frosty. Now, the thing with the Frosty is unlike a cone you have to use two hands. It was the chocolate one. It was very good. The problem with the Frosty is when you're driving and you're holding the spoon in your right hand and the Frosty in your left you have to move your hands to bring the ice cream to your mouth. So, at no time did I have two hands on the wheel while I was eating the Frosty. Now, to complicate it, if you're smoking a cigar while you're eating a Frosty, but then if you have your window open and a bee flies in, you wouldn't imagine the havoc that created. There's ashes in the Frosty, you're moving

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

you're hands like this. Thank God I wasn't on my cell phone, right, 'cause that would have made it worse. But my point is, the things that I was doing was probably more distracting than I would've been by simply being on my cell phone and speaking. So, I'm concerned on our public policy that when we talk about specific actions that we're not really looking at the global effect of driving while distracted. I mean, if anyone deserved a ticket that day, I'm sure I did for having a Frosty and smoking a cigar with the window open."

- D'Amico: "I think by driving a car, having your hand on a Frosty and having your hand in a spoon at the same time while you're driving, I don't think you're being responsible."
- Franks: "Right. And I wasn't and I understood that, but that happens every day and it also happens when you're eating fast food and when you're reaching over to put your DVD in or you're having your coffee and you spill it in your lap or you do a shortstop. But my point is, it just doesn't seem fair to be focusing on one type of behavior but leaving the other ones. So, I think you should..."
- D'Amico: "Well, all I can tell you is, Representative, this type of behavior has been linked to a lot of casualties, a lot of casualties and we're trying to correct that. And if you remember, I'm just... what we're trying to do is just go back to basics. When you took driver's ed, when I took driver's ed, they taught us to keep our hands at 10 and 2, not 10 and with one hand on a phone."
- Franks: "I get that. So, you can still… but what I'm concerned about is that the… it seems to me is that the next logical way to go on this would be to get rid of cell phones completely

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

while we're driving. And I think it's become such a part of our culture that it'd be... that would be a very difficult move, but it just seems that we're focusing on that when there's many other just as dangerous actions while you're driving. And I know that we've... we all know that we should do better and I think we can all agree that we've made... we've been lucky sometimes while we're driving. So, that would be my point and that was my concern on this Bill. And I appreciate your indulgence."

D'Amico: "Thank you for your support."

Speaker Lang: "And thank you for the offer to buy us all Frostys,
Mr. Franks. Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, you and I have had a conversation about this. I'm trying to figure out how you would determine on either the driver's abstract or elsewhere, if a person has a disposition that is a nonmoving violation and then it's recorded as a moving violation because you and I discussed this where if the Village of Addison writes me this citation it's an ordinance violation. That would be the first offense. That would not necessarily go into the driver's history and then if I got a second one in the City of Chicago, they may not know about the one in Addison, so I'm not sure if the Senate Amendment works, forgetting about the underlying Bill that you and I have disagreements on."

D'Amico: "Yeah. I was told that it would just be entered into the database of the Secretary of State."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Reboletti: "Why wouldn't it just be a moving violation all the way? And if the prosecutor wants to amend it to a nonmoving violation like they do every day in court, I mean, it just makes sense; either it's a moving violation or it's not. John, are you aware of any other offenses that are treated like this in the Vehicle Code? I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but..."

D'Amico: "I am not aware."

Reboletti: "...because in my previous career as a state prosecutor

I haven't seen any other offenses that are like that, so."

D'Amico: "I look at it as a good way to educate everybody to let them know that are doing something that's against the law if they don't know it already."

Reboletti: "And here's the other issue, to the previous speaker, Representative Franks. We passed the Bill, House Bill 1816, out of this Body that dealt with, I thought, a change in reckless driving where you could infer three moving violations or more were proven in front of a court or a jury that there could be an inference of reckless driving if there was a Class A injury meaning like a broken arm or death and our colleagues across the street thought that that was too easy of a standard to reach. So, that's why we end up with a lot of these Bills is because we can't come to one uniform agreement. So, I reluctantly will be in opposition of this. I don't believe that it's going to be easy to track in our databases. So, thank you, John."

D'Amico: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico to close."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- D'Amico: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd just appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1247. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1288. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 206."
- Speaker Lang: "Now, House Bill 1288, Representative Gabel. Please proceed, Representative."
- Gabel: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 2. What... there is no actual change to the language. It's the same exact language that passed the House except that the state complaint part of the Bill is placed in a separate subsection at the end the Bill. The request was made at... the change was made at the request of Chicago Public Schools because they wanted a clear distinction between the due process changes and the state complaint provisions. But this Bill addresses... it requires ISBE to adopt special education complaint procedures that are consistent with Federal Law and increase due process procedures for parents. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tabares. Please take the record. On this question, there 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1288. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1309, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1309. It's a very simple Amendment that slightly narrows the focus to address the actual heinous acts that were committed in West Rogers Park last summer. And I ask for your support."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1309. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1349, Mr. Schmitz. Please proceed."
- Schmitz: "Okay, sorry. House Bill 1349 would move to concur with Senate Amendment #3. They took a perfectly good Bill and added some more things to it. So, with that, if the House would bear with me. They added... they define health care facility and the Senate also decided if the health care facility has an electronic code box they do not have to have a key box. And the last item that came over from the House of Lords deals

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

with the public utilities would not have to install a fire key box as well. And I would move to concur."

'yes; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Leitch. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1349. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1652, Mr. Brown. Please proceed, Sir."

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with House Amendment... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652. This states that DNR has the ability to refuse or revoke the hunting or fishing license of anyone who has been convicted of interfering with the hunting or fishing license provision. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks on the Motion."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "How does the Amendment change the underlying Bill, Mr. Brown?"

Brown: "Well, the underlying Bill was regarding drone use, drone interference with hunting or fishermen was an issue that the underlying Bill addressed. This Senate Amendment gives DNR the ability to refuse or revoke any hunting or fishing license from those folks that have been convicted of such interference."

Franks: "And the underlying Bill remains?"

Brown: "Correct."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Brown: "Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1683, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What... House Bill 1683, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and this was a minor change that the Illinois Hospital Association wanted in just the making sure that the money, when a mental health facility would close, would go to provide care for the people... the money to follow the individuals. And this would allow DD facilities to do the same."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1683. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2250, Representative Willis. Out of the record. House Bill 2311, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. House Bill 2339, Representative Will Davis. Please proceed, Sir. Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Oh, I'm sorry. I thought the Clerk said something first. I apologize. Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur in

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2339. Very briefly, what it does is, that it provides for the authorization rather than the consent to of an anatomical gift. It provides that an agent under a health care power of attorney may authorize an anatomical gift. It makes changes concerning the revocation of an anatomical gift. It also makes changes concerning evaluation of a... evaluation of suitability of a donated body or part. It does a little more to define the terms 'donee' and 'recipient'. And then I also have two pages of very technical stuff that I really don't want to have to read if I don't want to, but I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Fortner. Please take the record. On this question, there 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2339. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2471, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I want to concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2471. The change very simply makes clear that in our desire to protect victims of sex crimes and child victims of sex crimes that we also intended the privacy protection to extend to victims of human trafficking as well. And I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Rita. Please take the record. On this question,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2471. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2508, Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. Out of the record. House Bill 2787, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on House Bill 2787 with Senate Amendment #1. What this Bill was addressing was working with the Cook County Guardian in reviewing the DCFS procedures. So, what it does is it provides a better process in promulgating the rules and establishing criteria to address false reports, the timing of the reports being quicker, appeals and a few other things. I ask for your support."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2787. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 2508, Mr. Hoffman. Please proceed."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is... now came back as an agreed to Bill between the Illinois Motorcycle Dealers Association and the Harley Davidson Motor Company. You may recall the debate regarding a franchisee. They be... came to an agreement on the provisions and now it's an agreed to Bill."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Flowers, Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2508. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2905, Mr. Evans. Please proceed, Sir."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a Motion in Concurrence for Senate Amendment 1 for 2905. This Bill, which flew out of here, makes a couple of technical changes. It's sort of been watered down. The penalties have been reduced too as such. The penalties were all the way up to a possible felony, exfelony or a first felony, but now it's been reduced down to, in the Senate, to a... at the top... I mean, it's... the worst possible case would be a Class 4 felony and just to potentially stop the possibility of arguing over small properties, there's been a floor set at \$10 thousand. So, it'd only be properties over \$10 thousand. So, I ask for your support."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Moffitt, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 73 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2905. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2947, Mr. Drury. Please proceed."
- Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2947. This was a budget transparency Bill. The Amendment merely clarifies what specific information needs to be provided in the Governor's budget table related to our true surpluses and deficits. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Cabello, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2947. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3003, Representative Soto. Please proceed."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Yes, I wish to concur with Senate... I'm sorry, with Senate Committee Amendment #1 which amends the Bill so that the board members shall receive no compensation and shall not be reimbursed for any necessary expenses occurred for their performance and duties unless funds become available to the board. And I urge an 'aye' vote... appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Riley. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

House Bill 3003. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Leader Riley. Mr. Riley."

Riley: "I'm sorry. With all the excitement, I've forgotten what...

did you... my button was on. Was that..."

Speaker Lang: "Yes, indeed, Sir, it was."

Riley: "It was pressed by mistake."

Speaker Lang: "Do you know who did it, Sir?"

Riley: "No, I didn't, but it could be one of many people, so."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin will look into it for you. Mr. Arroyo.

Another phantom hit Mr. Arroyo's switch. Very nice. House
Bill 3139, Mr. Smith. Please proceed."

Smith: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Amendment 1 and 2. Amendment 1 and 2 just allow the insurance companies to use the post policies on the Internet website and also changes the language from damage to portable electronic devices as used to display electronic insurance. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Amendments. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3139. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3157, Mr. Evans. Please proceed."

Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3157. In the Senate there were some

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

questions regarding to how a Section of the Bill regarding apportionment of gangs would work for some firms. Rather than, you know, continue with the confusion, the various parties are going to work over the summer to try to correct the Bill. For the most part, the Bill just clears up some usage of paperwork with the Department of Revenue at this point."

- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment 1. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Leitch, Reboletti. Mr. Leitch. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3157. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3272, Mr. Moffitt. Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On House Bill 3272 I move to nonconcur and working with the Senate Sponsor this... the initial language passed the House. The Senate put some... an Amendment on it. In working with Chairman Franks, we're looking at possible... some technical changes, but we ran out of time and so we have the main Bill. We'd like to send it back to the Senate and they're going to remove the Amendment and then, I believe, pass it."
- Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 3272. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."
- Franks: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Moffitt worked hard on this Bill and unfortunately when it came over from

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

the Senate it was just misdrafted. We caught that in committee, so his Motion is simply to send it back for another shot to get it right. We have another Bill that has the language, but we're waiting for that to come out of Rules. So, I encourage an 'aye' vote on the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields. This is a nonconcurrence Motion."

Zalewski: "Is the Senate going to recede from... have you been in contact with the Senate, Representative?"

Moffitt: "With the Senate Sponsor, yes."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Moffitt: "And they will withdraw or recede from their Amendment."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1. The House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3272. House Bill 3319, Mr. Halbrook. Please proceed."

Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3319. It's technical in nature."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Costello. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3346... Excuse me, House Bill 3319. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- declared passed. House Bill 3346, Representative Wheeler. Please proceed."
- Wheeler: "Sorry about that. Mr. Speaker, thank you. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3346. I ask for your support and welcome any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Perhaps you can tell us briefly what the Amendment does, Representative."
- Wheeler: "I would love to, Mr. Speaker. When we passed the veterans' Bill for women to have a special task force, the veteran's assistant director had called and asked that when it went to the Senate for a vote that we actually included with the discharged veterans task force that already existed. So, that was the Amendment in the Senate and that's what I... would ask for your Concurrence today."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson, Jefferson. Mr. Jefferson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3346. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3359, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to, on House Bill 3359, move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 which adds to the task force to look into recycling metals, a coin collector person. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the Concurrence on the Senate Amendment. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cassidy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3359. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3380, Representative Tabares. Please proceed."

- Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3380 which adds guardians that are appointed under the Juvenile Court Act to the list of guardians that can request a security freeze on a minor."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bost, Evans, Lilly. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3380. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3388, Representative Kelly Burke. Please proceed."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1. This Bill... the original Bill required the Law Enforcement Training Standards Board to conduct or approve a training program in animal fighting awareness. The Amendment simply adds that training on canine behavior and nonlethal ways to subdue a canine would be added to that awareness program. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hatcher, Sosnowski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3388. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1584 under the Orders of second Bill... Senate Bills-Second Reading. Please read the Bill. Leader Currie."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a technical Amendment to the Bill. We discussed it in committee yesterday. I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment and then we can discuss the Bill on Third."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say... excuse me.

