66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1723."

Speaker Riley: "The hour of 1:00 having come and gone, the House of Representatives will come to order. Members and guests are asked to be in their seats, refrain from starting all lap top computers, silence all cell phones, and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Lloyd Washburn, who is a member of the First Baptist Church of Pana, in Pana, Illinois. Mr. Washburn is the guest of Representative Berrios. Pastor Washburn."

Pastor Washburn: "Wayne told me not to put my hand on the podium, so I have to remember to do that. If I could, I'd like to thank the powers that be this morning for those that have made it possible for me to be a part of this... starting in this Assembly. I really appreciate the fact that Rene made this help... along with her husband, my son Daniel. Now if you would, I'd like for us to bow our heads and have a word of prayer. Most kind and gracious Heavenly Father, we thank You once again for the privilege of living in this great country. We thank You for the freedom that we enjoy, the health and all the other creature comforts. But we pray this morning, Lord, for a very special blessing for the men and women of this Assembly. We pray that they might seek and You might grant them wisdom as they go about conducting the business for the people for the State of Illinois. We pray this morning... this afternoon, that You might grant them strength.

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Strength to withstand the criticisms that they will have to endure, but also bless them for the good that they've done. We pray this morning... this afternoon, again, that You might give them patience. May we ever remember that we are all God's children and we ask that we might go about ourselves doing it peaceably with no admonition for anyone. We ask that You bless us in all we say and do and You've been told that if we ask these things in the name of Jesus, it'll be granted. So we pray this day, in the name of Jesus, Your Son and our salvation, and all God's people said, Amen."

- Speaker Riley: "Thank you. We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Wheeler."
- Wheeler 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 Riley: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Chapa LaVia is excused today."
- Speaker Riley: "Leader Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present."
- Speaker Riley: "With a Roll Call of 117 present, a quorum has been established and we're ready to do the business of the State of Illinois. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1659, Senate Bill 2243.

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken May 29, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 572, Senate Bill 1409, Senate Bill 1496, Senate Bill 1739, Senate Bill 2187. Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee on Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2773. Representative DeLuca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 983. Representative Jackson, Chairperson from the Committee on Counties & Townships reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2239, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2832, Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2832; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 and 3 to House Bill 3111. Representative Jay Hoffman, Chairperson from the Committee on Labor & Commerce reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 922; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3125. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 490. Representative Verschoore, Chairperson from the Committee on Agriculture &

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Conservation reports the following committee action taken May 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken May 29, 2013: do pass short Debate is Senate Bill 1756; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments #1, #2 and 3 to House Bill 84; a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 948; recommends be adopted as amended is House Joint Resolution 43. Representative Zalewski, Chairperson from the Committee on Health Care Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2777, Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3186. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2381; recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2408; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2925; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 3035. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: do pass as amended Standard Debate is Senate Bill 1547. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 411, offered by Representative Moylan, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Ives, for what reason do you rise?"

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Ives: "Ladies and Gentlemen in the House, in the Speaker's Gallery today, we are pleased to honor from St. Francis High School in Wheaton, the Illinois state championship girls volleyball team and the Illinois state championship girls soccer team. They are coached by Jim Winslow and Kristin Keigley and the Girls volleyball team is coached by Peg Kopec and Dave Boes. It is the eighth state championship win for Coach Peg Kopec. Please give them a warm welcome."
- Speaker Riley: "Welcome to Springfield. Thank you for your accomplishments. Good luck to you in the future.

  Representative Will Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Riley: "State you point."
- Davis, W.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, since we're in a welcoming mood,

  I would ask that you please welcome a Page that I have on the
  floor with us today. This is young Tatyana Gardner who is a
  16-year-old junior at Southeast High School here in
  Springfield. Please give her a hand."
- Speaker Riley: "Welcome to Springfield. Well, welcome to our chamber. Congratulations to you. Representative Hammond, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hammond: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Riley: "State your point."
- Hammond: "In the gallery behind me, I am pleased to announce that we have with us today, Miss Macomb 2013, Rayni Lasley. Rayni is a 21-year-old senior this fall at Western Illinois University in Macomb, majoring in family and consumer

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

science. And her platform is something that I think is very important in this day and age and touches on all of us and that is teen suicide and cyber bullying prevention. Rayni's mom is Deborah Peek, her dad is Racy Lasley. They are joined today with Bob and Nancy Foote who are the executive directors of the Miss Macomb pageant and have been for many, many decades. And I should also like to mention that Rayni is a constituent of Representative Brauer and thank you so much for being here today."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you for coming. Congratulations to you and thank you for your advocacy. Representative Brandon Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Please help me welcome to the House Floor, my Page for the day, 7-year-old Seiger Dunston. Welcome to Springfield, Seiger."

Speaker Riley: "Welcome to Springfield, young man. Representative Walsh, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Walsh: "I also would like to welcome my Page for the day, freshman from Joliet Central High School in my district, John Murphy, whose goals are to be a cadet at West Point. So, please welcome him to Springfield today."

Speaker Riley: "Thanks for coming, young man. Good luck to you.

Representative Tabares, for what reason do you rise?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Tabares: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on the point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Riley: "State your point."
- Tabares: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the House Gallery I have three guests, the Murillo family, please stand. They are visiting me from the 21st District. They are from Little Village and they came to visit Springfield today. And I want to welcome them to Springfield and I also want to add that their son, Adrian Murillo, I am very proud of him, because he received earlier this month... I recognized him for becoming... for receiving the Eagle Scout. He became an Eagle Scout, the highest honor a young man can receive. So, I want to welcome them to the House Gallery."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you for coming. Only one percent of all young men who are scouts become Eagle Scouts. Thank you for your achievement. Representative Bellock, for what reason do you rise?"
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to introduce my Page for the day, Joe Guinan, who came down from River Forest, Illinois, and has just graduated from Fenwick High School and is going on an academic scholarship to Ohio State University and also to play rugby and fencing. So, I'd like everybody to give him a warm welcome. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you, young man. Great accomplishments.

  Representative Pihos, for what reason do you rise?
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And although we've already applauded them, I'd like to add my congratulations to the two outstanding teams from St. Francis. Sports foster many things we know, teamwork and leadership. While these young women

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

know that talent may help win games, they are great example of how teamwork keep... wins championships. So, congratulations."

- Speaker Riley: "Another round of applause. Representative Raymond Poe, for what reason do you rise?"
- Poe: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you ate the meal today, I want to make sure everybody knows that Mike Horstman from the optometrist. They paid for the chicken and tell them thank you, and then Phil Gonet of the Coal Association paid for the ice cream. So, thanks a lot and thank those guys."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you very much. Representative Moylan, for what reason do you rise? You haven't risen. Representative Pritchard, for what reason do you rise?"
- Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Riley: "State your point."
- Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, our Legislative Research Unit produces the <a href="First Reading">First Reading</a> which has a lot of good information in it. And this morning, for... especially the people in the gallery, I would like them to note that Illinois has the fifth most women serving in the Legislature. There's an article talking about the role of women in State Legislators and they point that in the most recent election, we now have 30.5 percent of our Members women. There's plenty of open chairs here for more. One right here, in fact. So, we hope more women will join us and become involved in the governmental process."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you. There are chairs everywhere in this Body. Representative Costello, for what reason do you rise?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Costello: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Costello: "I would like to introduce Hannah Auten who's the daughter of Brent Clark who many of you know. She's here to Page with us for the day and with my lovely daughter Danielle, as well."

Speaker Riley: "Thank you so much. Congratulations to you.

Representative Jil Tracy, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

- Tracy: "I would like to personally thank Representative Raymond Poe for another fine meal of fried chicken. Raymond got up this morning, fried 900 hundred pieces of chicken, so that we could enjoy it. And I think we all owe him a round of applause for the best chicken in Springfield."
- Speaker Riley: "Thank you, Representative Poe. Representative Poe, would you like to be recognized? Mr. Clerk, we have House Resolution 376 by Representative Scherer. Read the Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "WHEREAS, The members of the Illinois House of Representatives are pleased to congratulate the Southeast High School Spartans girls' track & field team on winning their 4th consecutive Class 2A State championship on May 18, 2013; therefore, be it
  - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we congratulate the members of the Southeast High School Spartans girls' track & field team for their victory and wish them continued success in the future."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Riley: "Representative Sue Scherer."

- Scherer: "I have a very special group with me today. This is the Southeast Track Team. For four years in a row, they have been the overall state champions in track. They're here with their coach, Barbara Montgomery. This is her first year coaching. They have won the girls Class 2A championship and we're going to give them instead of a clap, we're going to give them a whoosh. So, if you will help and turn and face them, we'll show you how to do it. You just go, whoosh. Ready? Here we go. Whoosh."
- Speaker Riley: "Good job. Congratulations to all of you. Leader Currie, you have a Motion?"
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I have a Motion to suspend the posting requirement so that Senate Bill 1911 may be heard in House Executive, House Joint Resolution 39 in House Higher Ed, House Resolutions 360 and 375 in Human Services, House Resolution 377 and House Joint Resolution 40 in State Government Administration, House Resolution 374 in Transportation: Regulation, and House Resolution 370 in Veterans' Affairs."
- Speaker Riley: "Motions are all on the floor. All those in favor, state by saying 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And those Motions are adopted. Members, we have Senate Bills on Third Reading, Senate Bills on Third Reading starting on page #3. We have Senate Bill 1330, Senate Bill 1330. Representative McAsey. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1330, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Riley: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1330 is the initiative of the HFS Inspector General. Essentially what this legislation does is to import some provisions that are currently in Federal Law with regards to the collection of Medicaid overpayments, different Medi... Medicare abuses, to import them into State Law so that our State Inspector General has the ability to go after Medicaid overpayments. I'm happy to answer any questions and appreciate the support of the Body."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Reboletti: "Representative McAsey, you and I attended some meetings to work out an Amendment that was an agreed upon Amendment. Could you explain what the contents of that was, what the purpose was?"

McAsey: "Yes. Thank you, Representative. We did attend some meetings, there were some concerns when this Bill was initially in committee. It was held in committee. We worked on an Amendment which was introduced, and that Amendment is part of this Bill language before us. Essentially, that was to address some concerns brought up by one of the Medicaid providers, specifically, ambulance service providers with regards to disputed overpayments. So they had a concern with regard to essentially how the process would work, if there's an overpayment identified having that returned to the state. So, this Amendment does put language into the Bill that allows for a specific process with regard to setting up a receivable

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- but pending the collection on that receivable while that dispute is... is pending."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I know it's pretty loud in here. I'm having trouble hearing the Sponsor."
- Speaker Riley: "Members, we're going to be here for a while, so let's give some respect to the people speaking on the Bill.

  Let's... let's keep the noise down. Thank you so much. Proceed."
- Reboletti: "Representative McAsey, I know that some of the issues that have driven this discussion is that recently there were payments made to ambulance providers that they actually believed were from back payments, old bills, and actually they weren't and there was an issue about how to give the money back to the department without being in violation. Is this designed then to correct that?"
- McAsey: "That issue is separate from this underlying legislation, but as a result of the discussions that we had related to this pending Bill, I believe that the department is working to resolve that issue and that this Amendment, being part of this Bill moving forward, will be in place to address any situations such as that, should they arise in the future with regard to overpayments."
- Reboletti: "And there was a discussion about fraud in the either ambulance providers or the Medicare providers. Does this address any of that? Because the Inspector General had talked about that, and my understanding was it was more along the lines of a... from a national study not necessarily from an Illinois state perspective. Is that fair to say?"
- McAsey: "I'm not... I'm not certain that I understand your question."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Reboletti: "Well, I had received a packet from the department that made some allegations of what was alleged to be fraud against one of the providers. It actually turned out not to be fraud, it was something that was, I guess they use the term extrapolated, or it was a discussion between a Medicare billing versus an ambulance billing. So, there was some discussions about fraud and... and all that. Does this... does this address any of that or do you think we'll be back here addressing some of those issues as well?"

McAsey: "I think that the intention of this legislation is to bring language that's currently a part of Federal Code into our State Law to allow for our Inspector General to have the ability to conduct investigations and to move forward based upon the results of those investigations. Certainly, none of us want fraud within the... our Medicaid system, the spending of our state dollars. I'm hesitant to comment about any specific allegations of fraud, but it is my hope that this language sets forth a clear process about what exactly will be investigated, how exactly disputed overpayments will be handled, and certainly, if there are issues that arise in the future, I and I'm sure there would be other Members of the Body that would be willing to work to understand and if legislation is needed to bring it at that time."

Reboletti: "Well, Representative, I appreciate you working on this and listening to the Judiciary Committee. I know that you came back with an agreed upon product. I would just state for the Body that it's... I have some concerns about when any Inspector General sits in on negotiation about a Bill when they preside over a meeting over people that they also inspect

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

and regulate. And so, I have some hesitation with that moving forward in the future. I don't have them... I don't have a problem with them being an advocate for a particular position, eliminating fraud, waste and abuse, but as part of negotiations, it's a little concerning to me that they're part of those negotiations. So, thank you, Representative."

McAsey: "Thank you, Representative, for your work and willingness to help with this issue."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Bellock."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Bellock: "Thank you very much. Representative, I was just reading over this quickly, and does this defer a payment if it's... I mean, can you tell me about the payment and the overpayment?"

McAsey: "So, the way that this legislation would work is that...

basically, this is after the fact when there is an audit of
a particular provider or a particular payment. So, after the
fact, if there's been an audit finding that identifies that
perhaps there has been some overpayments or in the event,
which actually under this language, the provider would have
a duty to self-identify overpayments. This just sets up a
schedule for, at that point, a payment that's already gone
out to the provider to make sure that we have a system in
place for that payment to come back into the state, but it
was... the Amendment is a balance to make sure that while that
dispute is ongoing, you know, those payments aren't coming
back to the state until there's a resolution to the dispute."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Bellock: "Okay. The reason I'm asking that is we... it sounds like we've had something similar recently involved in Medicaid with HFS and payments to providers in social services such in the DD community, and they overpaid them, but they didn't realize it was an overpayment and then all of a sudden they got a letter saying, you know, you have to pay this back. And now we're trying to work on that problem because some of them had already deposited those checks and they amounted up to a hundred and fifty thousand and two hundred and some thousand dollars."

McAsey: "So, I'm not aware of this specific situation that you're mentioning, but I am aware of a specific situation that Representative Reboletti and I just discussed with regard to ambulance service providers. The Amendment that was adopted to this Bill is intended to make sure that we have a clear process moving forward, should that be something that occurs. So, I know that right now the department and the Inspector General are working to resolve that. The instance that I know of and I imagine the instance that you're aware of is not, you know, I'm willing to try and help get that to a resolution. But we believe that with this language, we will have a process in place so that that won't be an issue in the future."

Bellock: "Thank you. 'Cause we've been working a lot with the ambulance community on especially, you know, the transit with the criteria that we set in place last year, and then somehow that criteria was... somehow there was mention of that criteria being changed, but that's already in statute."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

McAsey: "Right. And one other thing that I neglected to say which I should, is that any of this language with regard to overpayments, we're talking about fraudulent overpayments, we're talking about Medicaid fraud issues, so something that's a mistake on the part of the department, there wouldn't be liability for a provider under the... under these provisions, but we do believe that with this Amendment it will help to clarify a process if it is an error on the part of the department."