Mr. Reboletti. Did not see your light, Sir."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know this is Amendment #2, but the underlying Bill would basically take the police/fire folks and put them in what is commonly known as Obamacare."

Currie: "No."

Reboletti: "Is that what this would seek to do?"

Currie: "That's not what the Bill does at all."

Reboletti: "What does it do?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Currie: "Would you like to discuss Amendment 2 or may we adopt Amendment 2 and then we can discuss the Bill as amended?"
- Reboletti: "We could discuss it as amended, Leader. That would be fine."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1584, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Under a Currie: consent that pre-entered into 25 years ago, the City of Chicago and the worker's pension fund help subsidize, do not pay for, but help subsidize retiree health care. That settlement agreement comes to an end at the end of June, 2013. The city, however, instead of just pulling the rug out from under these retirees, the city has asked us to extend the sunset that currently would go into effect at also June 30, 2013 and mean that the worker's pension funds would not be able to help subsidize health care. The city has asked and so have the retirees that we extend the sunset date on the opportunity for the pension fund to help pay for retiree health care costs until such time as the city figures out a new plan or January 1, 2016, whichever comes first. So, this is a measure that will see to it that people who currently get some subsidies for health care will at least, in the near future, continue to receive those subsidies from the pension

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

program and of course, the city will continue its subsidy as well. There is a number of the… a class of retirees, those who retired before 1989. Their number is about 5,500. The city has said that they will continue to pay for whatever they have been doing for these individuals who are the poorest and the most vulnerable of citizens, but as for the others, the city is trying to investigate ways to figure out what kind of health care would best suit their needs. In any case, the city doesn't want to pull the rug out from under and I surely hope that the Members of this chamber don't want to do that either. So, I would appreciate your 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 1584 and I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Senger: "Good. Leader, just to clarify here, it is my understanding that the 30 thousand individuals that are police and fire and labor and municipal workers of the City of Chicago will, for six months until January 1, 2014, have coverage. But then after 2014 until 2016 the city, at any time, can take them off..."

Currie: "The city can take them off as of July 1, 2013..."

Senger: "...and put them on Obamacare."

Currie: "...next... basically next month. The city has every right to kick these people out of any kind of subsidy in paying their health care bill. The city has graciously said we don't want to pull the rug out from under. We want to establish a transition period and they have committed to continuing the subsidy and the only way the subsidy from the pension fund

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

can continue is if we vote 'yes' on Senate Bill 1584. The city would like to figure out a way to transition some number of the retirees out of subsidized health insurance which they have every right to do. They have made a commitment to some 5,500, the poorest, the most vulnerable who retired before 1989 that they will continue to provide coverage for those."

Senger: "And the way they're going to provide coverage is through Obamacare."

Currie: "The 5,500, I believe, the city will continue to subsidize. For other retirees, for whom the city has no responsibility as of June 30... July 1, 2013, I think the city will try to help them figure out their best options for health care. In any event, the only way the subsidy from the pension fund can continue, at least until that transition period or 2016 whichever is first, is if we say 'yes' to Senate Bill 1584."

Senger: "To the Bill, if I may, to the Body. And listen to this very closely. What is occurring here is a situation in Chicago where a lawsuit now has a sunset date and the City of Chicago is choosing not to cover these retirees. Not only not to cover their subsidized funding, but to deny the health care assurance and put them on the so-called Obamacare without us knowing how this is going to work or if that's even the right thing for them. This is a precedent we are setting here which is a very dangerous, slippery slope to be on. You could guess that after this we'll see Chicago Public Schools, our teacher's retirement system, our municipal retirement systems... I mean, anybody who wants to start taking this route can take it. And we are, very realistically here, taking

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

annuitants who are being provided health care insurance off their state systems and putting them on something that's unknown. I very much would ask for a 'no' vote here. This is a very dangerous place to be right now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "So, Representative, the agreement ends as of June 30 of this year."

Currie: "I think it's June 30. It's June 30/July 1. This is a settlement..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "...that was entered into 25 years ago."

Harris, D.: "Right. And the exchanges start when, 1 October?"

Currie: "I think people can sign up in October, but the exchanges don't begin until January 2014. This Bill has nothing to do with the exchanges."

Harris, D.: "No, I..."

Currie: "This Bill has only to do with the fact that the city, in another month or so, will have no obligation whatsoever..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "...to help city retirees pay for health care insurance and unless we change the law, the pension funds for those workers will not be able to continue the subsidy."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "This has nothing to do with Obamacare."

Harris, D.: "Well, I realize it doesn't have anything specifically to do with the Affordable Care Act; however, the city is,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

from what I have read, the city intends to help these individuals make that transition to the Affordable Care Act and the… the health…"

Currie: "Or to whatever. There are other..."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "...options that may be available."

Harris, D.: "And..."

Currie: "I think the important point is the city does not want to throw all of these retirees under the bus July 1, 2013."

Harris, D.: "They have a... they have big hearts in the city. They certainly do."

Currie: "You know, it's a pleasure to find out that my own city has a heart."

Harris, D.: "However, let's... let's... I've often felt that the hearts are sometimes motivated by the dollar signs. And if the city no longer has to bear the cost and can transfer these individuals or help these individuals make the transfer to the exchanges, they're going to save an awful lot of money..."

Currie: "They're..."

Harris, D.: "...and they could do, potentially, they could do the same thing with the school systems. They could do the same thing with other employees who may work for the city. That... the transfer could be made and the city would save a whole heck of a lot money when it..."

Currie: "I don't know..."

Harris, D.: "...came to dollars and cents."

Currie: "...I have to say, I don't know what happens with the other pension funds. The Chicago Board of Education, for example, has responsibility over whatever happens with the pensions

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

for that system. That is not a direct responsibility of the city."

Harris, D.: "You know..."

Currie: "All I know is the city can say to all of the retirees,
July 1 this year, you're on your own, buddy. And I think it
is important that the city is prepared to help create a
transition so that people are not left in the lurch. I think
it speaks well for the city that they're prepared to continue
with subsidies for those who retired before 1989, the least
affluent of their number, I think that's a good thing."

Harris, D.: "And..."

Currie: "But I also think that the city cannot afford to continue subsidizing retiree health care to the tune it currently does and I also think it's not a good idea for the worker's pension fund to be paying for health care in the long run. This is a transition period and I urge your support."

Harris, D.: "And I understand. And just by way of observation, to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, the city can do this and they can do this for the retirees and guess what, I believe they can do it for their employees as well and the difference is that if a private employer does this under the Affordable Care Act the private employer pays a penalty for each individual that they do not... for each employee that they do not provide health care coverage for. And the city can avoid such a penalty. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie, did you have a response?"

Currie: "With respect to employees, yes. With respect to retirees, no. Employers do not have responsibility, as I understand it, for the health care costs of their retirees today or tomorrow.

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

So, under the Affordable Care Act, the city would not have any responsibility for these retirees. But the city is... has, with our help, the city will continue to give them some support in the near future during a transition period."

Harris, D.: "Thank you and I appreciate the debate with the Majority Leader."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Zalewski: "Leader, we're getting off into what this does with respect to Obamacare and maybe I wasn't at the same committee that everybody else was yesterday. This is in response to a specific court decision, correct?"

Currie: "This is the result of a 25-year-old settlement between the city and the plaintiffs in the Korshak case. That settlement ends at the end of June, beginning of July. That means that at that time the city no longer has any obligation to pay one penny for the health care costs of its 36 thousand retirees. If we do not pass this Bill, the city will not be very well able to continue helping some of those retirees at least in the near future."

Zalewski: "So, the existence or nonexistence of the Affordable Care Act doesn't have any bearing on the statutory duty that the Body has to deal with this problem, correct?"

Currie: "Zero."

Zalewski: "And to the testimony in committee yesterday, again, if
I'm mistaken, was that the subsidies will be continued for a
limited amount of time and then the city will make a
determination about how they want to proceed. So, the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

testimony left a little bit of ambiguity to the extent that we don't know what they're going to do. Isn't that accurate?"

Currie: "Well, we don't know and that the reality is they're not quite sure either. But this measure would give them time until they figure out what they're doing for the retirees who have retired since 1989 or until January 1, 2016 whichever comes first."

Zalewski: "So, to the Bill. I, again, implore the Body to not look beyond what the constructs of the Bill are and simply say that all the Bill does is ask the Body to make a statutory change that we would have had to made regardless of what's coming down the pipe with the Affordable Care Act and this isn't... shouldn't be looked at outside the four corners of that particular posture. And I ask for the Body's support for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think that Representative has done a good job in explaining this Bill particularly, but anybody who reads the Chicago newspapers over the last two weeks has seen this as a several-page article in several papers stating that the mayor, in long range, wants to save and we can understand why he wants to do that over the next 10 years his costs for health care for his retirees and we faced that ourselves. Have... It will go from I think it was 54 million to 240 million. So, this is a definite precedent in looking towards taking your retirees from either your county or your city or your state and putting those retirees on to the health exchange. This is going to set a precedent of a major city looking towards doing this

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

whether this Bill... this Bill does not specifically do that, but this leads into a major topic of discussion throughout the country. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "Am I missing something in the very first step of this Bill, Leader Currie? Can't the city of Chicago, being the benevolent city that it is, do this voluntarily without us passing this legislation?"

Currie: "Representative, the city cannot offer pension fund subsidies to current retirees without action by this Assembly. The subsidies... the subsidies expire June 30, 2013. That is a month from now. The city can't do anything without our help on this Bill."

Kosel: "I understand that the court order expires on that date..."

Currie: "That's right."

Kosel: "...but the city can't do anything..."

Currie: "The city cannot..."

Kosel: "...without the court order or us?"

Currie: "...the city cannot access pension subsidies unless we take out the sunset date currently in the statute. The current statute says the pension fund payments for health care will expire June 30, 2013."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Willis: "I just have two simple questions. Number one: this is for retirees that retired prior to 1989?"

Currie: "This is all retirees. There are two classes. The city has said they're required to do nothing to help any of these 36 thousand retirees, help them pay their health care bills. The city has said for those who retired before 1989 who tend to be very low income, their pensions are low, they're elderly, the city will continue to provide the same kinds of subsidies they're providing today. For the others, they're asking for our help in providing a smooth transition away from city subsidies."

Willis: "So, this would also then include those older retirees that are on Medicare to get like Medicare supplement to assist with that kind of payment?"

Currie: "You're exactly right."

Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. My husband is a recent retiree. His union saw this coming and they actually set up a health care subsidy type of program. Obviously, the City of Chicago wants to have time to do this, is my understanding. So, therefore, I think this is a wonderful Bill and I certainly would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I don't actually see this as a wonderful Bill. I see this as a Bill that is the opening of the floodgates to dumping workers from cities and municipalities and townships and the State of Illinois into Obamacare. And I know why we're going to do that because I learned about that yesterday that when you put workers on Obamacare it's free. So, why wouldn't we put everybody on

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

there? This is a nice test case. The Korshak decree says that, I guess, we don't have to do anything now and these poor people are without health care. Fortunately, Obamacare exists and this will be the start of the end because now we will have single pair. We'll all be on one health care system. It's only a matter of time, but the good thing is to remember that this is all free."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The reality is that without passage of this legislation retirees from the City of Chicago, the police, the fire, the laborers, they will be faced, they will be stuck immediately with a \$20 million bill for health care, if we do not pass Senate Bill 1584. I don't think anybody in good conscience should say that, gee, that's just dandy, pull the rug out from under, stick them with a \$20 million bill right away next month. I would certainly hope that you will join me in providing some protections for Chicago city worker retirees and vote 'yes' for Senate Bill 1584."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Crespo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 206, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill. Take that out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 214, Mr. Crespo. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 214, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

day. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And I need to adopt Amendment #2,
House Amendment #2 to House Bill 214."

Speaker Lang: "Are you withdrawing Amendment #1, Sir?"

Crespo: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Crespo and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. House Bill 214, the Amendment pretty much becomes the Bill and is the budget for the agencies under the Appropriations-General Services Committee. Amendment #2 to House Bill 214 added some technical changes and it also moves some funds from the ag premium to the Department of Agriculture at \$500 thousand to fund the implementation of House Bill #1. It also moves \$900 thousand from the Professional Indirect Cost Fund, another state fund, to DFPR to regulate House Bill #1."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 214, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is the product of the Committee on General Services which funds close to 40 agencies in State Government. We had a request, the entire budget for this Appropriation Committee was a little bit over \$8 billion, all funds, which included 1,178,030,500 in GRF. The agencies came in requesting 1,264,834,580; the committee appropriated 1,178,030,507. So, overall we cut close to 7 percent of the request. A couple of salient items here, the AFSCME contracts or anything related to the AFSCME contracts, were not included in our appropriations. The agencies and departments will have to figure how to fund those. After we sat down with the Senate, as the chair of the Revenue Committee had mentioned, there is some additional revenue that was made available. We received close to \$40 million of additional revenue and we used that to help some of the agencies that have been grossly underfunded in the past whenever we could. We also decided, as a committee, that we will spend more money on job training. We saw some value there. And any other items that we thought added some value we tried to fund. After all that, we still have some money available, close to \$50 million and it was the decision of the committee to direct that to public safety, elementary educations. We felt they had more pressing needs. And with that, I'd like to first thank all of the committee Members for working on this including the... my colleagues on the Republican side. I truly believe we worked in a great way. We came closer together. Unfortunately, there are forces outside our control, so I'm not sure how the vote will turn out, although I think I know how it will, but I want to thank all

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

the Members including Darlene Senger, who is the Minority Spokesperson. And with that, I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Senger: "Just a couple quick questions. There were... again, we had a good working group, many good discussions that went on and set some good policy when we were working through this budget. However, at the phase of the process where the House sat down with the Senate, the Republicans were not included. And on that note, there's a couple projects which we just became aware of today that we were not aware of until today and I'd like to know what they are. One example is the Forever Green Illinois Program in the tune of \$750 thousand in GRF to agriculture."

Crespo: "Yes, Representative. Thanks for asking. That's something that the Department of Agriculture had done in the past. It had not been funded for quite some time and as a result of the additional funds that became available, that's one of the programs that the committee decided to fund moving forward."

Senger: "And then the other item I know we had on this side, I believe, and it's know re... it's installed after, again, when you sat down with the Senate to find the money, the DuSable Museum for the Historic Preservation Agency, what that is? And that's a... a GRF..."

Crespo: "Right. I believe that was for ... "

Senger: "...to the tune of of 250 thousand."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Crespo: "...250 thousand was another... with the funds that became available we saw value there from the committee Members, so we decided to fund that."
- Senger: "Good. And I guess, I'm going to close this. To... to the Bill. Again, this was a good working group. We set some good policy. We basically did the things we had to do, but it was very unfortunate for those who worked very hard to get there that right before we finalized the budget to be removed from the process until this morning where we then found that, you know, items were added without our knowledge and without any policy involvement. So, as you can see with the frustration we had here working well until the end, you know, I cannot support this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

- Reis: "Representative, on the Department of Natural Resources' budget, can you explain the difference between GRF and other state funding?"
- Crespo: "Yeah, give me one second, please. You're talking about...

  Representative, are you comparing fiscal year '13 to '14?"
- Reis: "Well, just the two funds itself. Part of one line is general revenue and the other line is other state funds.

  What's the differ... I obviously know what GRF is. What's other state funds?"
- Crespo: "First of all, before we forget, if you recall, last year Representative Mautino passed a Bill to help fund the DNR which had been grossly underfunded for quite some time. A lot

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

of those other state funds are from fees that come from that sustainability Bill that passed last year."

Reis: "Okay. How come GRF went down then..."

Crespo: "Well..."

Reis: "...from '13 to '14 and almost every other agency they went up?"

Crespo: "So, what we did, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, Representative, we took anything related to the AFSCME contract whether it be salaries or anything else and we removed that from all the agencies. In this particular case, Natural Resources came in a little bit over and they had factored in the AFSCME pay raises and we removed that and that accounts for the difference."

Reis: "Well, part of my problem and the reason I've never supported increase... fee increases for agriculture and Department of Natural Resources, is because you put a five in one pocket and you take a five or a seven out the other pocket. Why do we continue to lower GRF which puts the agency in a bind and then we have to increase fees on the other end. You follow me?"

Crespo: "I follow you..."

Reis: "And I..."

Crespo: "...and, just for the record, Representative, when we went through this process, we took DNR and we put those on the side and we gave DNR a pass through rounds one and round two because they had worked last year on coming up with a funding mechanism. When we got to round three, we needed to make some more cuts and we had to bring them back in. And just to be consistent with all the other agencies, we removed anything

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

related to the AFSCME contract. But I get your point and I agree with you and the committee felt the same way especially for DNR."

Reis: "Okay. My next question is under the Illinois Arts Council.

Can you explain why they're getting a 24 percent increase in general revenue?"

Crespo: "So, again, this is a product, Representative, when we met with the Senate and there was additional funds that they made a compelling argument how the arts were important for... especially for many municipalities. They're looking at helping some of these struggling artists and to come in and just help them fund some of those programs."

Reis: "A 24 percent increase though?"

Crespo: "It's a..."

Reis: "How does that put their funding with fiscal year '10, '11, '12?"

Crespo: "It's... well, if you look at '13, '14, if you go a little bit further back, you'll see, again, as I said it earlier, some of these agencies have been grossly underfunded for quite some time. Whenever we could, we went back with additional funds and just tried to make them whole at least for this... for this year."

Reis: "Well, I understand. All of us, no matter what side of the aisle or what Party we belong to or what part of the state, could nitpick a budget, but I would find it outrageous that we're giving a 24 percent increase to the Illinois Arts Council when we still haven't fully funded education. We still haven't fully put back a lot of other things. We're not paying bills down. We're giving them a 25 percent increase. We all

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

know what's going on here and I just wanted to point this
outrageous part of your budget."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Franks: "First of all, Mr. Crespo, I appreciate the hard work. I know how dedicated you've been to this and how much you've worked on it. So, I appreciate all your efforts and that of your committee. I had a couple of questions on some of the line items. One's dealing with the lottery and I see that we're asking to give them one and a half million dollars to defend lawsuits. Can you tell us what that's all about?"

Crespo: "So, yeah. So, there's... and I think there's consensus in the committee on both sides of the aisle. There is a problem going on with the lottery. As you probably already know through your committee that they contracted with a company called Northstar to run the lottery and they've been going back and forth. We're actually waiting for an outside audit to come in which is way overdue. I don't think the audit came back in yet and unfortunately, what that means is they're spending more money on this potential litigation issue. The committee, at one point, was thinking about funding them at 50 percent and have them come back during the Veto Session. Hopefully, this whole thing will have been settled. We ran into some problems. There were some contractual obligations with Northstar, so it was kind of difficult to do that, but we're keeping a close eye and it's a concern for the committee as well."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Franks: "Well, what's... where did this lawsuit or potential lawsuit emanate from? Was this on the actual procurement of the lottery contract itself and not with the actual running of the lottery?"

Crespo: "My recollection from what we heard in committee, Representative, was that there's a disagreement as to whether Northstar has hit the threshold that they had to hit in order to get certain compensation and there's a disagreement on what that number is. That's one of the reasons we insisted on seeing the audit. I think the audit ultimately will let us know what that number really is in an objective way. We're still waiting for that audit."

Franks: "That was a bad deal from the beginning. The Governor, he has to wear this one completely. This was one where we dealt with the procurement of a private manager which, I think, was ill-advised. And the procurement was just replete with problems which I think, now they're coming home to roost and when we have to look at cuts in other areas, I mean, this a million and a half dollars that you have to set aside for a major mistake of the Governor and I'm just... I'm sorry that you have to do that. I understand it, but it's very upsetting to me that because that he didn't think this through and didn't do it right that we're paying for it again and again. And on that vein, I want to talk to you about the DCEO budget. On the DCEO budget, what did you decide to do with that? As I'm understanding, it looks as though that it's actually been expanded."

Crespo: "So, what we did with DCEO, Representative, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, when we met with the Senate and agreed

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

that there was additional funds to spend, in our case, close to \$40 million, we went back, we revisited some of these requests and we prioritized what was really important. And again, as I mentioned before, there were some agencies that had been grossly underfunded historically, so we tried, whenever we could, to bring them whole at least for this year. On DCEO, one of the things that we heard a lot of was the job training. And it seems like job training was something that we all agreed on and we actually pretty much put more funding on that line which resulted in the increase you see when you compare it to 2013."

Franks: "I see that. Now, what I don't see in the line items are the EDGE credits and we had our joint committee hearing with Revenue a few weeks ago and we heard at that time that DCEO has a blank check and they can give as much as they want to whoever they want. And two years ago when the fiscal... in our fiscal year, they gave over \$161 million in incentives without any metrics which accounted for almost 9 percent of all of the corporate tax revenues, the entire corporate tax revenues in the State of Illinois that they gave away to a few companies without any oversight. And I'm concerned here and maybe it's not in this budget, but I'm wondering is there any controls on how much they can give out?"

Crespo: "So, as far as the EDGE credits are concerned, you're right. It is not part of this budget. These are tax incentives. So, it's booked differently and it's not really something that we appropriate, so it doesn't come under our purview. Again, it's just tax credit. I know the Governor and

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

DCEO works with that, but it doesn't come before the appropriation process."

Franks: "Where does it show up in our budget? Because a couple years ago they blew \$161 million hole in the budget that no one, no one budgeted for. It wasn't in any line item. Where does it show up in this year's budget, if you know?"

Crespo: "I would imagine that's a matter of accounting, that it is booked somehow has a decrease in revenue coming in, but there's not real dollars that we're handing out. It's just revenue, potential revenue that could come in. It's just booked differently and therefore, doesn't show up on our approp."

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate those answers and my concern is this is not something that's done abstractly. When we make mistakes or when the Governor makes mistakes, there are real life consequences to real life people. You look at the lottery and if they're right with the amount that they're off and could've cost our state \$190 million, that's much more than the decrease that we've looked at in many of our other areas of our budget. And you look at the problems where DCEO has been unfettered in their ability to give out money without any metrics and costing the state 161 million two years ago. We have no idea what it had... what it was last year or what they're planning on this year. I think that is a major problem in our budget on how we... you can't really budget when you don't know how much money you're going to have, so we're guessing. So, I appreciate your efforts, again, but I think that we have to hold those people who are making some of those larger decisions accountable because then they roll downhill

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

and people who are in the Appropriation Committees who are working so hard are often hamstrung on what we can do. So, I'm disappointed in some of the decisions the Governor's made that's made us where we are today where we could be in a much better shape, but instead we're literally taking medicine away from people who need it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I yield my time to Leader Cross."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for any confusion. I Cross: want to hit on a couple of notes, nothing directed at you, Sponsor of the Bill or Representative Crespo, but I think you're going to notice here over the next day or two a concern on our side of the aisle on supporting these budgets or this overall budget. And I think when you look at the totality of the budget and the situation and where we've been and where we are it makes a lot of sense on why we are not supporting the budget. I want to remind everybody in this building and that's listening and in this chamber, that when we have worked together with a common goal of getting things done, this chamber has been fairly successful in recent history. We tackled the unemployment tax situation. We passed, under the direction and leadership of Patti Bellock, significant Medicaid reform. We passed, just recently with the leadership of Darlene Senger and Elaine Nekritz, pension reform. We worked together to pay old bills in last year's blueprint and we passed an education reform Bill a number of years ago. All... all that, you would argue, would put us in a better place

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

as a state. But when it comes to spending and when you are left to your own devices and seemingly have an interest..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cross. Let me see if I can get it a little more peaceful for you."

Cross: "No, that's all right. I'm going to clear the record."

Speaker Lang: "Let's pay some attention to the Minority Leader.

Please proceed, Sir."

"Well, thank you very, very much. When it comes to Cross: spending, Mr. Speaker, the willingness to work with us goes by the wayside and that is unfortunate because at the end of the day when this budget is tallied up and put together and when we have an ability to examine it in one piece you will see spending increase by almost \$2 billion. That is a \$2 billion increase from the 2013 budget. And what is equally troubling is that by all accounts from the people that should know we will have, specifically Judy Baar Topinka, almost seven and a half billion dollars in unpaid bills when the end of 213... the 2013 budget year ends. We had seven and a half billion, if not more, bills at the end of last year's budget and we will be in roughly the same position as we were last year when we get through with your budget. Clearly, we're not going in the direction that we need to go, if we are going to either get our bills paid... if we intend to get our bills paid and if we intend to do away with the tax increase. Now, nobody on this side of the aisle has shied away from the things that we need to do. We have told you those ... told you those things in all the working group meetings. We sent a letter to the Speaker on February 21 along with the President of the Senate and the Governor and said, there's some areas here in 2013

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

that have to be addressed. We did a Smart Act Bill dealing with Medicaid reform. It contemplated a billion six in Medicaid savings. To date, we're probably short about half a billion dollars. We brought that up repeatedly, we sent a letter, we've talked about it on the floor and to date, nothing has happened. We talked about pension reform several years ago. We talked about it a year ago. We've talked about it today. Now, this House did some action on pension reform, but do we have a Bill on the Governor's desk? No. Will we have a Bill on the Governor's desk? That's anybody's guess. But until we do pension reform and fully implement the Medicaid reform, we will continue to be in this vicious circle of trying to go somewhere with an inability to go anywhere because of our inability to get a grasp on pensions, on Medicaid and the insatiable appetite of spending money we don't have. It happens time and time again. So, Mr. Speaker, I found it interesting that last week we were disinvited to the working group meetings and it occurs to me that we were disinvited because your side of the aisle refuses to put a lid on spending, refuses to push the Governor on the implementation of the Smart Act, refuses to push the Senate President to call the real reform... the real pension reform Bill, refuses to hold the line on spending. So, yes, we want to work with you. We're willing to work with you. We've demonstrated an ability to work with you, a willingness to work with you, but we are not going to sit here and support Bills on the budget side, the budget implementation Bills that increase spending by almost \$2 billion. When you have seven and a half billion dollars in unpaid bills to increase

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

spending by \$2 billion is unacceptable, so for those reasons and I'm sure you'll hear many others, Mr. Speaker, we will be, on this Bill and I suspect on the others, voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo yields."