Bellock: "Okay. I guess I would just point out that in a lot of cases with something similar to this with the DD, they were so far behind in their payments, HFS, sometimes, you know, six months, but when they got the check it wasn't clarified and so they went ahead and did that. And is the ambulance community, I didn't see it on here, were they in opposition or okay with this?"

McAsey: "They... they are not opposed to this. They have no position. They have no opposition."

Bellock: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield please, just for a few questions?"

Riley: "She indicates she will."

Flowers: "Representative, I understand what it is that you're trying to do and I really appreciate it, but what type of... I heard you refer to Amendment #1. What types of protection will the office put forward to make sure that the rules are plain and clear? Because some clinics who have been working

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

with Medicaid patients have been audited because they had given the patients the service that was needed and Medicaid has came in and penalized them for it because they gave too much and had these clinics to pay them back for the services that was medically necessary, not so much as the rules and the guidelines. So, how is it going to be perfectly clear, because, after all, we're talking about taxpayer's dollars..."

McAsey: "Right. And that..."

Flowers: "...and we're talking about... we're talking about poor people getting the services that's needed."

McAsey: "Right. And that's certainly our concern and you know, the balance, we want to make sure that we have a system in place where the limited resources that we have are there for the people who need them, but at the same time, we want to make sure that there is not fraud and abuse going on with regard to the spending of our taxpayer dollars. So, through both the underlying Bill that came over from the Senate as well as the Senate Amendment, there's a whole body of rules in addition to the Amendment that has to do specifically with the overpayments."

Flowers: "I understand about the rules. My question to you, again, is, how will the providers know about the rules because..."

McAsey: "Yes."

Flowers: "...because, in certain areas of the city... or the State of Illinois, the rules are different. It does depend on the population..."

McAsey: "So, I appreciate that and that was actually a question that had come up during the negotiation. The department as well as the Inspector General have made statements and

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

commitments that they will work to communicate with providers about what the rules and the policies are. I don't want to misspeak on the part of the department, but it's my understanding that they're going to make sure that these things are posted online and certainly, if there are specific concerns from a provider or if we need for the department to do something else, I would appreciate if you'd let me know if you know of specific instances where we can have the department follow up."

Flowers: "And so, once again, I just want to bring to you... bring to your attention, under the acts of penalties, for instance, under number five, says for services that was not medically necessary. And so, when you think about what we're doing now, there's certain services that is for prevention services, and then, there's other services that the doctor say is medically necessary, and that's what I'm telling you that clinics have been penalized for giving patients what is medically necessary, despite the fact Medicaid did not pay for it, but because Medicaid did an audit and they found out that those services were given but Medicaid was never charged."

McAsey: "So, I think that that would become then a question of fact with regard to the audit. So that would be something with regard to the provider and the Inspector General working through these questions of fact, but under the rules, if there is a service... well, Medicaid will not reimburse and under the federal rules as well as importing those rules into this, if there's a service that's not medically necessary, then, you know, taxpayer dollars shouldn't be going for services that are not medically necessary, so as to make sure that the

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

dollars are there for the services that are, in fact, medically necessary. And if there is a dispute, then there is a process in place to work through that."

Flowers: "I agree, and I'm not going to belabor the point, but if a patient presents themselves to the doctor, it is, I would assume, to be medically necessary, but I understand about the other side of the coin as well. And my final question is, what is in place for checks and balances whereas that that provider will not be put out of business because unfortunately, during the late '90s a lot of providers were put out of businesses because of the HMOs and I want to make sure that that does not occur again, that there are checks and balances for..."

McAsey: "So..."

Flowers: "...the providers."

McAsey: "Yes. So, certainly the audit process is a process that, you know, would move forward, but there's also an administrative hearing process that's part of the audit process. So there is an opportunity for... you know, a hearing with regard to disputes."

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates that she will."

Ford: "Thank you. Representative, I have a few questions. The first question I have is, what type of violations prompt this Bill?"

McAsey: "I'm sorry. Did you say what type of violations?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Ford: "Yes. This is about, yes."

McAsey: "Okay. So certain things that are in the language would include that, for example, billing for a service or an item that was never actually provided or up-coding, so say that you provided one sort of service but you coded, you billed for a service that was more expensive than the services that was actually provided. Just flat-out fraudulent or false claims. So you file a claim when no service at all was provided. Services that were provided by someone who was unlicensed or improperly licensed. Services that were provided and then billed for someone who, in fact, was not Medicaid eligible. And then, as the Representative from Chicago and I were just discussing, services that are not medically necessary. So those are the sort of... of issues."

Ford: "Well, I think this is a great Bill then. I'm glad you made clarifications for me. And I rise and I will press the green button. Thank you for bringing this measure."

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "There being no further debate, Representative McAsey to close."

McAsey: "Thank you so much to the Members of the Body for your thoughtful consideration of the legislation. I urge your 'aye' vote so that we can make sure to protect our state's limited resources and make sure that we do not have fraud and waste within our Medicaid system. Again, urge your 'aye' votes. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "So the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1330 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, please. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with a vote of 111 'yea', 4 'nay', 1 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 56, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 56, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Cassidy."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 56 as amended codifies important protections for tenants living in properties that are foreclosed. Many of these protections exist under Federal Law but that law will expire in 2014. Fundamentally, it provides renters with sufficient time to make a safe move when their home is foreclosed, recognizes leases entered into during a foreclosure for a term of up to one year, gives tenants with those leases the right to remain in their home for the term of the lease, and ensures that tenants have adequate time to move by requiring 90-day notice for all renters. The Bill does not prevent lenders or landlords from evicting tenants early if they violate their lease, don't pay their rent, or are involved in criminal activity. It clarifies that buyers at foreclosure sales must inform tenants how to pay rent. It is a product of many hours of negotiation between advocates and financial institutions. It passed the Senate unanimously, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Franks: "Representative, does this Bill only deal with residential property and not commercial property?"
- Cassidy: "I believe that's true."
- Franks: "Okay. And I'm reading the... the analysis and it talks about bona fide leases. What's a bona fide lease?"
- Cassidy: "It is a... it is an executed lease between a property owner and a tenant."
- Franks: "Okay. But there are some additional safeguards aren't there? It has to be an arm's length transaction, and it can't be a relative of the landlord."
- Cassidy: "Exactly. It can't be a way to avoid foreclosure, absolutely."
- Franks: "Okay. Let me ask you this. So let's assume there's a bona fide lease with an arm's length transaction, and the tenant knows that the landlord's in foreclosure, and says, I'm just not going to pay. Because they know that it takes two years to go through foreclosure in Cook County, and maybe more, so during that time, even though they have a bona fide lease, they're just not paying. What procedural safeguards does the mortgagor have who's seeking to foreclose on this mortgage?"
- Cassidy: "Well, very specifically, the Bill does not prevent lenders or landlords from evicting tenants early if they are not paying rent. It preserves their right to evict for nonpayment."
- Franks: "Well, presently, under the Foreclosure Law, you can include the tenant in the foreclosure, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Franks: "Okay. So then, I'm wondering how this is going to work, because if they have an affirmative defense, if they have a bona fide lease, and so they go to the... they go to the court and they say, but Your Honor, I have a lease. At this point, how is the lender going to know whether they've paid or not because in residential mortgages you are not going to get a receiver? This just doesn't happen, especially if the borrower is living in one of the units. Are you aware of that?"

Cassidy: "I... I'm... I'm not sure I follow."

Franks: "Okay. What happens typically in a commercial case, is you get a receiver. And then the receiver could tell you whether or not the tenant has actually paid. But in a residential, let's assume it's a four flat in your district, and the borrower/owner lives in one of the four units. So there's three other units and they're in foreclosure and the other three don't pay. How is the bank going to know that?"

Cassidy: "How is the bank going to know if those three tenants are paying or not paying?"

Franks: "Are... Exactly."

Cassidy: "The answer was that the receiver would have that information, but you're saying there's no receiver."

Franks: "There's no receiver in residential property, so the... I think there may be a flaw in the drafting of this because even though you say that the lender would be able to dispossess someone who's not paying their... their... the lease, there's no way the bank would know. Unless you have an affirmative obligation requiring the tenants to prove that they've paid, I don't know how a lender would know."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Cassidy: "In any eviction proceeding, the... the tenant would... would have to show proof."

Franks: But the problem is, the lender wouldn't have..."

Cassidy: "So the lender seeks to it..."

Franks: "...any privity of contract."

Cassidy: "If the lender seeks to evict the tenant, the tenant would have the opportunity to show proof that they have paid."

Franks: "But they wouldn't be able to do that 'til years down the road. Here's the problem. The lender does not have privity of contract. It is only the borrower with the lessee, correct?"

Cassidy: "In order to evict, the borrower would have to go to court and this would all be... right."

Franks: "I know, but this... but you can't... here's the problem. You're going to wait two years under a foreclosure in Cook County, minimum. During that time, if I am a lessee, I am going to make sure I don't pay anybody anything because there's nothing a lender can do about it..."

Cassidy: "If... but that's before it foreclosed..."

Franks: "...under this Bill."

Cassidy: "...and the landlord is collecting the rent."

Franks: "But let's assume the landlord doesn't."

Cassidy: "So, that's long before it becomes a question."

Franks: "But oftentimes what happens is the property goes into foreclosure because the tenants have failed to pay. And oftentimes, the landlord is elderly or not knowledgeable of how things work and do... it does not go forward to dispossess. Wouldn't it make sense if a foreclosure action commences and you were trying to protect the tenant, that you also require the tenant to have the affirmative obligation to actually

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

prove that they've made the payments, either with a receipt or a cancelled check?"

Cassidy: "That would be once an eviction proceeding began."

Franks: "But the problem is, you could not start an eviction proceeding if you're the lender until you have title. Because no court's..."

Cassidy: "But that's the case now."

Franks: "Right, but... but..."

Cassidy: "Unless you... unless you go into foreclosure..."

Franks: "...but... but... so, here's the problem to add insult to injury. So, what happens typically in a foreclosure is a bank will lose between 40 to 50 percent of the equity. I mean, they... it's the atomic option... I'm sorry. ...and they lose. So, now what you're saying is, if you have to wait and give and... and to recognize a lease, I think we ought to at least give some modicum of protection also to the lender. And at the time of the foreclosure if the tenant is going to say, I want to stay, they have to show that they've paid."

Cassidy: "This is negotiated with the lenders, this Bill, this language."

Franks: "I know. I'm not sure they... I'm not sure it's all there though."

Cassidy: "And they have the 90-day piece that they requested."

Franks: "Now, what is... tell me what the 90-day piece does? Kelly, you want to take a few minutes and you and I talk on the side and come back to this. Do you mind?"

Cassidy: "What's that?"

Franks: "Do you mind if we take this out of the record just for a minute and we can bring it back?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Cassidy: "Sure."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Riley: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1493, Senate Bill 1493, Representative Sullivan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1495, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1495, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Kelly Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1495, Amendment 1 is the product of three years of negotiation between the Departments of Public Health... or the County Departments of Public Health, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, the Illinois Restaurant Association and the Illinois Food Retailers Association. And their goal over those three years was to update our food safety training program and the ... the Bill is the ... is the result of all that ... all that work and it's an agreed Bill. And what it does is, sets up two levels of certification, one is for food service sanitation managers and... which is currently in law, but it changes around a little bit the requirements for that initial certification and recertification and then it also introduces food handler training. And... and these requirements would be for restaurants, schools, nursing homes, anywhere where there's food service. It's an agreed Bill. I would be happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1495 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 117 voting 'yea', none voting 'nay', none voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1664, Representative Kelly Burke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1664, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Kelly Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1664 is before us today because the Telecommunications Law and the Cable and Video Competition Law both sunset this year. And Senate Bill 1664, Amendment 2, extends those laws for two more years. The Bill also updates and modernizes those Acts to provide the cable and telecom industries with relief from certain rules that are no longer germane, allowing the telecom and cable industries to grow and encourage competition, invest in wired broadband infrastructure and preserve and create jobs for Illinois residents. In doing so, the industries have worked diligently with the Attorney General's Office, the Illinois Commerce Commission, AARP, CUB, and the Municipal League to make sure consumers continue to be protected. The Bill also has the support of the AFLCIO and other labor organizations, business supporters such as the Illinois Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association. It also has a long list of bipartisan support... cosponsors. I'll hit the high points of the Bill. It makes

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

several changes to the Telecom Act. In addition to extending the sunset to 2015, it will create regulatory parity between different providers of phone service, eliminate certain outdated and cumbersome reporting requirements, and allow competitive providers to post their services on their websites rather than filing a tariff with the ICC. In regard to the Cable and Video Competition Law, the sunset is also extended for two years. The state license issued to AT&T to provide video service is extended. The Bill levels the playing field in video network build-out requirement aligning Illinois' policy with FCC standards and practices. The law clarifies that video service providers that also provide video and Internet services have the same access to multiunit dwellings such as condominiums and apartments as cable operators. The Bill further clarifies the amount of fees payable by holders of state authorization for cable or video service for public education and government access, also know as PEG channels. The Bill further clarifies under what conditions state authorized cable operators would function if, at the end of the sunset, the law were to be repealed. In regard to the Cable and Consumer Protection Law, the Bill modifies some consumer protections for video cable service so they match FCC regulations. Finally, Senate Bill 1664 extends the sunset on the Wireless Emergency Telephone Safety Act for one additional year and creates a task force to work with the ICC to determine the cost necessary for maintaining the... for the 9-1-1 system to adequately function. This Bill is a product of many, many hours or negotiation and has many, many

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

proponents. I'm happy to answer your questions and I ask for your support."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know... for just some history here. This particular Act is one that I've worked on since 1998, and it has been modified... we made mistakes years ago in the fact that it... we didn't modify this Act for a long time, from eighteen... from... from 1988 to 1998. And what we realized is, this is a... this is a business that changes so quickly that we need to ... to work on it on a regular basis. And now this Bill, as much as I would've liked to seen just a few more things in it, it is an important Bill that we must pass today. And the fact that we only are extending it one year, still allows us to make some sense... two... for two years, allows us the opportunity to come back and work on this because, think about this. This technology has changed so much even in the last four years that we've had to move forward to try to make sure that our constituents and the industry itself are able to be provided with the best possible products for the best possible price. I think someone once ... someone said in some of the notes that this isn't any longer the Brady Bunch phone system, it's more like Star Trek. So, as we're working to put things together, we need to make sure that the market is freed up, that those options are available to each one of constituents. Now, the only concern that I had, and whenever I made the statement I wish it would have went a little farther, I believe that there is a safety catch that we put in during the last rewrite that probably should have been

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

removed this time. There was some argument whether or not that should be done because I believe that the wireless systems that are available for our homes today, actually, and that's proved out, are cheaper than the safety net that we've put in through the hardwire. And... and unfortunately, we're discouraging those people that have the hardwire companies from expanding the wireless side a little bit more. But the Bill itself, I want to complement the Sponsor on the hard work that she's done on this, and everybody involved to come up with a plan and a idea that can be supported by everybody on this floor. It is supported by the AG's Office as well, so all... all interested parties are in support. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Feigen... Feigenholtz." Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Feigenholtz: "Representative, for purposes of legislative intent, does this Bill change AT&T's obligation to provide landline telephone service in its service territory?"