Durkin: "Representative, I want to follow up on a ques... line of questioning that Representative Franks had to you regarding the lottery and this appropriation for some type of defensive lawsuit. Why isn't the Attorney General of Illinois representing the state agency when this lawsuit comes about, if it does, 'cause that's what their job is? Thank you."

Crespo: "You know, Representative, that's a very good question.

That never came up at our committee meeting."

Durkin: "Who made the request for the 1.4?"

Crespo: "That came from the lottery."

Durkin: "Does the lottery understand that they're a state agency and they're represented by the Attorney General?"

Crespo: "I would imagine they did and what reasons they've had for not doing it, I can't answer that."

Durkin: "That's what they're there for. They're salaried employees. They don't bill by the hour. They should be representing the lottery. That's a mistake that should not be in this budget. But to the appropriation and I'm going to follow up on Leader Cross. Everyone... I've looked through the previous year and this year's requests. It doesn't seem to make any sense at all. Every one of these requests should be flat or there should be a lesser amount appropriated. This is

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

about spending, folks. And we're just not getting the job done. I would request a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, you had yielded your time, but we'll allow you to speak, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, there's an upward mobility program for state workers if they want to go to college to move up.

Is that contemplated in the budget?"

Crespo: "That was not appropriated in this budget."

Reboletti: "Is it part of the contract?"

Crespo: "It is part of the contract, correct."

Reboletti: "So, how would the... an employee take advantage of that, if there's no money for it?"

Crespo: "I'm sorry. What was that?"

Reboletti: "How would an employee take advantage of it, if there's no money for it?"

Crespo: "Well, as I stated in my opening remarks, Representative, anything that had... anything related to the AFSCME contract whether salaries which was like \$7 million, upward mobility, \$5 million, we took out of our appropriations and that's a pressure that the agencies are going to have. What we've heard from the Governor's Office is that they intend to meet that commitment with AFSCME. How they do it, I don't know. I know we gave some agencies, we lump summed some of their operations to give them flexibility to move money around to help them meet that contract, if they choose to do that."

Reboletti: "For last year's budget, what was your portion from your committee? What was the final number that was spent

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

compared to what the appropriation would be this year? So, if we were to stay flat from last year, is there an increase or decrease?"

Crespo: "Give me one second. So, last year for fiscal year '14... So, let me say this over. Fiscal year '13, our appropriation was \$1,158,000,000 and some change, for fiscal year '13. For fiscal year '14, which I think goes to your question, we appropriated 1,178,030,000."

Reboletti: "So, there's a..."

Crespo: "It's an increase. I know where you're going with this and again, it's a by-product of our meeting with the Senate, as the chairman of the Revenue Committee had mentioned earlier. There was additional moneys out there that came to the committees. We... just for the record, our committee was ... we were entitled, not entitled, we were told we had \$40 million more that we can spend and we did not spend it all. \$15 million of that to public safety and We sent elementary/secondary education. We just figured since that money was there the committee felt that there's some pressure points, some agencies, as I mentioned before, were... had been grossly underfunded historically. We felt we can give them a break this year. Job training was a big one as well including one of the biggest pressures from the Supreme Court was probations. In the past, they've been funded at around \$47 million. They came in requesting \$110 million this year. We were able to up that a little bit, up to probably about 63, 64 million dollars."

Reboletti: "And looking forward and I know, obviously, we're looking at our May 31 deadline, have you begun to take a look

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

at what next year will look like at this time considering that the income tax will be... beginning to be... the temporary income tax will begin to expire or to drop in levels, so are you looking forward towards dealing with that issue 'cause it will be quite a lot less revenue we'll be having to address our fiscal needs?"

Crespo: "I think the biggest question, Representative, is whether that income tax increase is extended or not. I think that's going to drive it. I, just for the record, I voted against it last time and I'll be voting to not extend it. Whether it happens or not is going to drive what happens next year. You know, this is all, you know, dealing with hypotheticals right now. I don't know."

Reboletti: "And I appreciate that, and to the Bill. I think that you'll see a resounding theme around here that, not with respect to this Sponsor, but overall the entire process. When you disconnect over 40 percent of the people of the state through their representation, I'm not exactly sure how we move the state forward to some type of economic security. So, at the end of the day, we've been removed from the process yet again and then people wonder why we see partisan rancor, which I heard a former Governor talk about, it's unfortunate. That when we have very capable individuals on our side of the aisle with great expertise in budgeting and we have this thing called budgeting for outcomes and I'm not sure exactly what the outcome looks like because if we still have seven and a half billion dollars in unpaid debt, we haven't moved the ball forward at all from last year. So, when you cut us out, then the things you haven't cut out from this process is the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

people in our districts that are paying income tax and sales tax and fees. So, they may be cut out of the discussion, but they are not cut out of paying the state's bills. I'm sure we'll be out of here on May 31 at least with respect to the budget, but I have no doubt that we are at an economic Armageddon when it comes to next year and looking at dealing with our state's future. Is there an income tax? Will there be sales tax increases? If we can't sustain our economic issues right now, the future does not look at all bright. So, it's hard to vote for a piece of legislation that's been posted to Rules and reviewing within less than 24 hours. Isn't that amazing? I had to learn about... this was actually very interesting. I learned that the Senate Democrats and the House Democrats struck a deal on the budget, not from our Members that usually participate, I learned it on public radio. Isn't that a travesty when we deal with this budgetary process?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentleman proposing this Bill said it's a hypothetical whether we extend the tax increase for FY15 and '16. I will contend that it is not. If you vote for this Bill today,1 you should be prepared to vote to extend the tax increase. It's as simple as that. We have given you an outline at the beginning of the year how we should enact the smart reforms and save \$350 million, how we should make our savings in the group health care for \$300 million, how we should hold the line on spending. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you worked with us, we could have put together a credible budget, but now because you have pushed us aside you're going to increase

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

spending by \$2 billion. And when you increase spending by \$2 billion ask yourself the question, if I vote for this am I prepared to extend the tax increase? 'Cause you have no ability to try and get under the \$1.7 billion cliff that is coming next budget. That's the task before you. So, ask yourself your question as you vote for these budgets 'cause that's what coming next."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo to close."

"Thank you, Speaker. I did not say whether we vote for ... to extend the income is hypothetical. Hypothetical was what happens in the future. I don't know. Speaker, if I can have everyone's attention for just one second. Let me explain to you what the budget process is like in the General Assembly. We met probably like close to two months ago with the Republican side, and we were discussing what we call above the line items. These are the mandated expenditures. Things that we're obligated to pay which includes group insurance, debt service, transfers out, Medicaid and old bills. And we're trying to reach some kind of agreement because, keep in mind, folks and the press, any decisions we make above the line is going to have an impact on how much we have for the Appropriation Committees. That is the trigger. That is the key. And we added it all up with the Republicans. We moved some figures around, and approximately six to eight weeks ago we asked the Republicans, here's a proposal. Tell us, what do you think? Give us something, a counter proposal, your best and final offer, something that at least we can have this dialogue. We waited one week, two weeks and here we are close to six or eight weeks later, we haven't heard anything. That's

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

just one group. Now, rank and file, in the 10 days we worked very well together. Let me make something very clear. In my committee I mentioned more than once from the get go, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to work on this Appropriation Commit... this appropriation, however, it's contingent on what we hear from the Republicans on above the line. That's going to really dictate how much money we're going to have to spend. We waited, we waited. This week we came to the conclusion we haven't heard anything from their Leadership as to what they're offering or what they want to do. The clock is ticking. Part of the process is we need to reconcile our budget in the House with the Senate. We can't wait any longer. We sat down with the Senate and we had to reach some kind of reconciliation on this. They came up with additional funds that we had figured, okay, that makes sense and we're working with the Senate. So, for anyone to say that we cut you off, please keep in mind how the process works. Eight weeks later we still haven't heard from the Senate... from the House Republicans on what they want to do about the line. What are we supposed to do, wait? Today is what, May 28? We need to come up with something May 31. We waited patiently, Ladies and Gentlemen. So, for them to say we cut them off is not an accurate statement. We waited, we waited, we waited and the decisions that really mattered, the ones that were going to dictate how much money we have to spend, we never heard from them, but now it's our fault. We did not cut you off. We're still waiting for an answer. We're running out of time. We met with the Senate which is part of the process and this is

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

where we are today. And with that, I'd please ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Harris. Please take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sacia is recognized."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, personal privilege, please."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the previous speaker in his closing gave you a load of crap, a load of crap. And here's why. I sit on one of those Appropriations Committees. We work day after day after day in a bipartisan manner, both sides of the aisle, doing the best we could to come to consensus. There was never an ill word spoken. The Republican Leader is Luis Arroyo. Am I telling the truth, Lou? We never had... I'm sorry, s... the Democrat Leader. Yeah, we should be so lucky. The point is, to attack us and say that we did not want to participate is plain and simple hooey. It didn't work that way, Sir. We were in the middle of the process, working very hard to come to consensus and all of a sudden we're told, oh, you don't come to the working group anymore. So, at least get all of your facts, Sir, before you make a statement like that. Maybe that's what happened in your committee. It did not, I repeat, it did not happen in ours."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Speaker Lang: "We're going to move on, Mr. Crespo, but you get to speak 'cause the Bill... next Bill is yours. House Bill 206, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 206, a Bill making appropriations.

  This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor

  Amendments 1, 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration.

  Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Crespo."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Crespo on Amendment 1. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."
- Crespo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to move to adopt Amendment #3 to House Bill 206."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo moves to withdraw Amendment #1. Do you have any further Motions?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."

Crespo: "Correct."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, any further Motions?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Crespo and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. The House Floor Amendment 3, what it does, is basically contains the fiscal year '13 supplemental and the fiscal year '14 above the line appropriations. Amendment #3 also adds some technical changes for the debt service. We had to make some adjustments there. The court of claims award that was left out for \$335 thousand was included.

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

And we also had a supplemental for the Department of Corrections, 1 million of other state funds for their food contract. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 206. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill 206 for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 206, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. So, as I mentioned earlier, House Bill 206 contains the fiscal year '13 supplemental and '14... fiscal year '14 above the line appropriations. Some of the items included there were \$350 million for group insurance, \$500 million for human service related liabilities such as CCP for fiscal year '13 as well as the developmental... the DD provider. So, by funding them at this level, we pretty much take care of everything that's owed to them for fiscal year '13. It also funds the Health Care Provider Relief Fund as well as the Department of Corrections \$42 million. Let me be very clear, the Department of Corrections' \$42 million to meet payroll for fiscal year '13. This is not a pay raise. This is just to meet their payroll liabilities for the year... for fiscal year '13. It has \$5 million for the court of claim and above the line for fiscal year '14 and fully appropriates for all pensions, has certified and also appropriates for all

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

state group health insurance, debt service and appropriation for old bills at a rate of \$650 million. With the matching Medicaid funds, we expect to contribute \$1.25 billion towards old bills. Happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Mr. Crespo, I'm reading the analysis on this supplemental appropriation and I had a couple of questions concerning the appropriations for the above the line. It appears as though the old bills instead of being paid at 1,300,000,000 is now reduced to 1,252,000,000. Is that correct?"

Crespo: "The... in comparing apples to apples, Representative, last year we contributed \$800 million towards old bills. With the matching funds that we got from Medicaid, since we paid some of the old Medicaid bills, it brought up the amount that you just quoted. This year we're projecting, number one, instead of \$800 million we're going to pay \$650 million towards old bills and we expect to get some Medicaid matched on that, so we anticipate contributing \$1.25 billion towards old bills."

Franks: "The Comptroller indicated that she thought by July that our owed bills would be in excess of seven and a half billion dollars, again. I know that we had an April surprise where we had more moneys coming in, but that was really more of a timing mechanism than actual additional funds."