Burke, K.: "No, it does not."

Feigenholtz: "Does AT&T plan to continue to offer landline telephone service in this territory upon request?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that we must pass if we want to start the process of modernizing our infrastructure. This is a start. But beyond today, we must begin immediately to go

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

farther. If we want to increase business opportunities, investment and broadband and wireless, we must go forth farther than what we've done today. So, I rise in support of this Bill and we must pass it, but I want to put those on notice that this is only a beginning, and if you think that this is the end, you have just shut out business in the State of Illinois. And so please remember that this is a beginning and not the end. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. More broadband for Illinois means more jobs for Illinois, and that's why I'm supporting Senate Bill 1664. The Bill removes obstacles for private sector, wired broadband investment in the state. The Bill encourages more investment in broadband and creates jobs. It creates jobs to build the network, then it creates jobs through the power of broadband and it creates jobs in every area of our economy. Broadband is so vitally important to job creation, we need to be doing all that we can to remove the barriers and attract more broadband investment. In today's economy, the most important economic infrastructure are strong broadband networks. This Bill encourages more private sector investment, as the previous speaker stated, and in broadband without a tax credit, without a tax incentive and without taxpayer dollars. Again, this is a jobs Bill. Vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1664."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to the Bill, and there've

been some excellent comments made. I, too, rise in support.

First and foremost, we need to extend the 9-1-1 Act. Without

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

it, 9-1-1 as we know it goes away, so it's imperative that we extend that Act. Secondly, the creation of the 9-1-1 Services Advisory Board to determine the cost necessary for operations is critical. We've had several attempts at doing that, there've been some studies, but we really need to get to the point of having funds available and increasing some funding. The EMS task force that Representative Lisa Dugan and I, former Representative, and I held those 17 hearings around the state, 9-1-1 funding came up at many of those hearings. We have some 9-1-1 call centers in the State of Illinois that are on the brink of shutting down, and if they shut down, they have to be... I think protocol says they're taken over by the State Police. We need to have the good funding for them. This creates a mechanism to hopefully come up with a final recommendation that we can all live with. So, this is needed. It's imperative that we... that we pass this. It's important to the safety of the citizens of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Chair recognizes Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I, too, rise in strong support of the Bill. As the chairman of the Labor & Commerce Committee, we hear all the time in our committee about how we need to create economic development job opportunity. This does just that. This will provide more private broadband investment in Illinois. It'll create more jobs for union members. The IBEW Local 21, IBEW Local 51, IBEW Local 702, International 6th District of the IBEW, the Communication Workers of America District 4, the Illinois AFLCIO, the Chicago Federation of Tea... Federation of Labor, the Chicago District Council of Laborers, and International

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Union of Operating Engineers Local 15 support this Bill for a reason. They support the Bill because it'll create good jobs, good paying jobs. It'll also allow us in Illinois to mo... keep moving forward in the ever increasing competition of video competition so that consumers will be able to take advantage of the competition. We'll get better prices for consumers and create jobs for good work... good jobs for workers and union workers. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ford."

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

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

Ford: "Representative, I have a few questions, and the first one is, will this Bill allow for upgrades to the AT&T system?"

Burke, K.: "Yes, it will."

Ford: "And will this Bill require rate increases?"

Burke, K.: "The... the Safe Harbor packages that were part of the 2010 law are still preserved at the... at the... at no increase in cost."

Ford: "Okay. Where will AT&T get the money to do these upgrades? I mean, what we seen in the past, we saw two utility companies raise rates to do upgrades. This is a perfect example of how big businesses are supposed to operate and not hit consumers. So I commend you for carrying this legislation. I also commend AT&T for not sticking it to the consumer during this most difficult time in the economy. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Farnham."

Farnham: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of this Bill as chairman of the Economic Development and Manufacturing Committee. Not only will this create jobs, but

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

it creates a path to the future for all of us. It's a good Bill, and as one of the other speakers said, it's a start. I think more importantly, it shows that when people come together from differing points of view and work together that we can always find compromise. We can almost always find a path to something better. So, I rise in support."

- Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Riley: "She indicates she will."

- Davis, M.: "Representative, in our analysis it states that certain provisions are being abolished. Would you tell us what those provisions might be?"
- Burke, K.: "To... to... on which law, Representative? There's four different laws that are in effect. Are you speaking telecom or the video?"
- Davis, M.: "I think it's telecom."
- Burke, K.: "So, those are more regulatory provisions that are being changed. They include changes to allow regularly parity between..."
- Davis, M.: "Well, actually, it's cable or video service."
- Burke, K.: "Oh, okay."
- Davis, M.: "Certain... right. Thank you. Certain things are being abolished. Can you tell us what they are?"
- Burke, K.: "So, again, the... there are a couple of things in there.

  The first is some build-out requirements are being phased out... are being taken out and also that video service providers now have access to multiunit dwellings, such as condominiums and apartments. It... it clarifies that they have that right,

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

and there's also some provisions regarding public education and government access channels."

- Davis, M.: "Thank you. To the Bill. I think the build-out was a part of the agreement that was being reached because some people had fear that there would be limited build-out in minority communities. But research has shown that minority communities have a greater number in watching and purchasing television. I think it's an excellent piece of legislation, and I think it does show us in this Body, what can happen when groups work together, when those with varying interests make some compromises and do what it best for the Representatives and the citizens of the State of Illinois. When those things come together and they do occur, then a Bill that's ready for passage will certainly get an 'aye' vote. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "There being no further debate, Representative Kelly Burke to close."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Representative's comments regarding the 9-1-1 system, as a member of the EMS task force, I echo his comments about the importance of 9-1-1 system to our state. And I wish the task force good luck and that they come up with some... some ways to keep our 9-1-1 system strong. I'd like to thank the cosponsors, the many cosponsors of this Bill and those who took part in the extensive discussions and negotiations that resol... that... that came about in this... in this agreed Bill. I would ask for your support. This Bill will increase private sector investment in Illinois. It will benefit so many sectors across Illinois, from agriculture to technology to health care to public

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

safety. It will also benefit not only the employees of the cable and telecom companies, but also anyone employed in that sector, and with the hope that it will increase employment in our state, and bring jobs to more Illinois residents. As the market conditions change in this field, we will be back to revisit some of these provisions in 2015. It's a changing world with technology and we'll be ready to address it in 2015. This Bill is good for Illinois, it's good for your constituents and I ask for your support."

Speaker Riley: "The questions is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1664 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, take the record. On this question, with 117 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1221, Senate Bill 1221, Representative Soto. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1221, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1221 establishes the State Seal of Biliteracy Program to recognize high school student graduates who have attained a high level of proficiency in one or more languages. Participation in this program is voluntary for school districts. And House Committee Amendment #1..."

Speaker Riley: "Excuse me, Representative. Thank you very much.

Proceed."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Soto: "Yes. Thank you, Speaker. House Committee Amendment #1 is a suggestion of the State Board of Education and makes the following changes. It provides that attainment of the seal requires a high level of proficiency, sufficient to meaningful use. Makes a technical correction to remove the physical insignia because transcripts are electronic and requires a student to pay for the cost of any testing that may be required to attain the seal. It's... it's estimating that the cost would be 45 to 90 dollars per test. And I'm looking for an 'aye'... an 'aye' vote and I appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1221 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, with 117 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 56, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 56, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "And we're back. We... we have resolved the questions that the previous questioner had. And I would like to see this... Senate Bill 56, which would provide important protections to tenants in foreclosed properties, pass today. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Franks."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to thank Representative Cassidy for taking the Bill out of the record. We had a powwow in the back, and apparently it was also drafted just hunky-dory. And I stand in support of the Bill. So, thank you."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Cassidy to close."
- Cassidy: "You know what, you just can't do better than hunky-dory. Vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Riley: "So the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 56 pass?'
  All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.
  The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.
  On this question, with 117 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Senate Bill 1674?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1674 is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Riley: "Move this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. And read the Bill for a second time."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Thapedi, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Thapedi."
- Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Amendment... or strike that. Senate Bill 1674, Amendment #4, is actually the resolution of some long drawnout debates between the Illinois Bankers Association, the

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

lending industry, and the Illinois Housing Development Authority with respect to the administrative fees to be charged and the cap on the amount of fees that can be charged by IHDA with respect to facilitating the letter in spirit of Senate Bill 16. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Durkin: "Representative, I think you... you listed some parties that are... have come to some type of an agreement with this Amendment. The way our analysis reads is that the Illinois Bankers are still opposed to this Amendment, but there are other interests, Community Bankers, Credit Union League are supportive, correct?"

Thapedi: "That... that is correct. And... and in fact, Representative Durkin, we have worked on this issue for the last several weeks. I want to commend the Bankers for moving as far as the negotiations were concerned. To put it into its proper perspective, just so I can give you a complete answer to your question, what came up was is how much money or what was the percentage that was reasonable for IHDA to seek in order to reimburse for its operating costs for this program. Now, initially, IHDA came with a rule to JCAR in which they sought nine percent. I believe that I can speak for all of the JCAR Members that we thought that was somewhat exorbitant. We believe that this particular program is going to generate somewhere in the ballpark of \$40 million per year. We looked at the role of IHDA as being a facilitator of the program, reviewing documents, et cetera, and we thought that nine

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

percent was just extremely exorbitant. Having said that, the Illinois Bankers believe that IHDA was entitled to a big, fat goose egg. They thought that they were entitled to zero percent, no money whatsoever, that's where the negotiations began and now we've come up with a cap, of a four percent cap that there will be no more than four percent that IHDA can charge. Now, I think it's important to recognize how we came up with that four percent number. And how we came up with that four percent number is that we took into consideration, in the actual Bill itself, the Clerks of the Circuit Court are able to retain two percent and that's two percent acting as nothing but a facilitator and a depository of taking the money in with the filing of the cases and actually distributing the money to the appropriate entities. So, having said that, we agreed..."

- Durkin: "The fees that we're speaking of, those are coming from the financial institutions themselves, correct?"
- Thapedi: "Well, yes. They would be from the filing fee and then after the filing fee is made by the financial institutions, the different departments, the Clerks of the Court, IHDA, et cetera, would take their administrative fee and the remainder of the money would be made available to the public for..."
- Durkin: "Sure. Now there's been another Amendment filed, Amendment 5. Do you plan to call that and add that to Senate Bill 1674?"
- Thapedi: "And... and you will note that I, also, filed Amendment #5. It's my understanding that Amendment #5 is still in Rules and is not before the Body today."
- Durkin: "Is there a timeliness to pass this or do you believe that we could, perhaps, take this under some negotiation a

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

little bit more. Time is short. There's a lot of big issues on the plate. Can we have this go on and... maybe to the Veto Session..."

Thapedi: "No. I..."

Durkin: "...maybe reach some type of conclusion with the Bankers?"

Thapedi: "No. I... I would love to do that. And again, my charge is to be a problem solver and not a problem maker, but unfortunately, this program goes into effect June 1, 2013, so we've got to move forward."

Durkin: "Thank you very..."

Thapedi: "And that's why I've spent so much time working with the Bankers on it."

Durkin: "Thank you."

Thapedi: "Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Leader Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to compliment Representative Thapedi. As he indicated, this did come before JCAR and he's really had to put up with a lot of stonewalling from the... from IHDA. And I know how hard he's worked on this. I don't think any of us like this number very much, the four percent. We really don't know what the right number is, but I'll be voting for this and supporting the efforts that you have made, Representative. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "Do you have anything further on Floor Amendment #4, Representative Thapedi?"

Thapedi: "No. I'm just asking for its adoption. And I make the appropriate Motion to do so."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Thapedi moves do adopt Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1674. All those in favor say

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

Riley: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read this Bill for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1674, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Thapedi."

"Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you heard me say during the course of moving to adopt Amendment #4, Senate Bill 1674 is a trailer Bill to some of the legislation that was passed last year, Senate Bill 16. This addresses facilitation issues with the fast-track foreclosure process and the fees to be paid by lenders for both housing counseling well as the remediation of abandoned residential properties. House Bill... strike that. Senate Bill 1674, as amended, primarily does five things. The first thing that it is does is at the hearing on the fast-track motion will go forward in 21 days rather than 15 days to ensure that 7 days' notice can be given by the plaintiff bank. The second thing that this Bill does is the plaintiff's attorney will be authorized to sign off on the fees owed by the bank in addition to the actual bank itself. The third thing that this Bill does is that this allows the banks to recoup overpayment of fees when there's a reinstatement of the mortgage by seeking release of the funds via a court order. Presently, there is no way for the bank to recoup its money in the

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

instance of a reinstatement and the overpayment of fees. The last thing and the most important thing that this does is, and equally important to the issue that I discussed with the administrative fee relating to IHDA, this Bill, with respect to the Clerks of the Court, it provides two percent into the Circuit Court Clerk Operation and Administrative Fund to prevent county boards from sweeping these important moneys that are established specifically for housing counseling and the remediation of abandoned residential properties. Lastly, this Bill also clarifies the role of the clerk as a conduit during the process, not an arbiter or a referee of the moneys. I'm available to answer any questions. And I'm asking for an 'aye' vote on this very important piece of legislation."

Speaker Riley: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very important piece of legislation, but all of them are. I'm just trying to get the sound down a tad, please. Shhh. Thank you. The Chair recognizes Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Ives: "Do you know how much four percent represents in terms of a dollar amount?"

Thapedi: "Of what?"

Ives: "The four percent fee that's going to be collected. How much is that? Is it in the millions of dollars? Is it a few thousand dollars? Do you know how much that is?"

Thapedi: "Well, again, Representative, it depends on how much money this program actually generates. I would assume that it would be in the millions of dollars."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Ives: "Okay. And that's what I heard from the Bankers Association."

Thapedi: "Sure."

Ives: "And you do not plan on attaching Floor Amendment 5, 'cause obviously it's on Third Reading, so in our analysis it's a little bit confusing. Would you say, then, that the Bankers Association is in favor of it in its current condition or opposed?"

Thapedi: "What have they told you..."

Ives: "The Illinois Bankers Association."

Thapedi: "What have they told you, Representative Ives?"

Ives: "They have told us that they are opposed in its current form."

Thapedi: "Did they tell you why?"

Ives: "They felt like the fee was too high."

Thapedi: "Yes. And..."

Ives: "And that they felt like it would... should be more like the
 one percent."

Thapedi: "Yes. And... and as I was explaining to Representative Durkin during the course of adopting Amendment #4, that was the... the area of negotiation between the parties. Initially, IHDA was requesting nine percent and based upon the calculations that we looked at, we assumed that would be somewhere in the ballpark of \$3.6 million. And as I said a little earlier, we all thought, and I'm referring to the Members to JCAR, we all thought that that fee was exorbitant. On the other hand, IHDA... strike that... on the other hand, the Illinois Bankers Association, not the remainder of the lending institutions, but the... specifically the Illinois

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Bankers Association felt that IHDA should essentially administer the program for free. And it took quite some time to get the Illinois Bankers Association to move off of the zero percent. Ultimately, they did come to one percent. However, in the interest of negotiating and looking at numbers that were finally given to us by the Illinois Housing Development Authority, we thought that it was probably the most prudent thing to do was to put a cap. And again, I want to repeat that and underscore that, a cap of four percent. Under no circumstances will IHDA be getting a windfall. They would be entitled to receive any and all administrative fees that they can prove up entitlement to. So, if, for an example, they prove up an entitlement to \$5, then they will get \$5. If, on the other hand, they prove up that they are entitled to something far in excess of \$5, they would be able to do so as long as it does not exceed four percent."

Ives: "Okay. So, it's an ex... they will never exceed four percent,
 and it could be lower. That's correct?"

Thapedi: "Oh. Absolutely."

Ives: "Okay. Thanks for the clarification."

Thapedi: "And I would anticipate... I would anticipate that it will be far less than four percent. And in fact, with respect to legislative intent as IHDA will be coming back to JCAR, I should make it very, very clear that the numbers that I've seen are roughly in the ballpark of 400 to 500 thousand dollars per year."

Ives: "Okay. That sounds..."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Thapedi: "So, anything in excess of four to five hundred thousand dollars per year, we should be very aggressive and we should be scrutinizing those numbers very, very carefully."

Ives: "Thank you for the clarification."

Thapedi: "More than my pleasure."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Sullivan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Sullivan: Gentlemen, Senate Bill 16 that we passed was a pretty historic piece of legislation. The Illinois Bankers Association was reluctantly in favor of that, and they were reluctantly in favor of it for the reason of the amount of money being charged and the different levels of fees based on foreclosure amounts ranging from \$50 to 250 to \$500. So, your bigger banks were taking a big hit and treated differently in the foreclosure process, but they swallowed the pill and said, you know, to move this state forward, to get the Federal Government off our back, we're going to move forward on this. And so, now we have a Bill that comes before us that, once again, goes to the bigger banks and says we would like you to pay a little bit more for this. And so, the spirit of the negotiations, in my view and in the view of the Illinois Bankers Association, were broken. And so, for that reason they opposed that Bill, for that reason I oppose this Bill. And I would hope all of us would join together and say we had negotiations, we had the Bankers on board, they didn't really like all of this, but they said we need to move forward. And now, we're revisiting this to put further fees on the banks which is going to be passed on down to the consumers that use these loans. We need to stop doing this. We need to stop

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

digging the hole. And remember, we're in this position because that's what we did before, and we came up with a good solution and now we're going to go back on that solution. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's take this Bill, let's set it aside, let's vote 'no', and let's get back to the drawing board."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you. From my understanding, the Bankers were actually waiting for a determination on what the cost was going to be, and you said earlier that you were guessing it was somewhere in the millions. Can IHDA not come up with that number or at least an estimated guess?"

Thapedi: "Yes, Representative Davidsmeyer. And let... let me be very specific, and I... and I do want to address your question and I want to do so very, very specifically. However, I would like to address the previous speaker's statement. When Senate Bill 16 was passed, nothing is different here today. Senate Bill 16, as that was drafted, it was very specific in identifying the different types of lenders and how they were to be characterized. The first type of lender that was identified were those lenders that filed 175 or more foreclosure actions per year. Those particular lenders that are filing 175 foreclosures plus, per year, would pay \$500 as an additional filing fee to address two concerns and two concerns only. Number one, housing counseling, which is the issue of why the person's in foreclosure in the first place, and secondly, which many, many, many of us are experiencing in our district, remediation of abandoned residential

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

properties. Okay. The next strata of lenders that we looked at were those lenders that were filing between 50 to 174 foreclosures per year. Those particular lenders or banks or entities that were filing between 50 to 174 foreclosures per year would pay a nominal fee of \$250 to address the two issues that I just mentioned. And the last and the third category were those lenders that filed 50 or fewer foreclosures in the preceding calendar year, and they would pay the nominal fee of \$50. So, that's what actually happened in Senate Bill 16. The Illinois Bankers Association had no concerns with any of that, none of that."

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Thapedi: "The Illinois Bankers Association, and now I'm back to you Representative Davidsmeyer, the... the concern that the Illinois Bankers had was specifically and strictly with respect to how much money IHDA was going to charge to facilitate the program, that's it. They were on board with Senate Bill 1674 in its existing state. They didn't get a little squeamish until IHDA came with their Amendment, and they were looking for more specificity as to how much money they could actually charge to administer the program."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. And it's my understanding that... that the previous Bill, the history that you just went through, they don't have any concern with that. That is what it is."

Thapedi: "Understood."

Davidsmeyer: "I think the concern is to make sure that this money is used where it needs to be used and that there is the proper oversight to... to make sure that it is being used properly. I think they agree with the... the use of the money and the way

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

it is proposed to be used, but they're concerned about oversight."

Thapedi: "You know, absolutely. And... and again, when we're talking about oversight, and... and keep in mind that I'm not a novice in dealing with issues like this and the Illinois Bankers Association. And I want to, you know, send a shout-out to Ben Jackson, who worked very hard from the Illinois Bankers Association working with me to try to comesen... to try to come to some sense of resolution because Ben explained to me that their biggest concern was that they wanted to make sure that the money goes to the programs, not to administrators of the program, which was completely logical."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Thapedi: "And having said that, we did finally get those numbers from IHDA."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay."

Thapedi: "We did finally get that. After one of their Amendments failed in committee, they finally decided to cough up the information and give it to us. I shared that information with the Illinois Bankers. We know what that number is historically. Again, this is a new program, so we don't know exactly how much it's going to be but we do have a ballpark and I think that I've quoted that number somewhere in the ballpark between four to five hundred thousand dollars per year. And you may recall, earlier in this debate, that I was very specific and I said that at the time that IHDA gives or submits the administrative fees that they want to recoup, anything in excess of four to five hundred thousand dollars

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- we should be looking at that very, very, very aggressively because it may not be founded."
- Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. And... and from my understanding is, you know, they wanted... they wanted an actual projection of... of, you know, what... what it was going to look like over the next few years rather than just, you know, the short-term."
- Thapedi: "Well... well, again, and we did that. Is that, I know what the Bankers want, and I was fighting with them to get it. So, it was not an easy task to extract the information that we got, but once we finally got that information, which the Bankers have, I'm able to cite to you and quote to you the numbers that I've just given to you. So, again, keep in mind that the four percent, Representative, is nothing but a cap."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

- Thapedi: "They will not be getting anything in excess of what they have not earned."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. And... and does this... so, how... how is their cost proven? How... how do they show what their cost is to recoup that... that money?"
- Thapedi: "Well... well, what they do is and what they provided me with... with earlier programs, where they were charging or, in lack of a better way of putting it, that they had actually earned somewhere in that ballpark of what I had mentioned to you, somewhere between four to five hundred thousand dollars, they actually submit warrants, if you will, to, I believe, the Department of Revenue, if I recall correctly, to get those reimbursements and to draw that money. So, again, it's not as if that they're sitting on all the money and they just kind

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

of just pluck off whatever they think they're entitled to, there's a process for them to go through, submitting receipts, et cetera, invoices, to ensure that the tax dollars and also the people of the State of Illinois are protected with respect to the administration of these programs."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, will the Department of Revenue be charged with oversight of this program?"

Thapedi: "Well, a.m. again, let me not.m. let me look."

Davidsmeyer: "And I don't know. I'm just asking to see if this is actually spelled out in the Bill or... or if it's not."

Thapedi: "I'm sorry, Representative, it's very loud in here. I can't hear you."

Davidsmeyer: "I was just checking to see if this was spelled out in the Bill who had... who has oversight?"

Thapedi: "Well... let... let me answer your... your first question. And... and I was correct that they do submit a payout notice to the Illinois Department of Revenue. And they give detailed information with respect to how they calculate the amounts of money that are due and owing, going from travel to community affairs to home ownership, legal, et cetera, laying it out the specificity what they're entitled to. They then submit that and they sign off on it. The Chief Financial Officer of the Illinois Housing Development Authority submits that to the Department of Revenue for payment. Now, I don't know if that answers your question or not, but if you want to pose another one, I'm happy to answer it."

Davidsmeyer: "The... the other question, I just... general oversight.

I understand... I'm sure that the Auditor... Auditor General will have to..."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Thapedi: "I'm sorry. Again, it's very loud, and I... and I want to make sure that I can be responsive."

Davidsmeyer: "The Auditor General will have to take a look at this. They do audits on I... IHDA."

Thapedi: "Absolutely, absolutely. And I believe that this the process with primarily all of the... the governmental agencies and even a quasi-agency such as ... such as IHDA."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. All right. I appreciate your answers."

Thapedi: "And I appreciate your questions."

Speaker: Riley: "Before I recognize the next speaker, it is extremely loud in the chamber. And I don't want to have to gavel all the time to get... this is a very important Bill. Just bring the noise level down so we can hear the debate, please. The Chair recognizes Leader Lang."

Lang: ."Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. Representative Thapedi has worked hard to put this Bill together. Yes, there are still one... at least one group I know of opposed to the Bill, but not every Bill we do here has to be agreed to by everyone. Where do we ever get the notion that every Bill has to be agreed to before it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives? Nothing wrong with a good, old-fashioned debate. So let's not be talking, I don't think, about how everybody isn't on board. There's plenty of people on board, plenty of people involved in the negotiations. One group who's opposed is just simply opposed because they want to be opposed. They really didn't join the negotiations. They should have done so. The part of this Bill that deals with IHDA and their four percent fee is well crafted. Mr. Thapedi

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

and I and four others in this chamber sit on JCAR. IHDA had come to JCAR with a rule that they proposed asking for a nine percent fee, a nine percent fee. And JCAR said not only aren't we giving you that excessive fee, but you don't have the authority to even ask for that fee. You don't have the authority to get the fee. You need to go back to the General Assembly and get authority to have a fee. And so, here we are. The Representative, in good faith, has put forward a Bill proposing a four percent fee. This is a fee that does not come out of the pocket of the Banker's Association. It won't change their bottom line. The fees they have to pay into the foreclosure fund they have to pay. Where the money goes is really a separate matter from their philosophical problem with the fee in the first place. And so, we have a piece of legislation which used to be Senate Bill 16 that former Representative Yarbrough worked on for many years. This Bill cleans up some problems with that legislation. And we cannot afford, over this one small issue, to hold back the cleanup and the reforms that are in this Bill necessary to clean up some of the problems with Senate Bill 16. IHDA is charged, under the law, with administering this program. They're entitled to some fee for doing so unless we're simply going to give them a much larger line item to do their work. My guess is that since we've already passed the budget and since we don't want to reopen it and since we're probably not going to do a supplemental just for IHDA that we aren't going to give them a line item with a whole bunch of money. This is where they get their fees. This is where they get the money to do the operating, to do the program that Senate Bill 16

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

required them to do in the first place. So when they came to JCAR, we told them, no, go back to the House, go back to the Senate and they've done that. They've gone to Representative Thapedi, who is a Member of JCAR, who knows how this process works, and who has worked this through very carefully to make sure we get not only the reforms we need in the former legislation, but the fees IHDA needs to conduct the program that we have mandated that they do. So accordingly, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that should get your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brauer."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Brauer: "Sponsor, you have my apologies. I had a storm that came through my district here and... and missed the committee hearing when this was discussed and I certainly have a lot of respect for the job you've done on this Bill. It's something, and I hate to agree with Leader Lang as much as I have lately, but this is an important Bill and it needs to be passed. My concern is that four percent."

Thapedi: "Yes."

Brauer: "Where has that money typically come from in the past for IHDA to be funded?"

Thapedi: "As far as what? This is a new program, so essentially this is unprecedented. We've never before been in the scenario in which we recognize, during the course of this foreclosure crisis, that we need to address two primary issues and that is housing counseling, and what many of us are experiencing in our district, abandoned properties that are an eyesore and

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

serve as dangers to the people in our communities. So, again, this is an unprecedented program. We're just embarking upon it and I hope that it will be successful, as I'm sure that all of the Members here want this program to be successful. So, having said that, the moneys that will fund this particular program are by those individuals that opt to file foreclosure actions. Now, keep in mind, that you don't necessarily need to file a foreclosure action. In some instances in which someone is underwater, and I'm sure that we've all heard these stories, there is an option that banks can provide and that's something that's called a deed in lieu of foreclosure. So, what that means is that when a person is in the precarious situation in which they know that they're not going to be able to make the payment, they can simply say to their lender, hey, listen, I'm not going to make it. I'm not going to be able to make the payment. Here are the keys. You know, I'm sorry that this has happened. But banks often choose not to do so, but they choose to file litigation to bring about the foreclosure process and it's my belief that banks are often doing that so that they can obtain a deficiency judgment against that borrower."

Brauer: "Well, now, I think this is a really good piece of legislation. My concern is, since this is a new development, a new avenue for the IHDA to go downtown, I think we have to be careful how much money. What sort of range of money would four percent amount to?"

Thapedi: "Well, again, it would depend on how much money is actually generated by the program. We're anticipating, based upon the numbers that I've seen historically from similar

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

programs, that it would probably be somewhere in the ballpark of \$40 million per year. Now, again, that's... that's a rough estimate. We have not had actuarians look at it. The Illinois Bankers has actually come with a much lower number. Other lenders that are also involved in the process that are supporting the legislation such as the Illinois Credit Union League, the Illinois... strike that ... the Illinois League of Financial Institutions, the community bankers, who are all supporting the legislation, they also, too, don't have any projections as to how much money this program will actually generate. So, I guess the bottom line is, is that this program is going to generate as much money as the banks choose for it to generate depending upon the number of foreclosure actions that they file. If they choose to stop filing any foreclosure actions, there'll be no money, but if they continue filing a lot of foreclosure actions, then obviously that fund is going to build up and address the important two issues that I just disclosed."

Brauer: "Well, and that's my concern. If we're looking at a \$40 million pot of money here and IHDA gets four percent, we're looking at over a million and a half dollars that they're going to have for a program and I guess I'm concerned because I haven't seen their numbers. I know they were supposed to bring that back to us in committee, but I haven't seen the numbers and I realize it's going to be based on the amount of foreclosures we're going to have. I guess I would like to see, for legislative intent, that we cap this at an actual number as opposed to a percentage. Is that possible?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Thapedi: "Well, actually, I believe that I've done that as far as legislative intent. I think that I answered some questions from some very aggressive questioning by the Lady from the Wheaton-DuPage County area and also the Gentleman from, I believe, the northern portion of the state in which I indicated that, based upon the projections that I've seen, the information that I've able ... been able to extract from IHDA that I cannot imagine that IHDA would be asking for anything in excess of 400 to 500 thousand dollars. I was very specific when I laid that number out, in large part because, as the Leader on this side of the aisle indicated, I'm a Member of JCAR and I wanted to make sure that the legislative intent was very clear that under no circumstances would the amount of money that IHDA would seek to recoup would be in excess of four percent. Again, I'm anticipating that, historically, based upon similar programs, that the ballpark would be somewhere between 400 to 500 thousand dollars. And I know that I'm repeating myself, but it's probably important that I do because I've been asked this question by at least three Members so far and that is that any amount of money in excess of four to five hundred thousand dollars should be looked at with very intense scrutiny as being unreasonable."