Crespo: "Right. And let's just be very clear on something. When you look at old bills there's two things you need to keep in mind. It's the amount that is owed as well as the age of those liabilities. With the money coming in with the April surprise,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

I think most of those unpaid bills are sitting in the 30- and 60-day bucket. It's not as severe as it was. Granted, it was an April surprise. It helped us right now with the aging of some of these items, so we expect that to grow, to what extent, I don't know. But in terms of the old bills, I think most of those are sitting in those 30- and 60-day buckets right now."

Franks: "My concern though, even if they're sitting in a 30- or 60-day bucket, for those that are nongovernmental, we have the obligation to be paying interest on those late bills. Have we calculated what the additional costs will be by not... by cutting off some of this money to pay the old bills, how much more are we going have to pay in interest now because we're not paying the old bills as quickly as we could?"

Crespo: "I don't have that number. I agree with you. There's some additional expenditures and the interest. I know the trigger comes in 30 or... I forget when the trigger starts, but... you know, but we don't have that number."

Franks: "That concerns me greatly because when we underpay those old bills we're going to be paying more later. The next issue I had was on debt service and I see that that line item has been decreased above the line. Can you tell us why?"

Crespo: "One second. So, yeah. So, we got these numbers from the Treasurer's Office and those are the most recent numbers that he gave us, Representative."

Franks: "Okay. So, it's not a.m. it's not a deliberate under..."

Crespo: "No."

Franks: "...underpayment of the other ones."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Crespo: "It's just whatever we get and we put there; we have to meet that obligation."
- Franks: "And the... one other question I had and I'm looking here and I think it deals with the county clerks. And I'm looking for theirs and there was something dealing with stipends to the county clerks or something?"
- Crespo: "Right. I believe I said actually we do cover those stipends. In this particular case, Representative, what we did in our committee, those were paid out of other state funds and not GRF. There's a Bill that's being moved around right now by one of our Leaders to have PPRT pay for those, so it seems like that's going to pass and to me, this side, well, if that's the case, we might as well jump the gun now and use PPRT for that."
- Franks: "But is that legal? I thought we had... we passed a law that says that we can't have a budget on anticipated revenues, it's only what we have. And right now, that Bill has not passed that would move the..."
- Crespo: "That Bill has nothing to do with fiscal year '14. What I said was it seems like it will happen. As a matter of policy we figured, well, if this... something's going to happen in the future, we might as well jump the gun. That money is served, right now, under PPRT. This is real money sitting there and it's a matter of public policy. I think it's going to happen, so we figured we'd jump the gun and do it now."
- Franks: "Well, the public policy, I think, if we... 'cause the stipends were created by statute, were created by us. If we don't wish to pay them, then we should get rid of those stipends, but to keep them and then say someone else should

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

pay them, I don't think is proper public policy. So, I think it may be better if we just get rid of all those stipends and I think that would probably be the better move. But I... again, I appreciate your efforts and I know it's not easy and there's some real problems, obviously, not of your making. I appreciate what you've done, but Mr. Cross had talked about some of the issues we have and I am concerned that we are overspending and with these unpaid bills still out there, I think that ought to be our primary obligation to pay our bills because we do have a Constitution that requires us to have a balanced budget. I mean, it certainly also requires us to pay our pensions which we haven't done and it also requires us to have the state as its... the primary obligor of our education. Nonetheless, I think we need to take this very seriously and pay our bills and I'm very concerned about additional spending and what it can do to the economic climate here in the state."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Greg Harris."

Harris, G.: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in strong support of this legislation because it supports two of the main goals that this House has supported for many years. We are paying down hundreds of millions of dollars of old bills with this supplemental and we are attracting hundreds of millions of dollars of federal Medicaid match into the system that can be used to benefit programs in the State of Illinois. DD area, particular, in the in old bills developmentally disabled people 90 million is for DD. That will allow us to spend \$180 million and capture \$90 million in federal match and 40 million more on Medicaid that will allow us to spend another 90 million. Ladies and Gentlemen,

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

this is good public policy. It supports the policy of the House of fiscal restraint, cutting interest payments that we owe and attracting federal match to pay down old bills. I strongly support this legislation."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Crespo to close."

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

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 206 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunkin. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', House Bill 206, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 213, Representative Harris. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 213, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Floor Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Greg Harris."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris, is it correct that you'd like to withdraw Amendment #1?"

Harris, G.: "Yeah. I would like to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw House Amendment #1.

Any further Motions?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Greg Harris and has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the appropriation for the Human Services Appropriation Committee. That is the Departments of Aging, Public Health, Human Services, Veterans' Affairs, DCFS and others. This Bill we worked within our working group and with the Senate and we believe it matches many of the objectives of the House. We have repaid old bills. We have repaid, through a previous supplemental, \$173 million of senior citizen services in the Department of Aging. The Bill that was just passed allows us to pay down other past due bills. These are not new bills. These are bills which have been incurred by providers of services to our senior citizens, to agencies serving folks with developmental disabilities and mental health. We, with this budget, are eliminating the practice that has been in some of our agencies before of underfunding and having to come back for supplementals. We are also eliminating the practice of managing with payment cycle. We are calling upon our large departments to lump sum all their operations and head counts and reduce their operating expenses by two and a half percent and decreasing operations like grant lines by about one percent. There are some that are being held harmless which in the opinion of our committee protects services for working families, prevention, community services for our most frail and vulnerable. Also, we are anticipating expenses related to transition to the insurance exchange and the implementation of the Medicaid reforms that were passed yesterday. I'd like to just highlight some highlights indifferent of the departments. In the Department of Aging, we fully fund the adult protective services to protect adults

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

and people with disabilities. We maintain funding at a level funding for Meals on Wheels for senior citizens. In the Department of Children and Family Services, we eliminating millions of dollars in vacancies while protecting services for children and services for families. We are making lump-sum cuts to personnel in the Department of Health Care and Family Services in their GRF lines. In the Department of Human Services, we are lump summing their operations and we are asking them to reduce all of their operations by two and a half percent; however, we are maintaining core services to are critical communities which we feel neighborhood's needs. We are maintaining level funding for community mental health services, for substance abuse services, for homeless prevention services and we providing a modest increase to services for homeless youth. We are maintaining child care services and services for immigrant populations. We are increasing funding for rape victims to mitigate the effects of cuts from Federal Government due to the sequestration. As I said before, we're eliminating the practice of cycling bills in DD and substance abuse to move costs from one year to another. We're holding harmless the autism program. We are restoring cuts that were in the Governor's budget to supportive housing. We are maintaining the funds for indigent burial and we're giving a modest increase to community youth programming such as Teen REACH. In the Department of Public Health, the committee decided that we cannot simply assume an immediate and smooth transition on January 1 from GRF-based funding to the new insurance exchange and Medicaid programs for people with AIDS

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

and breast and cervical cancer. So, in this budget we are increasing the request from the Governor to ease transition and be sure that no one who is receiving services and treatment for AIDS or breast and cervical cancer are left behind. We are asking the department to reduce operations. We are providing for the administration of the medical marijuana program which both chambers have passed. We have restored a pilot program for prostate cancer and we have implemented a small program which was mentioned on the floor by a Member opposite to encourage testing, screening and treatment for those with hepatitis B and C. In the Department of Veterans' Affairs, we have managed cuts to that department by using certain funds and other state funds to be sure that we have enough money in the budget to fully staff up our RN funding to meet the new requirements of the nurse staffing ratio. However, I wish to point out to all Members that with all of these changes, our GRF appropriation is \$46,739,400 less than in FY13 and our GRF appropriation is about \$583 million less than the Governor's introduced budget. I would appreciate your support and I would be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we're going to debate this Bill on Third and we're just going to move it from Second right now to Third Reading. So, the Gentleman moves to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 213. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read House Bill

213 for a third time."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 213, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, G.: "I won't say it again, but I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you. And I just wanted to say that I thought that our Human Service Approp Committee worked well together this year as we did last year, in a bipartisan fashion and I wish we would have been able to continue those talks because we were working at a lot of... talking about cuts, but also preserving programs that we thought were essential to all the agencies in human services. So, I just had a few questions that I wanted to ask you. Have you seen the new revenue projection?"

Harris, G.: "We have seen revenue projections that came out of the Executive Committee yesterday. We know that they're... in addition to the money that we received in April, we are also anticipating additional revenue from the Corporate Refund Fund."

Bellock: "Is that what COGFA had reported on yesterday?"

Harris, G.: "I believe so, yes."

Bellock: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "I was not present in that meeting, but that's my understanding."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Bellock: "Right. I guess my question on that... it was actually later down on my list on, I don't know why that when we talked about paying down old bills, which was a major topic of conversation, why we wouldn't include, as Representative Harris had said earlier, that \$300 million 'cause it really came in in 2013, why we wouldn't include that towards paying down bills especially in human service that could be matched federally and then bring in a lot more money to pay down other bills?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe that that number was contemplated in the supplemental which was passed just previous to this and the bills which we're referring to in CCP, DD and mental health were included in that supplemental."
- Bellock: "Oh, no, that was my next question, but I meant the 300 million in savings from the income tax fund that COGFA had brought to the Revenue Committee. My suggestion is why wouldn't we use that 300 million that was extra rather than putting it into next year in a revenue projection, why wouldn't we pay down more Medicaid bills in 2013?"
- Harris, G.: "Again, I was not present in the Executive Committee yesterday, but I believe that those adjustments to the refund fund and I would ask what the other Representative with my name and other Members to correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that those revenue estimates were included in the FY13 projection."
- Bellock: "Okay. Since you brought up the supplemental, because that was a major topic of conversation throughout our talks as to what we were going to cover in the supplemental because we had voted through the first supplemental for CCP, so can

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

you just go back over because I know it came up before, but it was a little noisy..."

Harris, G.: "Sure."

Bellock: "...as far as our agency, what was covered in the supplemental?"

Harris, G.: "Yes, Representative, I'd be very happy to..."

Bellock: "Thank you."

Harris, G.: "...and as you remember the supplemental we did a couple weeks ago was 140... 173 million for FY12 Department of Aging bills related to services that had already been rendered to senior citizens. So, what we had in this Bill, if my numbers are correct, I hope they will add up, is 411 for CCP and substance abuse and there was also a transition of 145 in DD to the health care provider relief fund to generate additional match which was... which were commensurate with the discussions we had together and I appreciate your thoughtfulness on those."

Bellock: "Okay. Was that... so it wasn't 220 for the DD? It was... I thought we had discussed 220 million for DD."

Harris, G.: "Two-twenty for FY13."

Bellock: "So, total in the supplemental? What was the total in the supplemental for DD?"

Harris, G.: "So, thank you by my able assistant, Ms. Olds. It's only 220 new and 15 million that was the transition from Jacksonville."

Bellock: "Okay, thanks. And then I'm sorry to ask so many questions, but we didn't have as much time today, so we've been looking through the budget now and trying to ask a few

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- more questions. So, were the AFSCME raises, were they in the supplemental?"
- Harris, G.: "For the year going forward, we gave the departments lump sums. We reduced vacancies in some departments and we're asking them to manage within those lump sums. Now, you will remember we had these discussions..."
- Bellock: "Right."
- Harris, G.: "...in our working group that it was the intent of the administration to give those raises pursuant to the contract for FY14."
- Bellock: "Right. I just wasn't clear. I asked that question again this morning. So, do you have an idea of what the total cost in DHS... I mean, in the Human Service budget of the AFSCME raises from the 2013 settlement and moving forward in 2014?"
- Harris, G.: "I can get that breakdown for you by department. I don't happen to just have it with me on the floor."
- Bellock: "Okay. Thank you because that's a major part of the budget and that brings up what we talked about yesterday briefly, but in the Medicaid expansion, we briefly touched on that in the working group. I'm not sure what the director said as to the 600 new hirees and I think they mentioned that the average... we were trying to figure out how much that was going to cost in the budget. I was looking for it and I think I saw 60 million. In the committee hearing, they said the average state employee was now around 75 thousand, but with benefits it was closer to 100 thousand. Was that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "Well, there are... for different divisions in DHS, I remember that they gave us a sheet and you know, we can go over that later, the different divisions based on the job

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- requirements for each. Some require Masters levels and advanced work had higher rates of pay and then the family resource centers, which are the jobs that would do the intake and redetermination, I believe those were around 51 thousand, if my memory serves me on average salary."
- Bellock: "Okay. And others were 75 thousand? So, I guess we were trying to figure out, did you come away with the same idea that... that those 800 jobs were for the Medicaid expansion or just to bring better numbers down in the local offices?"
- Harris, G.: "They were to do processing of redeterminations and those would include Medicaid determinations, SNAP and TANF."
- Bellock: "Okay. So, do you think there's any money in this budget at all for the actual expansion? I mean, to cover what we're moving forward with?"
- Harris, G.: "Well, there are some savings associated with the expansion and then in the Department of Public Health, if you recall, there was a contemplation of transitioning certain persons with Medicaid and certain women who might be eligible for IVCCP services to the new programs beginning January 1 of 2014, but the… we made some modifications to our GRF to be sure that that transition was smooth."