Brauer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very important Bill. We need to have our action on it. The concern I have and the regret I have is that this IHDA legislation, part of it wasn't put in as a trailer Bill, but I think that's something that we can look at next year when we get some actual numbers. I would suggest to pass this Bill and move on."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Riley: "There being no further debate, Representative Thapedi to close."

Thapedi: "Again, thank you so much for your attention. Thank you your questions on this very important piece legislation. I can't stress enough the importance of what this Bill does. It addresses the two important issues of housing counseling as well as the remediation of abandoned properties in our communities. Again, I don't want us to get tied up in this quagmire scenario where IHDA is being aggressive trying to recoup its funds. There were no opponents. Absolutely zero opponents until IHDA came in and asked legislatively and also by way of rule for some specificity with respect to their expenses. That has been been fully resolved. Under resolved. That has circumstances is IHDA able to recoup anything, any dollar amount, in excess of four percent. As I've said before, I would not anticipate that anything in excess of 400 to 500 thousand dollars per year would be ... strike that ... anything in excess of four to five hundred thousand dollars a year should be looked at with very intense scrutiny as being somewhat unreasonable. Again, please don't get caught up in this minutia. Please give me a 'yes' vote on this very important piece of legislation for the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Riley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1674 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; all those opposed vote 'nay'.
The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record.
On this question, with 89 voting 'yea', 26 voting 'nay', 2

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise?"

Williams: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Riley: "State your point."

Williams: "I just wanted to welcome to Springfield, for the last few exciting days of Session, my fabulous Chief of Staff, Mike Reever, my three amazing interns, Anne Yonover, who is in her second year at Kent Law School, Dino Ianni, who is graduating soon from DePaul and Tim Meloy who's going to be starting at John Marshall Law School this fall. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Riley: "Welcome to Springfield. Senate Bill 1772, Representative Turner. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1772, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Leader Art Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. This Bill amends the Automobile Renting Occupation and Use Tax Act. It provides that B-plated vehicles, primarily pickup trucks that are rented by automobile renting companies, be taxed in the same way the automobiles are taxed. This change will make a tax reduction in Illinois that is the same as all surrounding Midwestern states and that... that neighbor Illinois. I worked with the Illinois Department of Revenue on this Bill and the Amendment was drafted at the request of IDR to ensure that this Bill applies only to automobile renting companies and not to moving box truck vehicles such as U-Haul or Penske. It defines a motor vehicle of the second division that has a

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Gross Vehicle Weight Rating of 8 thousand pounds or less. The specific change is that the sales tax is not charged on the purchase of the B-plated vehicle, rather the Automobile Renting Occupation and Use Tax is applied upon the renting of this vehicle. It is estimated that the State of Illinois can net as much as \$2 million a year as a result of this change. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and a question to the Sponsor?"

Speaker Riley: "The Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "So, Representative... Representative, tell me now how they're... trucks and vans are not taxed the same way as passenger vehicles. Is that correct?"

Turner: "Are you speaking currently, right now?"

Harris, D.: "Currently."

Turner: "Can you repeat the question, Representative?"

Harris, D.: "Yes. When... when, let's say, Enterprise Rental Car purchases a van or a truck, that they... if I'm... if I understand this correctly, they pay a sales tax at the time of purchase..."

Turner: "I believe so."

Harris, D.: "...whereas if they buy a passenger car they don't.

Rather that... that is... the tax is basically handled through the rental of that vehicle. Is that correct?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Harris, D.: "So, what we're doing here is we are making it uniform that when they buy a van or a truck, the tax will be... they won't pay the Retailers' Occupation Tax at the time, but

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

rather the tax will be paid during the course of the rental of that vehicle as it is with passenger cars. Is that correct?"

Turner: "I believe you're correct, Sir."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much. And this Bill did come out of the Revenue Committee and I think that's a good explanation of what the Bill does. And I... I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

Davidsmeyer: "Just...just wondered what... how this will affect, like,
Home Depot. They have a truck or two that they'll rent out to
people that are doing home... home improvement and other local
rental places that may have small equipment that they rent.
Will this affect them as well?"

Turner: "If you're referring them... if it's the same situation with like a U-Haul or something of that sort where they're doing the renting out, in this case, a Home Depot it's just being for... it wouldn't. It would not apply."

Davidsmeyer: "It would not? It's just the large car rental companies?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Riley: "The Chair recognizes Representative Jack Franks."

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

Speaker Riley: "He indicates he will."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Franks: "Representative, I'm a little confused on this Bill. I'm trying to figure it out. Does this only deal with rental car agencies?"

Turner: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. And what you're indicating is a gross weight of 8 thousand pounds or more they would not be able to be defined as an automobile?"

Turner: "The Gross Vehicle Weight Rating means a vehi... a value specified as the maximum loaded weight of a single vehicle.

Many rental moving trucks weigh less than 8 thousand pounds when empty; however, when full they far exceed the 8 thousand pound limit."

Franks: "So, would the net effect of this be to increase the tax revenue for the State of Illinois by changing this definition?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. Now, here's my question. That's what I figured that you're trying to do. I'm concerned that this may be inconsistent with Federal Law. How does Federal Law define these vehicles?"

Turner: "I can get back to you with that, Representative. I'm not sure."

Franks: "'Cause... 'cause here's where my... here's where I'm going with it. I'm wondering if there's a depreciation schedule that's different based on weight. Now, I remember back to my law school days that you could depreciate certain vehicles at quicker rates depending on weight. And I believe that weight cutoff was around 6300 pounds. But if you've changed the definition now to 8 thousand, would this affect the

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- depreciation schedules and make it inconsistent with the Federal Law?"
- Turner: "Jack, I'm not too familiar with the federal provisions concerning this. You would probably know better than I do so."
- Franks: "Well, I don't if your... if the staff knows because I'm...

  I'm concerned that we could have a problem constitutionally with this Bill under the... under certain clauses, the commerce clause because I know with depreciation schedules, if we're messing with those it could be an issue. Perhaps we could take it out of the record if... to get that answer, if you don't know."
- Turner: "I'm going to proceed with the Bill given that we only have a couple days left here and I can have counsel get back to you with that specific answer for you."
- Franks: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. If it's going to be staying in the record, I'll rise in opposition because I'm concerned that this would not pass constitutional muster. I'm also concerned that because of the difference in weight categories, as opposed to that in the Federal Government, that it'd be very confusing for our businesses and it also could affect the depreciation schedules and cost other taxpayers money that were not contemplated due to this change in the weight category because if you do for one, I presume you have to do for all. So, I think we have to be very cautious on this. And I'd encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Riley: "Leader Turner to close."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Turner: "I'm being told that this doesn't deal with depreciation values, to the last speaker's point. I just ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Riley: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1772 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, take the record. On this question, with 80 voting 'yea', 37 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1817, Senate Bill 1817, Representative Tracy. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1830, Senate Bill 1830, Representative Rita. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Riley: "Representative Rita."
- Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1830 basically cleans up some language from an audit finding from the Department of Labor that clarifies the language so it's clear to address their audit finding and how fees for mediators are set."
- Speaker Riley: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1830 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, take the record. On this question, with 112 voting 'yea', 5 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1842, Representative Beiser. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill.

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Out of the record. Senate Bill 1968, Representative Brady. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Sponsors. Senate Bill 1968 provides that, upon request of the moving party and with responsible notice given to the opposing party in a criminal prosecution in which the defendant is accused of the offense dealing with theft or deception, that by court order by means of audio or video... video transmission from a different location that the record testimony would be accepted into court. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Riley: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1968 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, take the record. On this question, with 117 voting 'yea', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2268, Representative Kay. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2268, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Riley: "Representative Dwight Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you give me just a moment?"
Speaker Riley: "Sure."

Kay: "Thank you. This Bill comes over from the Senate and represents a change in the amending of the Township Code. It allows townships and township road districts the ability to

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

lease or sell personal property by a vote of the township board or township highway commissioner. And it removes a high bid exception for property valued under \$2,500. This is a way to expedite things for townships in the transaction of property that is being sold and allows the use of computerization, online networks for the sale... offer and sale instead of an auction which we've done in the past. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Be happy to take questions."

- Speaker Riley: "There being no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2268 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, take record. On this question, with 87 voting 'yea', 30 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The warm greeting is always appreciated. Page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 92, Mr. Sacia. Mr. Sacia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Sacia."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

- Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Amendment does is it finalizes... Oh, I need to withdraw Amendment... no, I... Please hold."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll give you a minute, Sir. Time's up."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Sacia: "You're right. I need to withdraw..."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn."

Sacia: "...Amendment 1."

Speaker Lang: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn, Mr. Clerk. Please proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Sacia."

Speaker Lang: "How about this one, Sir?"

Sacia: "I'm good with this one."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this is, is a gut and replace and it... in its entirety it is a workout between the auctioneers and the real estate profession to auction real estate at auction. I'll be happy to discuss it thorough... thoroughly on Third Reading."

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

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 115, Mr. Martwick.

Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1042, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1366, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1587, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2106, Mr. Sandack.

  Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2106, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Sandack, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment 2. And Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to the Order of Concurrence starting with House Bill 189,

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Representative Cloonen. Please proceed. Out of the record. House Bill 733, Representative Cloonen. Please proceed."

Cloonen: "Yes. This Bill is the animal Bill that just adds on that if there are 10 violations or more, it would be a Class 4 Felony. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Rosenthal, Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 733. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 772, Mr. D'Amico. Please proceed."

D'Amico: "Oh, thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 772, I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. One corrects the name of the fund and 2 just clarifies the curriculum of... of the... of what 772 does. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, Amendment #2 talks about not requiring the operation of a motor vehicle. So, you're saying there's no behind the wheel for... for these individuals, just an online class or in a test?"

D'Amico: "Correct."

Reboletti: "Is that what it is?"

D'Amico: "Correct."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ives. 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 772. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 804, Representative McAsey. Please proceed."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Hopefully I can do a better job on the floor then I did in committee last night. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 804. This legislation began as a parity Bill with regard to the definition of sexual penetration. Senate Amendment #1 adds a new crime of failure to report sexual abuse of a child, and Senate Amendment #3 actually removes the changes related to the parity with sexual penetration and puts that language in the predatory criminal sexual assault of a child statute to be more inclusive with male victims. I will answers any questions and appreciate the support of the Body."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Lady's Motion. Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, we had talked about this a little bit in committee. As far as the requirement if somebody over the age of 18 witnesses this crime against a child, we... you and

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

I talked a little bit about this prior to the Bill being called, what is the requirement for that person to notify law enforcement and... and do we... do we need to reference something in a future Bill or... For legislative intent, what should we be looking at?"

McAsey: "Yes, thank you, Representative. So, this does create a new part of the Code with regard to failure to report sexual abuse of a child, but there is some question about whether there's a particular time frame. And in the future, we may address this with a trailer Bill or we may need to reference some other pending legislation. So, there... this may be resolved by some Bills that are pending related to mand... mandated reporting that grew out of the Sandusky case in Pennsylvania. So, I think in one of two ways in the future, we can address that concern."

Reboletti: "And under law enforcement, would the State's Attorneys

Office qualify as a law enforcement agency to report a crime
to?"

McAsey: "If you'll give me just a second..."

Reboletti: "Sure."

McAsey: "...to see if there's a specific reference. I don't see a specific reference to the State's Attorney's Office as I read the... the language of the Bill; however, I do know that the concern that you addressed has to do with if we have someone who is cooperating with the State's Attorney's Office, you know, that... that... we don't want them to get tripped up with regard to a failure to report sort of a thing."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

McAsey: "Thank you."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Flowers. 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 3 to House Bill 804. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 821, Representative Monique Davis. Please proceed."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 821, Senate Amendment 1 clarifies the Bill as it left the House by specifying that the court shall enter an order for certificate of innocence and expungement of the conviction as provided in the certificate of innocence. The Bill as it left the House only specifically mentioned the certificate of innocence; however, when a certificate of innocence is granted, the court also orders expungement of the conviction. These additions to the Bill clarify the current law regarding actual innocent... certificates of innocence and expungement upon proof of innocence. It also removes the need for persons who are found innocent to go through multiple legal procedures to receive these equitable benefits. I just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Ford: "Representative, I just have one quick question. Could you tell me why Reboletti's name is before mine?"

Davis, M.: "Why his name is before yours?"

Ford: "Yes."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Davis, M.: "I think he wanted it up there like that."

Ford: "I'm very happy that Reboletti is supporting this. And I..."

Davis, M.: "If you remember, we had a conference right up there and Reboletti was very helpful in helping us to get the corrected language from Senate Bill 1004? And Reboletti certainly helped us to get this Bill into perfect language and then you came aboard and helped us to get the period."

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

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sente. 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 821. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 946, Representative Yingling. Please proceed."

Yingling: "Thank you. I move for Concurrence with the Senate. The Senate has provided an Amendment to the Heroin Task Force Bill. It... it adds Members of the Senate to the task force along with two gubernatorial appointments, one from a school board association and one from a principal's association. It also moves administrative support from ISBE to the Department of Human Services. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for Concurrence. And the Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, this your first Concurrence Motion?"

Yingling: "Yes, it is."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Reboletti: "I wasn't sure if we could haze on Concurrence Motions.

  Uncle Jack Franks didn't make that clear or not. I... I do have some concerns because you and I had discussed this before about unequal representation on a task force, and now it appears that there's actually eight Democrats and only six Republicans. Is... was that a change that the Senate made?"
- Yingling: "Right. I know that that was a concern of yours and I tried to work with the Senate on that to bring it to an equal number, but this is the Amendment that came back."
- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that. I just... most other task forces have always been equal representation, obviously, this impacts everybody and their districts equally. It's not a partisan thing, I know you'll appreciate that, but I always have concerns about the differences. There should be equal members. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point that I was going to bring up was brought up by the previous speaker, and continued to be discussed by Representative Franks over there. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentleman has a good idea, and if you live in Lake County, you know why he brought it forth. And I don't want to criticize him for that, but I am going to be critical of this Amendment, because what you're telling me is, because certain members... you have certain members of... you have four Members from the Senate by the Senate President and three of the Senate Minority Leader. You're telling me that we're going to make this partisan. And that for some reason, maybe those in Republican areas are worth less than those in Democrat areas. And that's what this tells me, and I don't believe

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

that, and Representative, I don't believe... think you believe that either, but the reality is when you make this a partisan issue, you devalue the issue. And this is a very strong issue. And for that reason I'm going to be voting 'present' because I don't want to deny the underlying issue of problems with drugs in our communities, but you devalue the issue and devalue the families that I represent when you make this a partisan issue, and it's terrible, and it should not be here, but it is and we have to face it. So, Representative, I commend you for what you're trying to do, but I do not know why you're taking this Amendment forward, you should recede from the Amendment, and it's unfortunate. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I've heard some of the previous speakers, and I think Mr. Yingling's... listen, it's an eight to six breakup... breakdown here. If you look at it statistically, that's higher than the breakdown in both the Senate and the House. So, I don't think... there could be an argument that the Republicans are overrepresented. Okay. I can tell you the real life problem I had on our consolidation commission, when I had three Senate Republicans who were no longer reelected. We couldn't hold meetings for a while. So, I don't think we should be making much ado about nothing here. The fact is, is it's two to one Democrats in the Senate, not quite there here in the House. I think that the... it's fair. It's not necessarily typical, but it's certainly, I think, fair. So, I encourage an 'aye' vote. And I hope we don't make this political 'cause I don't think it

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

is at all. I think it was done not with the Sponsor's knowledge, and I think he would've probably preferred what he had originally, but I don't think this is the end of the world, and you can always add more people on to a task force if necessary. But let's not get carried away with numbers. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I would just ask a question. I'm looking at this and I was a huge proponent of this because I've had three town hall meetings already on heroin. We've had 28 kids die in DuPage County in the last year on heroin, so it's a huge issue. But in all of our town hall meetings, we included a medical professional to speak about the subject and I don't see anything like that. Is there a medical professional on this task force? I'm... I'm sorry, I'm not seeing where you are."

Yingling: "No. The intent of this task force was to bring in expert witnesses, some of which would be medical professionals to educate the Legislators."

Bellock: "But this isn't a legislative task force because you've got other people on the task force, correct? It says it's got a..."

Yingling: "Well, based upon the Amendment that was sent through by the Senate, it would allow for two gubernatorial appointments, one being from a school board association and one being from a principal's association."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Bellock: "Well, I guess that's my point. That if you're going... if it's not going to be strictly a legislative task force, and I would agree with Representative Sullivan on that. I've been on a million task forces since I've been here and I've never had one have so many more Republicans versus Democrats that I can remember, and that's another issue, but I... I have never seen that, where it wasn't evenly divided and I've done two or three task force Bills this year alone, and we always made sure it was even on both sides of the aisle on that issue, but to have a really good task force on this issue, if you're going to have Legislators and you're going to open it up to others from schools, then I would suggest a medical professional also that can talk about the real impact of heroin. Thank you. Oh."

Yingling: "I appreciate... I appreciate your opinion, and that is certainly something that we can look at in terms of making sure that we bring in medical experts. But this is about addressing the ever-growing problem of heroin usage in our districts and in our suburbs. This is not a Chicago problem. And I don't want to get bogged down in the weeds here because this is such an important issue, and we need to approve this Amendment, we need to approve this task force because that's what our constituents are expecting of us. They're expecting us to address this ever-growing problem within our youth population."

Bellock: "I thoroughly agree with you, Representative. I'm a huge proponent of the task force. I've worked with the Robert Crown Center in my area which is known for health care for young people all throughout Illinois, and they are going to do the

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

first heroin prevention program in the United States. So, I'm just saying that I think a medical person leads to more expertise on this, and I know that people... and I agree with you also, especially in the suburbs where the problem has grown so rapidly, we are the nation... national leader ...our suburbs, in heroin abuse in the entire United States. So, I agree with you on that issue, but I have two problems with this, what it's turned into. Is, I don't like it being misrepresentative and not an even division between people from both sides of the aisle, and my suggestion would just be to add another person who would be a medical personnel who could really talk strongly about the impact, 'cause we have included school professionals on our town hall meetings but we also... a medical person was extremely good and we also included a patient or a person who had gone through heroin problems on too. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill, but would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative, I like the measure. The only question that I have, is there anything in this Bill that could help deal with eradicating the drug accessibility in the communities where people are buying the drugs?"

Yingling: "Well, that is not... the Bill does not specifically address that, but what this Bill does address is looking at, not only heroin usage but how people are obtaining heroin and different approaches that potentially the State Legislator

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

can take to curb consumption of it, and then also the dealing of it."

Ford: "So, yeah, so how they attain it, and that would pretty much be certain areas. Would the Bill, once the task force take place, would identify the areas where the sales are mostly generated?"

Yingling: "That would... that would hopefully be one of the outcomes."

Ford: "Is that your wish and will you see to it that that becomes a part of the report?"

Yingling: "Sure, absolutely."

Ford: "Thank you."

Yingling: "You're welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Yingling to close."

Yingling: "First of all, this is an incredibly important issue and it's facing every one of our districts and we should not make this a political issue. And I'm more than happy to do a trailer Bill if that is what's needed to make sure that the... the Democrats and Republicans are balanced out. If that's important to some people, I'm happy to do that. What my primary focus on is addressing this increasing heroin usage rate within our youth and we have to do something about it and fighting over how many Democrats and how many Republicans are on the committee is completely irrelevant because it completely overlooks the point that we have a very serious problem that needs to be addressed. I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

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

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris, Morrison, Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 92 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 946. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1010, Mr. D'Amico. Please proceed."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1010, I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. It was added to address the concerns of the Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Basically, it simplifies that if you are in an accident that causes a fatality and you have a clean driving record, that you will be eligible for supervision. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor... First, we'll go to Mr. Reboletti." Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm sorry, it was a little loud over here. I didn't have a chance to hear you discuss the Amendment or the Concurrence."

D'Amico: "Yep. Basically, Representative, what it does is, if you are involved in an accident that causes a fatality and you do have a clean driving record, you will be eligible for supervision."

Reboletti: "And what is the... that mean by clean driving record?

You've had some previous supervisions or you've never had any dispositions on your driver's history?"

D'Amico: "Yeah. Just that your record is clean."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Reboletti: "I see that the... is the State Bar Association still opposed?"

D'Amico: "I thought they were neutral after that Amendment."

Reboletti: "I'm just showing, John, it looks like they're still opposed on..."

D'Amico: "You might be right."

Reboletti: "...on our analysis. All right. Thank you."

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? Davidsmeyer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1010. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes... nobody. House Bill 1225, Dan Burke. Please proceed."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1225. This initiative has to deal with the video that we've talked about in the original Bill that would provide training for college, pardon me, school athletes and coaches, high school athletes and coaches in the use of an AED and hands-only CPR. Be happy to answer any questions and this would provide that the Illinois High School Association would post the video on their website and certainly encourage all students and parents to view the video and hopefully be able to better aid in saving lives."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Burke yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, there was some opposition to the Bill before it went over to the Senate. Does this Amendment #2 alleviate the concerns of the Management Alliance and some others?"

Burke, D.: "As far as I know, it would."

Reboletti: "And it'd be provided free of charge now? Is that..."

Burke, D.: "It was always provided free of charge."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost. Mr. Bost withdraws his request.

Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Flowers: "Representative, does this... does your Bill have anything to do with EKG? Because studies have shown that if a EKG is given, that it could also help eliminate the... the heart attacks of so many young people."

Burke, D.: "Representative Flowers, this Bill would have to do with the training of young folks in the use of an AED which is an Automatic External Defibrillator."

Flowers: "I remember when you first did that."

Burke, D.: "Many, many years ago. We've been..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Burke, D.: "...here a long time."

Flowers: "Yes."

Burke, D.: "And literally when one would suffer cardiac arrest, the AED is the only device that would resuscitate the individual through electronic stimulus. And also, this would include a new protocol for administering CPR, Cardio

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Pulmonary Resuscitation, we are now talking about hands-only, and this is probably a good reminder to anyone that is experienced with CPR that you no longer have to give breath. You can literally do as much good resuscitating a victim of heart attack or cardiac arrest with hands-only, chest compression. But this does not have anything to do with EKGs."

Flowers: "And the website that you were talking about..."

Burke, D.: "That's the Illinois High School Association."

Flowers: "...and so that's free to anyone that wants to look at it and learn how to do the cardiac."

Burke, D.: "That is correct."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Burke, D.: "And I might take this opportunity to give a nice shout-out to the two physicians from Northwestern Hospital who, on their own, developed the video with... along with the cooperation of the medical students at Northwestern Medical School."

Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "Representative Burke, I think this has been made a much better Bill, but I just want to have assurances for myself that the school will provide notification to its staff, parents, et cetera, they may watch this video from home. It doesn't have to be done in school or during athletic practice time."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Burke, D.: "That is correct, Representative. It just exists on their website and certainly we would ask the schools to encourage parents and students and coaches to take advantage of the video on their computer at home or wherever they care to view it."
- Pihos: "Well, you've worked with the Senate Sponsor, I think you've made this a better Bill and it also allows the opportunity for anybody in the state to go to this website and have this experience which I think that's really good exposure. And I will support your Bill. Thank you."

Burke, D.: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke yields."

Osmond: "Is there any opposition to this Bill at the present time?"

Burke, D.: "No, Representative."

- Osmond: "Is this a sole... the reason for this is to further educate people in an emergency when an individual may have a heart attack?"
- Burke, D.: "Yes, Representative. As you know so well, having been the proponent for the greater use of AEDs in our society and congratulations to you and your family who have not only suffered a horrible tragedy with the loss of your husband, our prev... our former colleague, but certainly the wonderful work that you and your family has done to promote the placement of AEDs in our society. As you know so well, when one suffers cardiac arrest there's only four minutes available to resuscitate that patient."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Osmond: "And all this really does is teach them the proper... the proper way of handling an AED and the information as to how to proceed when this occurrence would happen."
- Burke, D.: "That's exactly right."
- Osmond: "Thank you very much, and thank you. You have been a proponent of this as long as I've been in this House, and I do thank you for putting me on as a cochair... a cosponsor with you. Thank you."
- Burke, D.: "Very proud and delighted to have you, Representative."

  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? Cloonen. 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 1225. And this Bill, having received the
  Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House
  Bill 2250, Representative Willis. Please proceed. Out of the
- Evans: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2269, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. This was simply a Bill to extend the Notary Act provisionals when they expire this summer. We extended it five years. Both Amendments make some technical changes. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

record. House Bill 2269, Mr. Evans. Please proceed, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mautino. 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 2269. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

declared passed. House Bill 2311, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. House Bill 22... excuse me, House Bill 2363, Mr. Sacia. Please proceed."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur on House Bill 2363. What the Concurrence Motion does, is the Amendment simply adds two more agencies to the list of state agencies who... whose employees and addresses, as well as the names and addresses of their spouses, will not be included on the list that the Comptroller's Office must compile and make available to the public each year. The two additional agencies that are being added are the Department of Juvenile Justice and the State's Attorneys Appellate Prosecutors. I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Sacia, you might want to vote for your own. 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 2363. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2382, Representative Hatcher. Please proceed."

Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Bill 2382 already passed the House with good support. The Amendment that has come back and come through committee makes it even better. IDOT is going to going to work cooperatively with both our communities and businesses. The Amendment specifically adds businesses."

66th Legislative Day

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Evans. 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 2382. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2454, Representative Fortner. Please proceed."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1. It is just a technical change. When we amended the dates for postings on the annual meeting, we missed one of the occurrences. The Senate Amendment corrects that."
- 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? Berrios, Cloonen. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2454. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2482, Mr. Cabello. Please proceed, Sir."
- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill... we're just doing a Concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482. This provides that the detailed statement required for... by the engrossment Bill must show any bonuses or increase in any salary, wages, stipend or other form of compensation. It is not subject to a collective bargaining

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

agreement regardless whether the employee receiving them is part of a collective bargaining unit. There's no opposition to this Bill. And I requestfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2482. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2647, Representative McAsey. Please proceed."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2647. The underlying Bill is the initiative of Attorney General Lisa Madigan and it deals with the consecutive sentencing in child pornography cases. What Amendment #2 does is address some concerns related to sexting and images that young people between ages 13 and 17 are sending to... on their own. So, it allows for judicial discretion with regard to that consecutive sentencing in those particular cases, retains all of the consecutive sentencing requirements for victims under age 13. So, it really goes after the worst of the worst predators. And I ask for the Body's support."

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? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2647. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2649, Mr. Arroyo. Mr. Arroyo. Out of the record. House Bill 2661, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on House Bill 2661 with Senate Committee Amendment 1. The Bill is... was heard in this chamber before. It was about the congenital heart screening test that we approved in the Senate. The department just used the opportunity to... to clean up their Newborn Screening Act with the Bill. So, there were very... a few changes made to their Act which really has no impact on the Bill at all. The essence of the Bill is the same. And I would appreciate 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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Jefferson. 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 2661. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2695, Representative David Harris. Mr. Harris. Out of the record. House Bill 2720, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the record. House Bill 2721, Mr. Rita. Out of the record. House Bill 2721, Mr. Rita. Out of

Poe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, we got to concur with Senate Amendment 1, and they added a license plate on in the Senate. It's Curing Childhood Cancer license plates and the grants go to St. Jude's Research Hospital Children's Oncology Group for the purpose of funding scientific research. So, I'd ask for a favorable vote."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Lang: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Chair recognizes Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Poe: "Yes."

Zalewski: "Ray, the board says wild turkey plates. Is that referred to the actual bird or to the whiskey?"

Poe: "It's the bird."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Poe: "That's the Bill that we passed in the House and..."

Zalewski: "It was... it was whiskey in the House and the Senate made it a bird?"

Poe: "Yeah."

Zalewski: "Okay. Thank you, Mr... Thank you, Ray."

Speaker Lang: "That's it, Sir? 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? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2754. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to House Bill 2649, Mr. Arroyo. Please proceed."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1. There was minor changes. One of the changes was the personal responsible bidder cannot be held accountable, individually accountable, and some of the fines were changed... were lowered. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, did the Amendment in the Senate remove any of the opposition?"

Arroyo: "Yes. It moves... it move most of them and the Chamber of Commerce, I think, they're neutral on it. They're not against it no more."

Reis: "So it changes the days to 28 instead of 14 then?"

Arroyo: "Yes, it did."

Reis: "And it reduces the penalty from... for the first offense to a thousand dollars instead of fifteen hundred?"

Arroyo: "Yes it does."

Reis: "Okay. We're still showing that there's still quite a few of... people in opposition. You said the Chamber went neutral?"

Arroyo: "I believe they're still opposed, but they're... some of the... two or three points that they were concerned with were put on it, but they're still against it. We made some changes for them."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative. To the Concurrence, Ladies and Gentlemen. I guess we made a very bad Bill less worse with some changes over in the Senate. We continue to hack away at businesses, require them to fill out more reports and increase fines. So, I would encourage people to look at the vote history on how they voted last time and vote accordingly. Thank you."