Bellock: "Okay."

- Harris, G.: "That's in the Department of Public Health."
- Bellock: "Right. In the end, we added back up, didn't we, from what the cuts were in the Governor's budget in those two categories?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Bellock: "Okay. I just wanted to ask one other thing that we were looking at in the budget as we were trying to go it through

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- as fast as we could. There was something about the Department of Public Health paying \$50 thousand for media and film production and outreach. Do you know what that was covering?"
- Harris, G.: "That was related to the adoption birth certificates.

  It was a video that I think that was in regard to... the previous chairman of this committee's adoption initiative."
- Bellock: "Okay. Thank you. So, moving on to... what do you... you know, when... when we went over this, this morning just to get the bottom line, I know it's confusing. I'm trying to find what the bottom line was of the difference, not the Governor's budget, but what was spent in this total agency last year and what was... what the projection is for '14? When we ran the numbers, and it may be the difference of the Medicaid not being included or the supplemental, I'm not sure, but what we came up with was closer to a billion... a \$900 million increase. And I don't know how that can be offset unless it's that the supplemental was taken out of that because our numbers..."
- Harris, G.: "I believe that that, you know, that the supplemental might account for some of that. What we're showing here for all funds in FY13 was about 9,087,000,000. So, if... in all funds including federal which would mean the enhanced match..."

Bellock: "Right."

Harris, G.: "...we're getting about 456 million increase. But in GRF, we are showing a \$46,739,000 decrease in GRF between '13 and '14."

Bellock: "Okay. Then that's..."

Harris, G.: "And maybe our staffs can help reconcile these numbers because..."

Bellock: "We're going to have to go over that."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Harris, G.: "...they are large."
- Bellock: "Right. Because ours are much different than that."
- Harris, G.: "And I... and Representative, may I just mention something that you and I had talked about earlier that had come up and I just want to bring this to the Body's attention, 'cause there's the concern raised that, as we mentioned this morning, the reason we had to do the Floor Amendment, one of the main reasons, this Amendment #2 was due to an error in the local health planning grants for our local county health departments to do..."

Bellock: "Right."

- Harris, G.: "...surveillance of different diseases and food borne illnesses. So that has been corrected and that number raised up."
- Bellock: "And well, yeah and that's really important to our local health departments. And what was that total?"
- Harris, G.: "That is an increase of \$800 thousand in GRF."
- Bellock: "Okay. Was it 17,098,500? Is that correct?"
- Harris, G.: "That's the total. But the increase that was in the Amendment to correct the drafting error was 800 thousand in GRF."
- Bellock: "Okay. Under HFS, does the Medicaid budget include the Smart Act changes with last year's savings estimates? We've gone over this and over this, but..."
- Harris, G.: "Yes."
- Bellock: "Yes, it does. And what were those savings that you included?"
- Harris, G.: "I believe the list... the chart you have here is..."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Bellock: "We were worried that there was close to 500 million in savings that we hadn't realized. I don't know if that's included or not?"

Harris, G.: "In?"

Bellock: "In the Medicaid, from the Smart Act? Remember..."

Harris, G.: "The Medicaid line in total and you know, we can go through all those different, you know, several pages of lines, assumes a 2 percent growth which is a substantial reduction in growth."

Bellock: "Okay."

Harris, G.: "This is in liability."

Bellock: "I have the Medicaid was funded at 6.9 billion last year and this year it's funded 2 million more than in FY13. Is that correct? I'm sorry. It's at 6.985 now, which is a 3 million increase over FY13. That's what we have."

Harris, G.: "Yes, it's..."

Bellock: "From 6.7 last year."

Harris, G.: "It's about 288 million, yes."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you."

Harris, G.: "That's what our figures show."

Bellock: "So, I have one other question under HFS that's a little confusing that we had not seen before. And it says that this budget gives HFS a 6 percent transfer authority, which is almost unprecedented. The usual transfer authority is 2 percent for an agency and HFS usually gets 4 percent. So, in FY14 they'll be given a 6 percent transfer authority. So, they'll be able to transfer \$400 million between lines this year. Is that correct?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Harris, G.: "I... I'm sorry, I didn't hear the last part of your
   question, Representative?"
- Bellock: "Okay. HFS in this budget..."
- Harris, G.: "At 6 percent."
- Bellock: "...most agencies are only given a 2 percent transfer authority, HFS has usually had a 4 percent transfer authority. Now in this new budget, in FY14, they've been given to my knowledge, a 6 percent transfer authority?"
- Harris, G.: "To maximize the ability to do care coordination."
- Bellock: "Okay. So they can transfer over \$400 million between lines?"
- Harris, G.: "So, this would be... this would be part of the process of moving to coordinated care and those types of things."
- Bellock: "Okay. And I wish we had been able to have more discussion on that in the budget 'cause it's such an important issue. So, I guess my only question at the end was when reviewing the budgets that we looked at this morning, I think there's 10 agencies under the Human Service budget and we went through them quickly, but out of the 10 Representative Roth brought up that I think 8 of them saw increases. Do you concur with that?"
- Harris, G.: "Are you talking about from FY13 to FY14?"
- Bellock: "Right."
- Harris, G.: "I didn't count, but I can. I know what the total is
   which is the decrease."
- Bellock: "Yeah. I'm not sure, well... to the Bill. Again... Oh."
- Harris, G.: "Yeah, 'cause I'm looking at a couple here like the Council on Developmental Disabilities was zero, Deaf and Hard of Hearing was cut 500, Guardianship and Advocacy we gave an

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

increase to. I mean, yeah... so, I... I'd... you could probably go through and there were modest increases in some but overall a \$28 million decrease."

Bellock: "Mmm mmm. Okay. Thank you. So, I know we were working towards at least a 1 percent cut, in the end I'm not... I mean, we were looking towards \$770 million, the working group to... to reduce. I'm not sure in the end what the actual savings were. As I said, I'm going to have to confer with you on that because our numbers don't jive. We see that there was an expenditure of close to \$900 million more. And what your numbers have is a savings of 45."

Harris, G.: "I think that when we reconcile the effects of the various federal funds maximizations that we can get pretty close to that, Representative."

Bellock: "Thank you. Well, to the Bill. I appreciated working with Representative Harris. Our group did a good job, we went over and over. In the end, when a lot of numbers were coming together, that's when a lot of our talks stopped. So in this case, we still do not know what the new revenue budget number is. We're concerned about spending more than what we really took in, in revenue this year. Our own number was 35.081, I'm not sure what that increase is going to be in the revenue spending. So, at this time, I would have to say we would be a 'no' on this particular budget at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cavaletto: "Thank you. I wondered if Murray Center was funded in a DHS 2014 budget."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

- Harris, G.: "Yes, Representative. We have funded Murray Center at a level number. As you know, there is a court case pending on Murray Center, which is extended at least until the 30th of this month. So, we have made provision to be sure that funding is available whichever way the judge eventually decides on this. It's a temporary restraining order and as you know, the judge who's the regular judge on this case was out of town. So, a TRO was granted until the 30th. I'm assuming that there might be further discussion in front of the regular judge. We want to be sure that there's enough money there to sustain the Murray Center and that should then the court order us to continue with the transfers that those moneys would follow those persons into the community."
- Cavaletto: "So, could you give me that amount, please?"
- Harris, G.: "We have... Well, I'll get you the exact sum for you.

  It's within a lump sum; I'll get you the exact number for Murray."
- Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you. And... and one other thing, as far as the \$800 million in old bills that we had, I know in the committee that I sit on we... we advocated to pay all the hundred... \$800 million in old bills and I think now that we've reverted back to 700... or \$650 million in old bills. But we stated we wanted to do that. And..."
- Harris, G.: "And we're paying down more old bills in this budget, Representative, then we contemplated we were going to be able to. And we're obtaining federal match which was one of the goals and objectives. I think this House has always agreed we ought to do to maximize the revenue and also reduce those things on which we might have a prompt payment interest."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Cavaletto: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand... I stand in strong support of... of this Bill. I want to thank the chairman of the committee for really putting together an excellent, excellent budget. And I really want to thank everybody on the committee for the hard work that they did, both the Republicans and the Democrats. This is a budget that is a prevention budget. This is a budget that really looks upstream. We've really tried to take care of the youth to make sure that they get the services they need. And we've also give... looked at protecting people from homelessness to prevent them becoming homeless and saving a lot of money rather than trying to deal with people once they are homeless. There's money in here for screening programs for breast cancer, cervical cancer. This is really an excellent budget and I... I encourage an 'aye' vote from everyone. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris to close."

Harris, G.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you know... standing with me here are the people who really made this budget happen, our wonderful staff. I want to thank them as well as the Republican staff for the hard work that folks did and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 213 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no' and 0 voting
'present', House Bill 213, having received the Constitutional

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 215, Representative Arroyo. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 215, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Arroyo."

Speaker Turner: "Representative, you would like to withdraw Floor Amendment #1?"

Arroyo: "Yes. And adopt Amendment 2."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Motions?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Members of this Body for working with me on this tremendous Capital Bill or I mean, budget Bill. All the Members on the other side, I think that we had a good working group in our... in our work group and also thank the staff. I thanked everybody. I want to also thank the other Members of the Appropriation Committee that also helped us out to be able to get to the funding that they... that we needed. This Bill did a lot of things that a lot of the Members wanted. And that was bring some money to DJJ, Corrections, State Police, Redeploy. And also, we didn't cut any of the matching funds for federal... for federal matching grants. I ask for an 'aye' vote and I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 215. All in favor say 'aye'; all

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, will you please read House Bill 215 for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 215, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Like... like I said, it was good working with both sides of Public Safety. I think that it was very interesting working with everybody. I think we had a good work group and I also want to thank everybody on both sides of the aisle, especially the guys that... on my committee, it wasn't easy. We also took a break to work with the Senate on this Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, could you explain to the Body how the personnel... personal services lines changed in Department of Corrections this year from what we've done in the past?"

Arroyo: "I think that... we gave them a lump sum. They... operational lump sum."

Reis: "So, is that just the personal service line items and I'm guessing Social Security or is that all the line items? Did we lump sum all the line items to Department of Corrections?"

Arroyo: "All operational."

Reis: "All operations?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Reis: "So, I want everybody to listen to this because we all have at least workers probably that live in our districts. By lump summing... in the past, we've ... we'd give each one of these line items to each facility: personal service, Social Security, printing, transportation, all of it. We spelled it out for each facility. This year it is being lumped sum to the Governor. And he could go into any one of our districts and shift that money around and close that facility. And I know there's a lot of freshmen and sophomores even in this Body that don't remember the lump-sum budgets given to the Governor, but it was a disaster. And I... I quess I just question why we are doing that in this year's budget when it gives the Governor too much power to move those around, (indiscernible), shift staff, perhaps shift the makeup of a prison and even worse yet, close a prison. And I know that's not what our intentions are, but we're giving the Governor an awful lot of discretion by doing that. Representative, also, I'd like to go to transportation, if Sean will allow. In the past, the transportation budget has been fairly small because of the Road Fund makes up most of the transportation budget, but Pace, Paratransit, RTA, all of those subsidies have been coming out of the transportation budget and the Amtrak subsidy was broken out based on the Road Fund, 55 percent downstate, 45 percent District 1. Is that... we have your word that that's the same this year?"

Arroyo: "Could you repeat that again, Dave, I didn't hear that?"
Reis: "The Amtrak subsidy has always been broken out between upstate and downstate, 55 percent downstate, 45 percent District 1."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Arroyo: "Yes, it's still... it's still like that."

Reis: "It's still like that?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. Now the... the Pace and the Paratransit and the RTA, now that just comes out of District 1, right?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Reis: "Well, we need to make sure that... check with Sean to make sure that that's the case."

Arroyo: "Do you have a question, Dave?"

Reis: "We want to make sure that the CTA... or the Pace, Paratransit, RTA, that subsidy payment comes out of District 1 and not out of the rest of the road state..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reis: "...or the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. It's been mentioned more than once on the floor today about budgeting for outcome. Can you give the Body some... a report on what's happened with the money that's been given to the Latino Family Commission over the last year?"

Arroyo: "I believe some of your Members asked us for a report and I believe I gave the report to, I believe, Representative Osmond. I don't know if she shared it with you? So, she has the report."

Reis: "I mean, just off the top of your head something that's good that happened from that 750 thousand?"

Arroyo: "Well, they... they deal with all the state agencies that have Latino issue... Latino family issues for the State of Illinois. Some of your Members have Latino members, Latino

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

families that they deal with. They deal with the Governor's Office and they deal with all the state agencies."

Reis: "So, from a budgeting from a... for budgeting for outcome standpoint, you think that's a good money spent?"