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? Please record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Davis, Golar, Jackson,

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Mussmans... Mussman. Please take record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2649. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. I see that Representative David Harris has returned. House Bill 2695, please proceed."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I move to concur with Senate Amendments to 2695. The Senate Amendments did this. You may recall that the Bill deals with alternative fuel vehicles. My Bill mandated that the Department of Transportation put fueling stations for electric vehicles at rest stops. What the Senate did was to make this permissive and to adopt by rule that the type... place of erection user fees which can be charged for those charging stations."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Reis: "Representative, thank you for your explanation of the Senate. My question to you is, is... is it still contained in the Bill that by January 1, 2016, that 25 percent of all vehicles purchased with state funds shall be vehicles fueled by electricity, compressed natural gas, or liquid petroleum gas?"

Harris, D.: "Yes. It doesn't… and there was some confusion I think in the initial debate. It's… beginning on or after January 1, 2016. In others words, after that point, you have to have that 25 percent level hit."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Reis: "And that wasn't a confusing point to me, I understood that perfectly. I guess my concern, to reiterate what I said earlier in the year, is that we are mandating the State of Illinois and I quess any municipality or any form of government that gets state funds, to purchase cars that may be more costly to purchase upfront, more costly to purchase in the long run, and there just may be not be enough fueling stations available to fuel these cars up with. And I asked the question to the Body, how many of you fill your own gas grill tank? You don't fill your own gas grill tank because it's dangerous. You have to be a certified LP person to fill those tanks. If this comes to being and it's... it's economical ... they change maybe some of the... the safety devices that allow people, regular citizens to go fill up their cars, then so be it. But let the free market work. As a fellow ALEC member, I think you know that they are promoting alternative fuels to come at their own pace, come at their own economic viability rather than state mandates. So, I would still encourage a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris to close."

Harris, D.: "And thank you, and just to address some of the points. First of all, it does not impact local units of government, this is strictly the State of Illinois, and the reason that the date of 2016 was put in there was indeed to allow the marketplace to come to the ability to have these vehicles available in the marketplace. If they're not available, then we can change the law. But let me give you an example, Ladies and Gentlemen, just briefly in closing. Pace, the suburban bus organization, just placed an order for 100

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

compressed natural gas buses, and they expected to pay \$550 thousand per bus. The bids came in at \$460 thousand per bus. In other words, the marketplace is indeed catching up with the demand of what is expected by alternative fuel vehicles. I think it's reasonable and I ask for a 'yes' vote."

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Hatcher, Reboletti, Thapedi. Feigenholtz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 85 voting 'yes', 32 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2695. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3010, Mr. Reboletti. Please proceed."
- Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Amendment #1. The Amendment took away a few of the… the crimes that would have been eligible, I guess they're eligible to be sealed elsewhere in the Code. And then instead… instead of having to obtain employment that the person has at least attempt to obtain employment and they can do the three-day service if the county has what is commonly referred to as a SWAP or Sheriff's Work Alternative Program. I'll take 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Hammond, Smith, Thapedi, Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3010. And this Bill, having

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3049, Representative Hernandez. Please proceed."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to concur with House Bill 3049, Senate Amendment #1. The Amendment takes the original Bill and makes two simple changes to the Latino Family Commission. It adds... adds a liaison from the Labor Department and funding may be appropriated through various state departments for the commission's purposes."

'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 116 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3049. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3112, Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill is an initiative of the Great Lakes Naval Station and School District 187, which is in my district. What this will allow for will be for instructors for our naval facility to have their families with them. Currently, most of our instructors are leaving their families behind because we do not have a quality educational system, had not had, we currently do now, and this will allow for them to have... bring their families with them to provide for our boot camp. This is the only boot camp in the United States of America and we do want to make sure that we are providing quality instructors, and we want to

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

keep them united with their families. This is a very small set—aside and it will save millions of dollars for our district. Should we not get this, we will actually lose our federal impact aid because our numbers are so low and this district simply cannot sustain that and we will basically be killing the district by not passing this Bill. I do recommend an 'aye' vote. There is no strong opposition... I'll put it like this, there's no strong opposition on the Bill. I have met with individuals from the community, the school districts, concerned parents, citizens. Everybody is pushing for this. This is something that we very much would like to move forward with. I'll accept any questions. 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. Franks. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3112. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3174, Representative Tracy. Please proceed."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Amen... Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3172. What this Amendment does is creates parity among the way we sentence juveniles and adults. And it allows the court to continue all the opportunities it has before it... them in diversion, opportunities to sentence juveniles to court supervised supervision. And there's only certain situations this is applied for. Class X Felonies and murders are not... are not within this scope of purview and

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

neither are forcible felonies. But what this does is postadjudication... the state's attorney cannot object to a court supervised supervision, and once the period of six months court supervised supervision is completed, the court can remove the adjudication of delinquency of the minor. Previously it's passed the House unanimously, the Amendment passed the Senate unanimously, and I'm asking for an 'aye' vote."

- 'yes'; opposed 'no' The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Dunkin, Hays, Unes. Mr. Unes. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3172. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk. We're going to do Agreed Resolutions, but we're not adjourning yet so don't get too excited. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Resolution 409, offered by Representative William Davis. House Resolution 410, offered by Representative Beiser. And House Resolution 412, offered by Representative Leitch."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Turning on the Calendar to the Order of Resolutions, we're going to call some that we think are ready. Page 14 of the Calendar appears HJR37, Mr. Halbrook. Please proceed, Sir."

66th Legislative Day

- Halbrook: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we're wanting to do here is designate a section of the U.S. Business 50 through the town of Lawrenceville as Trevor Pinnick Memorial Highway."
- Speaker Lang: "So, Halbrook, you have an Amendment. Is that correct?"
- Halbrook: "Yes, that was the Amendment. Like to adopt that."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Anything else to say on the Resolution, Sir?"
- Halbrook: "The Amendment says it all. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 38, Representative Flowers. Representative Flowers. Out of the record. House Resolution 80, Mr. Acevedo. Please proceed."
- Acevedo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 80 acknowledges that the population of persons 85 and older in Illinois is rising at a rapid rate. And it's projected to rise from 260 thousand in 2012 to 392 thousand in 2032. House Resolution also... 80 also states that providing home services is much less expensive than nursing home care. These services are oftentimes administered by family members. House Resolution 80 shows support for family caregivers and recognizes them as a needed profession today and in the future. The Bill also urges the Department of Aging to create a work... a work group to support family caregivers

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

and improve innovation in the field. A work group will review state policies related to family caregivers and also provide information education on home care. Be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 195, Rep... Leader Dan Burke. Please proceed. Excuse me. House Resolution 185. Thank you."
- Burke, D.: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 180 fil... 185 deals with the subject of better trade relations with the country of Cuba. I had the privilege of direct... leading a delegation to the country of Cuba last summer with a number of our colleagues here in the chamber where we discovered that that country, in fact, would probably have need of every single product that our state would produce. This Resolution would encourage greater trade relations and call for a working group which will consist of business, government, education, cultural, as well as the arts, to promote better relationship with Cuba, and certainly we hope as a result of that, maybe at some point in time encourage the Congress to eliminate this outrageous embargo that has not done a thing for humanity, literally, has hurt human beings. And I would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 214, Mr. Hoffman. Please proceed."

66th Legislative Day

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 214 is an initiative of the Leadership Council of Southwestern Illinois and the Southwestern Illinois Building Trades. There's going to be much work done on the levees of the Mississippi River in our area. The Southwestern Illinois Flood Prevention Project is using public taxpayers' dollars and this simply urges the Corp of Engineers to enter into a Project Labor Agreement."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Now, we come to the Order of Bellock. House Resolution 221, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And what this Resolution does is, it talks about raising the awareness of CRE which is a germ caused infection and it's lethal in some cases. I know years ago we did the MRSA legislation and raised the awareness of that before anybody knew. CRE, you'll start reading about in magazines across the country. It's the superbug of the new decade. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 222, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And House Resolution 222 designates November 4, 2013 as Heroin Abuse Awareness Day in the State of Illinois. I ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 230, Representative Bellock."

66th Legislative Day

- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 230 is the Diabetes Awareness Day and... Diabetes Awareness Month in Illinois. And I would just like to mention, you know, all that Representative Tryon, Representative Durkin, Representative Cross, and Representative Soto has done for diabetes in the State of Illinois in raising awareness to that."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 246, Representative Berrios."
- Berrios: "Mr... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 246 is asking the Federal Government to consider accepting Poland's application for the Visa Waiver Program. The U.S. Visa Wavier Program allows passport holders from membership countries to visit the United States from up to 90 days without a U.S. visa. Poland has been one of the longest in queue waiting for membership. Poland is also one of the most stable European allies of the United States and has stood by us during different wars. And in Chicago, we have the highest population of Poles outside of Warsaw, Poland. I've actually talked with many people who have not been able to have their family members here for weddings, others have spent over \$800 just to have... try to get their grandparents to come visit, all being denied. So accepting Poland would not only create tourism and add to our industry, but it will also strengthen our relationship with Poland. I'd ask for your support."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 247, Mr. Unes."
- Unes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 247 very simply proclaims the month of May as Motorcycle Awareness Month. This is something that this Body traditionally does for the month of May and as we all know there's been way too many motorcycle accidents and it's good for us to raise awareness. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 263, Representative Hurley."
- Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to designate May as Asthma Awareness Month in Illinois. Asthma has reached epidemic proportions in the United States affecting an estimated 26 million people. And asthma is the leading cause of childhood hospitalizations in Illinois. I would like its adoption and appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor or the Resolution will say 'yes; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 270, Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 270 gives the statistics on autism disorders and designates April 17, 2013 as Autism Day in the State of Illinois. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 275, Representative Walsh."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was not too long ago that we were here in this very chamber as the tragic events took place in Boston were unfolding before our eyes. Today, I'd like to rise with a heart full of mourning, but I also rise to honor all those fearless people who waited in the aftermath of this terrible event and brought those who performed those heinous acts to justice. Four people were killed on April 15, more than 170 were wounded, many still remain in critical condition. To all the families who lost their children and to all those that were injured and wear the wounds of tragedy, to all the citizen heroes, the first responders, those who acted with courage in the midst of chaos, no one can replace what the City of Boston has lost. And so, today I rise to remember those lives of those that were lost, to support those who survived and to honor those who served. Today, we remember Martin Richard, and eight-year-old boy who loved to place soccer, hockey and baseball in his neighborhood in Dorchester. We remember Krystle Campbell, who grew up in Medford and never missed a marathon. We remember Lingzi Lu, who came to the United States from China to study statistics, and we remember Sean Collier, who wanted to serve and protect as his gift to the world. I know their loved ones, friends and family and everyone around this great country will never forget them. To those who were injured on the 15th of April, know that we are here for you in the State of Illinois. May God bless those who have gone and leave them at peace. And I would respectfully ask that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors of this Resolution, and I ask that we take a moment of silence."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh moves that all Members of the House be named as cosponsors. Is there leave? Leave is granted. We'll take a moment of silence. Thank you. Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 280, Representative Hernandez."
- Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 280 urges Congress to initiate the Farm Bill, which strengthens and protects the federal dollars that deal with food and nutrition programs, and it also poses the reduction stores, the federal and state food safety nets funding. Those cuts would limit access to make it much more difficult for families in need of food security. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 291, Representative Jakobsson."
- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 291 designates the month of May of 2013 as Foster Parent Appreciation Month in the State of Illinois. Each year more than 4 thousand children, who have been abused or neglected, cannot remain in their homes and these children need and deserve the temporary safe haven of a foster family where they can be protected, nurtured, and loved. Without these volunteer foster pare... families, the Illinois Department of Family and Children's Services wouldn't be able to provide and fulfill its mission to provide for the well-being of the nearly 15 thousand children currently in its care. I urge an 'aye' vote."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 296, Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Resolution instructs the Illinois Student Assistant Commission to form a task group to continue the work that was started in investigating the Monetary Award Program to form a working group to examine the best practices for academic advising of higher education students who are monetary award recipients. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gent... Excuse me. Mr. Dunkin rises."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just curious, this is... this legislation deals with the Monetary Award Program, correct?" Pritchard: "Correct."

Dunkin: "Is there a reason it didn't come through..."

Pritchard: "So... so, the 97th General Assembly formed a task force to look at the Monetary Award Program and how is was awarded. One of their recommendations found that MAP recipients might prosper and be more likely to graduate if there was some advising in terms of academic as well as financial help. But they didn't bring any closure to what that recommendation would be. This working group will complete the work of that task force."

Dunkin: "So, why... why do we need a task force to... to come up with best practice?"

66th Legislative Day

- Pritchard: "This is... this isn't a task force. It's a working group that the Illinois Student Assistant Commission will... will bring together, having experts in student advising, both financial and academic, and they'll come up with some standards and best practices that we'll recommend to other universities who have MAP recipients."
- Dunkin: "Well, according to my analysis, at least reading the text of it, it's whereas a text... a task force member is also noted that additional school provided support for MAP recipients, et cetera. All this is under the... the structure of a task force. It says the task force reported to the General Assembly and commission with its finding on December 31 of 2012. So what's the tie in with the work group? What's the difference from the work group and the task force?"
- Pritchard: "So, the work group will be experts that the Illinois Student Assistant's Commission will bring in, so there's a little different organization if you will, and they're trying to rely on the best practices that individuals have experienced in their universities and try to bring that expertise to helping MAP recipients be more successful."
- Dunkin: "So, how do we capture that actually, given the fact that those individuals who receive the MAP money over... well over a hundred thousand students, they're not even obligated to stay within the State of Illinois where they receive this additional money on top of their Pell grant, on top of their Stafford or their school's financial aid. They're not even required to stay in the State of Illinois. How is it that we're going to reach out to the masses where they can go to a private school, a public school, or a for-profit school?

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

How do we realistically capture those students and really give structured and critical advice on having them maximize or profit from their monetary award experience?"

Pritchard: "The Illinois Student Assistant Commission already sets standards and expectations of recipients and their recipient schools. This is just an extension of that."

Dunkin: "I don't see how it is that we... today we give almost \$380 million to this Monetary Award Program, correct?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Dunkin: "But we don't have any tangible or trackable or traceable..."

Pritchard: "So, this will set up..."

Dunkin: "...return on investment that we can..."

Pritchard: "...some kind of standard. What that will look like is up to this working group, but that is the intent in my conversations with the Illinois Student Assistant Commission, is that they will look at some kind of reporting requirement so that we can put the best practices out for the universities and the students and then do some tracking that they are complying."

Dunkin: "Can we also put on there... them having to put... for every year, for example, that they receive the monetary award, that they spend a year, year and a half, in the State of Illinois so we can really reap the benefits of every turn on investment?"

Pritchard: "That might be a good suggestion. That goes a little bit beyond the intent that we have here."

Dunkin: "Well, outside of you communicating with them, what's the... I mean, how do you maximize this? It seems that this is

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

just another working group/task force. How do you truly maximize on this... with this working group, given you have people that go to... to all these kind of colleges, private, for-profit, how do we really take advantage of this?"

Pritchard: "I'm not sure I understand your question. How do we take advantage of what?"

Dunkin: "Right. When they give the advice..."