Arroyo: "I think that's very good money spent, Dave."

Reis: "Okay. We got this handy list and I noticed you prefaced your comments today about thanking everybody about working on the Capital Bill. I don't know if everybody in the Body has got to see this, but can you explain the rest of the... the Bill that you've got here on the Capital projects? How many of these are new and how many of them are reappropriated?"

Arroyo: "Those are all reappropriated. No new money."

Reis: "So, all of these were spelled out in the Capital Bill from '09 or '10?"

Arroyo: "There are some new identified projects, but they come from a new revenue source."

Reis: "And what is that?"

Arroyo: "No... no bonding."

Reis: "Okay. What's the new revenue source?"

Arroyo: "Water Revolving Fund."

Reis: "I didn't... I didn't hear your answer, Representative?"

Arroyo: "Water Revolving Fund. And most of it comes from the feds."

Reis: "The feds? Okay. Of the five... of the \$500 million in projects on this spreadsheet, how much of the \$546 million is new projects that weren't in the Capital Bill from a few years back?"

Arroyo: "We haven't... we haven't broke that down yet, Dave. I would have to..."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Reis: "Well, you said you'd get me that and that was this morning, so."

Arroyo: "I don't remember that question this morning. We don't have that list."

Reis: "Okay. So, we... we get the budget last night; we get this spreadsheet this morning."

Arroyo: "You... you have..."

Reis: "I asked that question in committee this morning, you said you'd get me the answer. And here we are at 6:30 tonight, we still don't have the answer."

Arroyo: "We don't ... we don't work that fast, Dave."

Reis: "Oh, evidence to the contrary."

Arroyo: "You... you have a list, I don't have it. So, you're probably working faster than I am."

Reis: "So, how's come there are new projects in here and what...
what was the need for them rather than just working off of
the list from 4 years ago?"

Arroyo: "The new stuff came from request from the Governor. For his clean water initiative."

Reis: "You forget my occupation, Representative. I'm a... I'm a pork farmer, so. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Arroyo: "I'm sorry."

Reis: "...you know, there's... as I said in my comments about one of the other budgets, we can nitpick about a lot of things. I think the budget met a lot of our requirements, I don't agree with the lump sum budgets for the Department of Corrections. I, for darn sure, don't agree with some of the projects that have been added over the last couple years. And I, for darn sure, don't appreciate or agree with the incentives that were

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

added here with the... the Capital Bill to... to get various things done this week. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates that he will."

Osmond: "Representative, I asked this question this morning and I'll ask it again, is there any money in any of these Bills to pay for the FY12 and the FY13 ASFCME raises?"

Arroyo: "No."

Osmond: "So, we have a supplement to bring us up to current, but we're not taking into consideration of what our expenses are going to be for bringing those into the raise level, correct? So, we could be very well back here with another supplemental in about six months?"

Arroyo: "No, I don't ... I don't believe so."

Osmond: "You don't think so... Okay. Let's go back. This morning when we were talking about the State Police we... we said that the State Police had... you were gracious enough to admit that they had put in an extra \$5 million for the fact of concealed carry, and starting it up and... and getting it going. But I was told after our committee that the State Police would not have enough money to fund their new cadet program. And I thought that that was in the pro... in the budget?"

Arroyo: "We took that money from the cadet class and put it in the lump sum. They're also getting a lump sum."

Osmond: "So, in the lump sum you're saying that they can pull out the money necessary for the AFSCME raises and also for the... the cadet class and still have enough to survive?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Osmond: "On the..."

Arroyo: "They have... they have two cadet classes from a previous fund, from other state funds too."

Osmond: "Well, I believe there was a total of three that we were...

we were trying to promote, correct?"

Arroyo: "Right. Right."

Osmond: "And so, you're saying with..."

Arroyo: "All three are funded."

Osmond: "All three will be funded?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Osmond: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "Representative, I know you've worked hard on this. I was... I'm just having a chance to go through this and a couple of questions. Did any agency get cut by more than three percent?"

Arroyo: "No."

Franks: "But I saw that some got 3 percent and some got less, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Let me ask you this, what was the rationale behind engrossed numbers? Cutting the Appellate Defender while at the same time increasing the Appellate Prosecutor?"

Arroyo: "I think we both... we gave them both 400 thousand."

Franks: "But the difference was the Appellate..."

Arroyo: "We... we gave them a 3 percent cut, Jack and then that put 400 thousand back."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Franks: "But the difference..."

Arroyo: "That makes them okay... they're okay with that."

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

Arroyo: "I said that they're okay with that 400 thousand."

Franks: "But it seems as though the Appellate Defender has about a quarter of a million less than the year before, where the Appellate Prosecutor has an additional 85 thousand?"

Arroyo: "They only have 300 thousand less than last year."

Franks: "That's the Defender. But the Prosecutor, I think, ultimately got more money?"

Arroyo: "Just \$100 thousand more, Jack."

Franks: "Okay. So my point is, the rationale, I just think you, if you're cutting a Defender, you'd think you'd want to level the playing field and... instead of giving the Prosecutor more, and giving the defendant less, but that's, I'm not sure how we got there and that's what I was asking?"

Arroyo: "We made sure that they were both okay..."

Franks: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...for what they were asking with this amount."

Franks: "Now, I see and this is a minor one and maybe I'm being too nitpicky, but I see the East St. Louis Advisory Board is still being funded. For the life of me, I can't... I don't understand what they do? And why do we need them? Why do they get anything?"

Arroyo: "Jack, I believe that this is their last year. So, after this year they will no longer be funded."

Franks: "Okay. Well, that's... that's good to know. I... I'm just concerned because it seems like we're just throwing that money in a black hole. I hate to see them get anything 'cause I...

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

I've never seem them do anything. Now, let me... one of the previous speakers had asked about some of the Capital projects and we were not given a... a list, at least on the Democratic side rank and file and I've not seen a list. And how much more of this in this budget here are new Capital projects that were not simply reallocated?"

Arroyo: "We don't have that number right now in front of us, Jack."

Franks: "Do you have a... a ballpark estimate?"

Arroyo: "No."

Franks: "I just want to know how these decisions were made 'cause
I'm concerned when we have all these unpaid bills, if we would
make more sense to actually pay those bills instead of create
new projects."

Arroyo: "Frank, we've done this every year since 2009. I mean, any of the Members were allowed to come into these work groups and sit in and see what we were doing."

Franks: "Well, since 2009 our budget deficit has ballooned and maybe that's part of the problem. I mean, we're looking here. We've never had such problems paying our bills and maybe we ought to do something differently then, instead of just keep repeating the same mistakes of the past. I wish that, you know, we always complain here... and to the Bill. I appreciate the Sponsor's hard work. We always complain here about the budget process and how it's dumped on us at the last minute and then we pass a budgeting for outcomes Bill that's supposed to change it, but it really doesn't. And then, we have budgets that are dropped on us in the morning and then they're asking us to vote on it 10 hours later and we don't have the

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

information necessary and we can't get the answers we need. So, we're asked to make uniformed decisions on a broken promise and on a broken system that only gets worse. And I know there was a lot of work done in the Appropriations Committees, but I know we can do better than what we've been doing. And I'd encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, B.: "Hi, Mr. Chairman. I worked with you last term when I was on your committee, you do a fine public service."

Arroyo: "I miss you."

Mitchell, B.: "I bet you do. Have a question in terms... in the... you know, Illinois is hurting. This year's budget is about \$2 billion over last year's budget. We have higher unemployment in our great state and the nation. People are hurting, working people. What... how much is... are we funding in the IDOT budget of the state air fleet, the largest air fleet in the nation, state-owned?"

Arroyo: "Give... give me a minute."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you."

Arroyo: "That would be 265 thousand."

Mitchell, B.: "I think the… gosh, I hate to argue. Those aren't our numbers. Our numbers are a little higher than that."

Arroyo: "That's level funding. That's the numbers we have."

Mitchell, B.: "No, no. I believe it's about 6.9 million?"

Arroyo: "That's the aeronautic division."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Mitchell, B.: "That's correct. And that... that's what I'm talking about. How much does it cost the taxpayers to fund the air fleet?"

Arroyo: "I believe that's out of the Road Fund."

Mitchell, B.: "That's my next question. So, how much of that \$6.9 million that we... that takes to run the largest air fleet, state-owned air fleet in the nation, with nearly the highest unemployment... how much does that money come out of the Road Fund? How much of that \$6.9 million?"

Arroyo: "I'll get you that number."

Mitchell, B.: "Tonight? Before we vote?"

Arroyo: "Sure."

Mitchell, B.: "I'll wait."

Arroyo: "So... so, if we give you the... if we give you that number now, will you vote for it?"

Mitchell, B.: "I'm interested in it. The people..."

Arroyo: "Will you vote for it now if I..."

Mitchell, B.: "...the people in central Illinois..."

Arroyo: "...get you the number?"

Mitchell, B.: "...the people in Illinois certainly want us to know the amount before any of the 118 Members votes for it. I know you know that."

Arroyo: "Did you have a question?"

Mitchell, B.: "I... yeah. How much of that \$6.9 million comes out of the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "About 6.5"

Mitchell, B.: "So, the majority of this comes out of the Road Fund, that the Road Fund..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Mitchell, B.: "...most people think are to fix roads?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Mitchell, B.: "Okay. Thank you. And that's my point. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You're always a Gentleman and I appreciate it. The point... and to the Bill, is we're broke. We have high unemployment, hardworking families are barely making it. And yet, the Governor and all the Constitutional Officeholders get to fly around our great state in either a plane or a helicopter. By the way, one helicopter is grounded, it doesn't work or they don't fly it. It got stuck in the mud in Aurora, I think. Why are we doing this? We... we criticized the CEOs of the three automobile companies when they flew to Washington, D.C., asking for a bailout and they flew in their private jets. We criticized them and we should have. So, why does this great state allow its Chief Executive and Members of the General Assembly and all the hoity-toities to hop on a plane when we're insolvent? We're broke. We should vote 'no' on this budget. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Luis, it looks you're well-staffed tonight and I've got a few questions. So maybe we can run through these pretty quickly? And I want to talk about just the significant changes that I note in the budget this year. Let's... let's start with Capital... the Capital Development Board. Are you familiar with the increases that we made with respect to that agency?"

Arroyo: "Dwight, there's no GRF in Capital Development Board."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Kay: "Well, I understand that. But do you know how much is in there?"

Arroyo: "The operation part?"

Kay: "Yeah, I... I'm looking at just the... the changes from FY13 to FY14 and according to what I'm looking at here, we have a condition analysis for facilities that's pretty expensive. Can you tell me about that?"

Arroyo: "That's so we could be up-to-date electronically and we could monitor the prisons 'cause they're all back in paper..."

Kay: "So, that's computer..."

Arroyo: "...pushing."

Kay: "...that's computer systems, hardware, software, salaries?"

Arroyo: "Right. Right. Yes."

Kay: Okay. And then I see it looks like a million, almost 2 million that we're putting toward personnel services... personal services and fringe benefits. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "And what in... what kind of increase is that over the previous
year?"

Arroyo: "What was that, Dwight?"

Kay: "What kind of increase? What increases..."

Arroyo: "Two point eight million."

Kay: "...is that represented from '13 to '14?"

Arroyo: "Two... 2.8 million."

Kay: "No, what percent?"

Arroyo: "I'll have to get that to you in a few minutes, Dwight."

Kay: "I'll wait."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Arroyo: "We're hiring seven people, head count is seven.

Percentage, I couldn't figure out a percentage, Dwight."

Kay: "Okay. Well, you and I can look at that later. The project management tracking software, we've got that pegged at a pretty high number. It looks like, what, half a million dollars?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "And that's in addition to the line item I just talked to
you about with respect to hardware, software..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "...and mainframe?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "What do we do... are we... are we upgrading the entire
 department?"

Arroyo: "Trying to."

Kay: "So, this is a onetime expense?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Kay: "Well, it's fair to know. If it's onetime, that's one thing,
but if we're looking at an ongoing number like this, that's
different."

Arroyo: "We don't know what's going to happen next year, Dwight."

Kay: "Okay. Well..."

Arroyo: "We're hoping that this is a one time."

Kay: "Okay. Let's... let's look at Corrections, if you don't mind, for just a second. Just the significant changes. If my numbers are right, we're looking at about a 7.7 increase to operations compared to FY13. Does that seem right?"

Arroyo: "It... it would seem right. We're... this is the problem that we had in our committee, Dwight, where they came to us...

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Corrections came to us and asked us for \$93 million and we could not give them the \$93 million. So, we found from the new moneys we got, \$70 million. And we're going to avoid from closing prisons because everybody in our workgroup had a problem. Because then, like Mitchell said, that would have been unemployment. So we diverted unemployment and we diverted from closing any more prisons. So, this is... I think that this is a good part. And we gave them a lump sum so they could decide where they're going to spend their money."

Kay: "Well, that doesn't mean they're not going to close a prison
though."

Arroyo: "Well, according..."

Kay: "Do you have an assurance?"

Arroyo: "...to what the Governor told us, he's not looking to close any more prisons."

Kay: "Well, but he told us... last year we had an understanding that we were not going to close too."

Arroyo: "Last... last year was a different..."

Kay: "I understand."

Arroyo: "...situation with Tamms, Dwight."

Kay: "Okay. All right. But..."

Arroyo: "You were in all those meetings."

Kay: "Yeah, I understand. Let me... let me digress a minute. The 52 million that was reported out of the <u>Chicago Tribune</u> this year is going from Road Fund to paying workers' compensation. How did that happen?"

Arroyo: "I don't know nothing about that."

Kay: "Don't know? Does that surprise you that I would throw that
 number out and..."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Arroyo: "It surprises me... I haven't read the <u>Sun-Times</u>, so I wouldn't know."

Kay: "Well, that's Tribune. It was actually the Tribune."

Arroyo: "Tribune."

Kay: "Yeah."

Arroyo: "I don't read the Tribune."

Kay: "I wonder... I wonder if maybe we haven't had a lot misuse of Roads Funds over the years for miscellaneous and sundry purposes. Do you have an opinion on that?"

Arroyo: "That was... that wasn't what we worked in our workgroups."

Kay: "Okay. Well, I think the Road Fund though kind of falls within your... your committee's province, so I was just curious. Let's talk about CeaseFire for just a minute. I think you told us that it was moved to CJIA?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "And that's out of GRF, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "And that looks to be about a 4 million... \$4.5 million piece
 of our budget. Is that right?"

Arroyo: "I believe it's 4.7 million."

Kay: "Okay. And did you ever get the performance measurements?

The analyses that we asked for to tell us whether it was an effective operation, or did we just simply forget that?"

Arroyo: "No, no we did not, Dwight. No. But that's what we put it in CJIA because CJIA's going to get a performance on the money that they put in there."

Kay: "Well, let me... let me... let me remind you, Representative, that this was asked for two or three weeks ago when the committees were joint working together. This is not a new

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

request. But I'll... I'll keep going here. Let's talk about the appropriation from Franklin County Meth Program. Is that a new one or an old one?"

Arroyo: "That's the same one we had last year."

Kay: "Okay. Is that truly a meth program or is that just to house prisoners who can't fit into Madison Center?"

Arroyo: "It really... it really is a meth program."

Kay: "Okay. And what kind of increase did we provide to them this year over last?"

Arroyo: "Dwight, I can't hear you?"

Kay: "I'm sorry?"

Arroyo: "I can't hear you."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please bring the volume down in the chamber? This is the final speaker on the final Appropriation Bill for the day."

Kay: "I think my question was about the meth lab and whether it was a... whether or not it was a true meth lab and a recovery center..."

Arroyo: "It is. It is, Dwight. It's a juvenile... it's a juvenile center where they treat people that have been taken... that meth..."

Kay: "Okay. Let... let's... let me just stop here a second. How are we doing with respect to the decrease that we were supposed to make pursuant to the Governor's request? Are we above, below or kind of spot on?"

Arroyo: "We're... we're still below the Governor's request."

Kay: "About how much below?"

Arroyo: "Overall, Dwight?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Kay: "Just Corrections. We'll get to GRF at the end."

Arroyo: "We're 25 million under."

Kay: "Really? Okay. All right. Let's keep... let's keep moving down here and let's look at the Criminal Justice System for a minute and let's look at some... some of the more significant changes, if I could. Adult Redeploy, that was one of the programs that we asked for measurement and we asked for some metrics and we never got that back. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Correct."

Kay: "So, we don't know whether they're doing really good, really
bad? In fact, we don't know what they're doing at all?"

Arroyo: "Well... well, Dwight, those are... that's one of the programs that some of the Members in your committee advocated for and they wanted to make sure that they fully got funded. So, that was one of the pressures that we tried to alleviate in our workgroup..."

Kay: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...a request from your side."

Kay: "Okay. I don't remember that, but that might have been a meeting I... I might have missed. So, tell me what the number in your budget is assigned to Adult Redeploy programs?"

Arroyo: "Seven million."

Kay: "How much?"

Arroyo: "Seven million."

Kay: "And what did we talk about in committee?"

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Arroyo: "They lost their federal match, so now we have to fully fund them and it expands the program."

Kay: "Well, who... so, the fund... now it's on the taxpayer's back
here in Illinois, right?"

Arroyo: "Right. Right."

Kay: "Okay. Well... how about moneys that were added to the budget
for school programs. Are you familiar with that number?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "And this... these would be to departments, school programs, not K-12?"

Arroyo: "Excuse me, Dwight?"

Kay: "Yeah. These... these are not K-12, these are not college programs, these are programs within the departments..."

Arroyo: "Which... which line are you talking about, Dwight?"

Kay: "Well, I don't have a line. I'm just... I've just summarized this. I'm just looking at the more significant increases we have in the Public Safety budget. And one of them happens to be additional moneys for departments and the so-called school programs. And I'm just curious as to what that consists of? That's a lot of money. It's a GRF item by the way."

Arroyo: "That... that's a request from the Senate."

Kay: "Oh, that... did we discuss that in our committee?"

Arroyo: "Yes, we did."

Kay: "With the Republicans?"

Arroyo: "I don't remember who... we... we discussed that with the Senate when we had a working group with the Senate."

Kay: "Okay."

Arroyo: "And that was one of the..."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Kay: "I don't... I don't recall that. How about moneys added to... how about the total sum of money that was added to the budget for programs to reduce recidivism? Do you recall that?"

Arroyo: "One hundred and seventy-seven thousand."

Kay: "And that was an increase or a decrease over last year?"

Arroyo: "I think that was an increase."

Kay: "Pretty significant increase, really. Do you know what
 percent that was?"

Arroyo: "Last year we cut a lot of programs for recidivism. So, this one we funded."

Kay: "So, we... we're really redoubling the effort plus some money?"

Arroyo: "Yeah."

Kay: "Where we'd get the money to do that?"

Arroyo: "That was from an allocation."

Kay: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you, Luis."

Arroyo: "From our allocation."

Kay: "Allocation, again, from what?"

Arroyo: "We got money from other committees."

Kay: "You got money from all the committees?"

Arroyo: "Other... other committees."

Kay: "Other committees?"

Arroyo: "General Services..."

Kay: "So, all the money... all..."

Arroyo: "...and then the Income... the Income Tax Refund Fund."

Kay: "So, the money for this program came from another committee.
Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Various moneys came from different places, with a reduced income refund fund and some of it came from, I believe, General Services."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Kay: "So, next year when you go to fund this, is this going to be a stand-alone program or are we going to have to borrow for Paul?"

Arroyo: "I... I couldn't tell you... I couldn't tell you about next year."

Kay: "Yeah, I know. How about Operation CeaseFire? Can you tell
me a little bit about the appropriation there?"

Arroyo: "That's 4..."

Kay: "Is that up or down?"

Arroyo: "...4.7 million, Dwight."

Kay: "I'm sorry?"

Arroyo: "Four point seven million."

Kay: "Four point eight million?"

Arroyo: "Yes. That was another issue we negotiated with the Senate side."

Kay: "And do you recall that there was a request for metrics and information and the number of employees and salaries and so on and so forth, do you recall that?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "What happened to that?"

Arroyo: "We haven't gotten that information and that's why the Governor and we decided to put it in CJIA."

Kay: "Well, that's okay where you put it, but you know, the... the simple truth is when you go through a budgeting process and people ask for things, when it comes to this kind of money, I think we were entitled to that."

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Kay: "Okay. All right. Let's... let's move on. I've got quite a bit here to go through with you tonight. So, I'd like to talk

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

about the Federal Trust Fund Grant. Was there an increase or a decrease?"

Arroyo: "The... what fund is that, Dwight?"

Kay: "The Federal... Federal Trust Fund Grant Reduction."

Arroyo: "What... what line is that from?"

Kay: "Non-GRF."

Arroyo: "From what committee?"

Kay: "Yours."

Arroyo: "From CJIA?"

Kay: "Your... your committee. About \$8 million-plus..."

Arroyo: "What... what agency?"

Kay: "Pardon?"

Arroyo: "What agency?"

Kay: "It's a non-GRF item, but you had it... you had it plotted on
 a line for \$8,061,400. And I'm curious as to what that's
 about?"

Arroyo: "We reduced various funds on the state fund... various lines on the state fund."

Kay: "So, this is a reduction?"

Arroyo: "And it droves the number up."

Kay: "This is a reduction?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Kay: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

Kay: "Yes."

Speaker Turner: "Could you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Kay: "Well, I wanted to go through the rest of the lines because I don't think we got a lot of the answers in committee, mainly because we weren't there for about a week and decisions were

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

made without us. And I've gone to a lot of work to summarize this."

Speaker Turner: "Understood."

Arroyo: "Could I answer that, Dwight? We... we spent a lot of time together and I think that we drew the line when we got to 2 weeks ago or a week ago. I thought that we were... we were at the line that we didn't need to discuss... we tried to go along with what everybody asked on that side of the aisle. We tried to meet you halfway, so... I mean, some Members missed a meeting. I missed a meeting, I didn't go to all the meetings. So, this is what happened."

Kay: "Well, I guess my... I'm going to defer to the Speaker. I'm sure everyone doesn't want to listen to me go through line by line... line by line tonight to talk about increases and decreases. But here's... here's a couple of things I would just share with you. First of all, we're spending money that we don't have for programs we know little or nothing about. And that's too bad because in this budget our items that quite frankly are unnecessary, personally I don't think are needed. And we... we call it, I think in most circles we call it unnecessary expenditure, some call it pork. But we are spending money we don't have. Whether you steal it from another committee or you try and take it out of GRF or you find some other source, there is ... there is in this budget and was a way to save the 3 percent that we were asked to save. And instead like every other budget committee that I have listened to today, we've said the heck with next year, the heck with this year. We had a bump... we had a bump in money this year in April and so therefore, we're going to feel free

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

to spend it as we wish and we have. Mr. Speaker, this budget does not resen... does not represent, in my opinion, anything but money that is being put on paper that we can't afford. I know you made a legitimate effort, Luis, to make... do this right, but it's turned out wrong. And I'm very sorry."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo to close."

- Arroyo: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and to all the Members here for being patient to listen to all this testimony. But I want to thank the Republican side for working with me and spending all the time we spent together. Dwight, I think that we spent a lot of time together. I thought that was... that was enough time. But I also want to thank all the Members of the Appropriations-Public Safety and the battalion of staff that I have here helping me out with this Bill. But I want to thank everybody for being patient. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 215 pass?'
  All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
  is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
  Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
  On a count of 69 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no' and 1 voting
  'present', House Bill 215, having received the Constitutional
  Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Dunkin,
  for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... Take it easy. Take it easy. At ease. On House Bill 206, I wish to have voted 'yes'. And on House Bill 213 please let the record reflect a 'yes' vote. Thank you, Sir, for your indulgence."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

  Representative Manley."

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

Manley: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."

- Manley: "Just a reminder to the freshmen, there is a photo going to be taken tomorrow 20 minutes before Session. Please, if you can make it, there's going to be a group photo. All of us then we're going to break off into our respective Parties. Twenty minutes before whatever time that is tomorrow. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolution. House Resolution 407, offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves to adopt the Agreed Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately after Session: Elementary & Secondary Education in Room 115, Financial Institutions in C-1, the Judiciary Committee in D-1 and Rules Committee in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn until Wednesday, May 29 at the hour of 1 p.m., 1 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned. Representative Sullivan has a quick message."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those that would like to see Representative Hays and Representative Tryon play some

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

music tonight, they'll be at Boone's Saloon, rain or shine, from 7 to 10 o'clock, maybe even a little bit later if you want to stay up past your bedtime."

Speaker Turner: "Rain or shine. Thank you, Members."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 1625; recommends be adopted is Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 946, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3112, House Resolution 361. Representative Berrios, Chairperson from the Committee on Financial Institutions reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 28, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 115, Senate Bill 1006; do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1042, Senate Bill 1587; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 804, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 804, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 821, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3010, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3172. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3419, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3420, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3423, a Bill for an Act making

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

appropriations. House Bill 3424, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3450, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3451, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3473, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3474, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3527, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 3528, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 114, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Senate Bill 1006, a for an Act concerning criminal law. House correction, Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 1227, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1329, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1687, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 1689, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Senate Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1910, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Senate Bill 1961, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2155, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 2221, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. Senate Bill 2335, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2389, a Bill for an Act concerning education. These will

65th Legislative Day

5/28/2013

be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."