Pritchard: "Correct."

Dunkin: "...they're going to be... we're going to be just be talking to professional to professional? How is this going to translate to the student?"

Pritchard: "Well, that's what the working group will come up with.

But the task force that we had in the 97th General Assembly,
in their discussions, came to the conclusion that if students
had more advice, there would be more likelihood that they
would be successful and they would progress and then they
would graduate. And therefore, the state's investment in
those monetary awards would be more productive."

Dunkin: "So, what is ISAC..."

Pritchard: "The goal here is to get more of the MAP students to progress and to graduate. There are best practices for advising those students, and for the students to take advantage of that advice. That's what we're trying to deal with here."

Dunkin: "So, okay, point taken. What advice is going on right now that students should be taking advantage of? In other words, are you also implying with this that maybe we're allocating almost \$400 million today and we're not getting a particular

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

return on investment and/or the students are not profiting from this..."

Pritchard: "I would just say that if we had a better advising system that the students took advantage of, we would get more return on the dollars we invest. So, I'm trying to improve what we're getting over today."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kosel: "MAP grants are a wonderful thing. They have one flaw in my opinion, and that is that they are not academically tested. Will this task force be looking at the possibility of academic requirements for MAP grants?"

Pritchard: "That's not within the scope that we're asking this working group to address."

Kosel: "I'm sorry to hear that. I think it's something that absolutely needs to be done. Thank you very much."

Pritchard: "If you look at the working groups report, they do have comments in there that deal with the qualifications of students, but those implenta... those recommendations, as I understand it, aren't being implemented today."

Kosel: "And why would that be?"

Pritchard: "I... you would have to ask ISAC for that."

Kosel: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Hammond: "Representative Pritchard, I would like to commend you on bringing this Resolution forward, and I am very proud to be a cosponsor with you on this. You know, all too often here we create task force, but to my knowledge, Representative Pritchard, is this one of the few task force that actually is going on to further to form a working group to actually take action on the recommendations of the task force?"

Pritchard: "Well, the monetary award task force came up with many creative ideas, and I think the Student Assistant Commission is considering some of those. This is one of those ideas that they came up with that we want to further develop and then implement."

Hammond: "And certainly there were a number of suggestions made by that task force that I think, going forward, we can address in other ways, similar to other task force, for example, dealing with health care and ambulance service and that kind of thing. But as I see it, Representative, this to me is a collaborative effort between ISAC, IBHE and the institutions. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "Correct."

Hammond: "Okay. I want to thank you very much for bringing it forward, Representative."

Pritchard: "And thank you for cosponsoring."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, M.: "Representative Pritchard, I just have a couple of questions. In reference to ISAC coming up with advising and support programs, are you saying that ISAC will do it or they

66th Legislative Day

- will have those who assist students do it? I, mean, exactly what do you have in mind?"
- Pritchard: "So they will form a working group of professionals in the field of advising students to come up with the best practices. They will then share those best practices with universities that have MAP recipients and will then work to capture data to make sure that these students are receiving the advice and therefore, more likely to progress and graduate."
- Davis, M.: "You know, I find that many times at a university, perhaps because of their limited income, they may not offer certain subjects, enough of them I should say, to the degree where a student can quickly take them and graduate. Sometimes a student has to stay another year, another semester, because the courses he or she needs are not available."
- Pritchard: "So, you raise a good point that is a challenge to a lot of students. We're trying to address that, as you know, with the performance-based funding for our public universities and community colleges, where we're trying to encourage the best practices which would include the offering of courses but more importantly, advising of students so they take courses in the proper sequence and do get the required subjects without a lot of superfluous hours of credit."
- Davis, M.: "Representative, where... where would you see proprietary schools falling within this task force's duties?"
- Pritchard: "It is up to the Student Assistant Commission to form the working group, but I am told they have already been in consultation with the private colleges as well as the publics, the four-year, as well as the community college and will be

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

drawing a broad base of advice in drafting these procedures and best practices."

Davis, M.: "Do kids get MAP grant money to go to proprietary schools?"

Pritchard: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "And some of these schools don't necessarily give their... perhaps the best advice that they should have to graduate on a timely basis. Is that correct?"

Pritchard: "Well, certainly we're trying to improve the results of our students that receive the Monetary Award Program. We're trying to develop best practices and then as I said, share that with all the recipient institutions so that students will be more likely to graduate."

Davis, M.: "The only other thing that I think you left out was student advice on loans. Sometimes taking loans can be very damaging to the future of students, and I don't think they realize at the time that those federal loans are not... you can't bankrupt them, and many times, if the interest is very high and you get out of college and can't find a job, you still have to pay those loans back. So I don't see where you mentioned anything about finance for the kids. Aren't we more concerned with... also, I should say, aren't we also concerned with that?"

Pritchard: "We certainly are, and that is the intent. This Resolution may not specifically spell out the fact that there would be financial aid professionals contributing, but that is the intent of ISAC in forming this group that we will be advising students on not only academic issues but also financial aid issues as well."

66th Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "Thank you. I really appreciate you coming forward with this. However, I would be very appreciative to know who the members of the task force would be to make sure they represent the geographic areas of all of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."
- Pritchard: "Sure."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Resolution 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. Bost, Morrison, Rosenthal. Morrison. Please take the record. On this question, there 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair would like to acknowledge the presence of a former Member, the Director of the Department of Agriculture, Bob Flider, back in the Democratic side over here. Mr. Morrison."
- Morrison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We voted on the Bill in the past, HB827. I voted 'no' and I would like to be recorded as a 'yes', if possible."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Representative Ives."
- Ives: "I, too, Mr. Speaker, would like to be recorded as a 'yes'
  vote on HB827."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. HJR38, Representative Flowers. Please proceed, Representative."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. HR38 creates the Return to Illinois Prosperity Commission for the purpose of evaluating the creation of the Illinois State Bank. The joint commission shall review and evaluate the creation of the Illinois State Bank and make a

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

report to the General Assembly by December 31. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions, and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Resolution. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, how will creating a state bank return Illinois to prosperity?"

Flowers: "Well, I'm glad you asked that question, Representative. Right now, Illinois has different funds and the money is not placed in one central location, that's number one. Number two, our money is not working for Illinois, and by creating our own state bank, we can begin to have the conversation on how to make sure that our money is working for the people and not for the shareholders. But more importantly, more importantly, the purpose of this commission is to have the discussion on how to restore prosperity to the State of Illinois."

Reis: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Flowers has been very passionate in her wishes to create a state bank in the State of Illinois. I guess I would ask the question to everyone, what has the government done right? We've had this discussion in Financial Institutions, about any other committee that the Bill can get assigned to, and many times it doesn't even come up for a vote and if it does, we vote it down. The government should not be involved in the banking business. We don't have money laying around; we can't manage the money that the taxpayers give us. And it's just

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

something that State Government should not be involved with. So, we don't need to create a task force to see about Illinois creating a state bank. Look at the postal service, look at Amtrak, look at any other thing that the government has gotten into that really should be handled by the private sector. They've messed it up. So, I would encourage a 'no' vote and Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call on this and should it receive the number of votes, request a verification."

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

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. Maybe we should have a state bank because we could borrow billions of dollars from that state bank to pay all the bills off that we have the seven and a half billion dollars, and maybe we could put all that money back in the pensions that were taken out in previous General Assemblies. I'm not sure really what a lot of the things we do here that actually have been working to Representative Reis's comments. If we can't manage our... paying our own bills, I can only imagine how we'd... we would manage people's bank accounts. And when they would go to the bank, they'd find out that their money had been swept in some special Bill that would've been filed and that we'd have to replace that swept money with some type of interest payments. So, I appreciate the Lady's opportunities here to try to change some things; I know she's very passionate about it. I just can't imagine how this would work. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Kay: "Representative, I think I have seen an iteration of this Resolution in committee several times. Do you recall all the dot dialogue we've had, the debate we've had on the state bank?"

Flowers: "Are you talking about the first one, the second one or the third one?"

Kay: "Well, you know, there's... let's just start here."

Flowers: "Right, let's..."

Kay: "How... how many... how many banks, whether they're state chartered or federal chartered banks, do we have in the State of Illinois?"

Flowers: "You know, Representative, I cannot answer that question. I don't know how many banks we have, but I can answer this. We do not have a state bank, that's number one, and I just want to comment on some of the... the comments that were made earlier in regards to government being involved. We are already involved in banking. We spend \$85 billion a year with no returns on our dollars. And other people... the CEOs of the banks get to reap the benefits, not the people of the State of Illinois. And to the last speaker, I agree with him 100 percent. Maybe if we did have our own state bank, we would be able to borrow money and we could pay ourselves back at a cheaper rate. We would not have to borrow or tax the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. I agree with him 100 percent in regards to our pension. If we did have our state bank, we would have enough money to pay down on a pension rather than taking away the services from the promise that we made to other hard working people whom we..."

Kay: "Mary, Mary."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Flowers: "...said that if you..."

Kay: "Mary, Mary..."

Flowers: "...were to play by these rules..."

Kay: "I just have a couple..."

Flowers: "...this is the money that you will get."

Kay: "...I just have a couple of simple questions. I know how you feel and you just told me again, so let me... let me go back to some basics here. How we going to fund this bank?"

Flowers: "We're going to fund it with the money that we have and instead of it going to other banks to... to satisfy its shareholders, it will come to the Illinois State Bank first and then it will be disseminated to those other banks."

Kay: "That's curious. What... I think I just heard you say is, that the taxpayers are going to fund this bank. Is that pretty much correct?"

Flowers: "Let me just answer you in a different way, Representative, because the sole purpose of this Resolution, because I am not a banker, is to answer the question that we all have. How is it that North Dakota has been successful for a hundred years or more? How is it that North Dakota is the only state that haven't had to raise taxes? How is it that North Dakota's banks have been the only state whereas that those banks have not had to go under..."

Kay: "Okay."

Flowers: "...and none of the North Dakotan..."

Kay: "Okay. I..."

Flowers: "...peoples had to bail..."

Kay: "...I hear..."

Flowers: "...them out?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Kay: "...I hear North Dakota, but I think North Dakota has some fracking going for them there and they got a lot of money going into their treasury. So, but let me..."

Flowers: "And we are..."

Kay: "...let me ask..."

Flowers: "...bigger than..."

Kay: "Mary, Mary..."

Flowers: "...than North Dakota."

Kay: "...Mary, Mary, settle down a second. Let me ask you a couple
 of more questions."

Flowers: "I'm trying to answer your question."

Kay: "I'm... I'm trying... I'm trying to find out here who is going
to assume the risk on bad loans?"

Flowers: "You know, Representative, I'm glad you asked that question, because it has been we, the taxpayers, that have assumed the risk of the bad loans of the banks. It has been we been we, the taxpayers, that have assumed the loans or the bad risk of the insurance companies. We have assumed a lot of private businesses' risk. So, does that answer your question?"

Kay: "No, it... it really doesn't. I... I guess I have one final... or maybe two final questions. In your banking scenario, you put the taxpayer at risk with taxpayer dollars with no, no return whatsoever, and that's not a good business plan for the state. Previous Representatives, I think, have pretty well ran down the track record that we have in the State of Illinois for doing things right financially and our record in that regard is pretty poor. I have no reason to think that a universal state bank funded by the taxpayers has one chance to do

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

anything besides assume risk the taxpayers would have to pay for and do nothing else. So, I think this is a bad plan. You and I have talked about this many times. I hope everyone in the Body votes 'no' for it because it should go nowhere. Thank you."

Flowers: "Representative, I just want...

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "I want to answer the last Gentleman and say to you, Representative, that all of your questions are very good questions. They are questions that deserve to be answered by the professional people, and that is the purpose of this task force. No one should be opposed to returning the State of Illinois to prosperity. North Dakota has been doing it for years and everything that North Dakota has, we have more and we can do better. And it's with this task force, Sir, this task force is the one that we should be asking these questions to and they're the ones that should be answering. And if they say no, then it's no, but at least... can we at least have a discussion? That's all. Because the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, they're tired. Their paychecks are getting smaller and their tax bills are getting higher. They cannot afford to expand their businesses because the banks won't loan. They cannot afford to send their kids to college because the rates is too high. They cannot remodel their homes; they can't do anything. So, I'm asking you to please help me return the State of Illinois to prosperity by passing this Resolution. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Well, that was a nice close, but there's still three people waiting to speak, Representative. I thought you

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

were responding to Mr. Kay. That's all right. So now you don't have to close when we get back to you, right? Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will answer your questions but not close again."

Harris, D.: "Representative, who's on this commission?"

Flowers: "I'm sorry, Representative."

Harris, D.: "Who... who would be on the... the commission or the task force that you're setting up?"

Flowers: "Well, I would start with you, because I think you're very brilliant."

Harris, D.: "Well, as I read the... as I read the... the text, it says that there will be two Members of the House, there would be Members too from the... members... of the public knowledgeable about the state's banking sector that would be appointed by the House, two Members of the Senate as well as members from the public appointed by the Senate, knowledgeable about the state's banking sector and economy, similarly with... from the Governor's Office you have people who are knowledgeable about the state's banking sector and the economy. Folks, I'm here to tell you, I believe that anyone in his right mind in the State of Illinois, liberal, conservative, Republican, Democrat who thinks that setting up a Illinois State Bank is a good idea is crazy. However, the Lady has a point, she's simply asking for a task force or a commission to be set up hopefully for people who have knowledge of the state's banking sector. Anyone who has knowledge of the state's banking sector is going to look at the State of Illinois and say you guys

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

are \$7 billion in debt, you can barely balance your budget, you've got a... you've got a credit rating that's in the toilet, why in the world would we set up a state bank? So, the members of this group would probably reach that same... that same conclusion, but in fairness, let them reach that same conclusion. With all due respect to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who are strongly opposed, this is not a Resolution that says do one, this is simply one that says study it. So, let the folks go out there and study it. Hopefully they will... they will be people of good knowledge and come back and say, dumb idea, don't do it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course she does."

Davis, M.: "Representative Flowers, you said that this... the state that has one is South Dakota or North Dakota?"

Flowers: "North Dakota."

Davis, M.: "Pardon?"

Flowers: "North Dakota."

Davis, M.: "North Dakota has the set up. Is that state fiscally solvent or are they in great debt?"

Flowers: "Oh, no, Representative, they are very solvent. They have not raised taxes. Their banks have not closed. They have expanded their businesses. It's just a wonderful state to live in."

Davis, M.: "Representative, if we had a state bank, would people be mandated to use just that bank or could they use any other bank they choose or the state bank?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Flowers: "Representative, they would be able to use the state bank if they so choose to, or they could continue business as usual with their own bank."
- Davis, M.: "Someone asked the question, Representative, of where would the money come from, and I think they should know where the real... where any bank's money comes from. It comes from deposits. We put our money in banks. We either have savings accounts, we have CDs, we have investors, but if we had a state bank, Representative, what kind of savings on interest payments do you think we could achieve?"
- Flowers: "Representative, right now, I don't know what the interest rates are, but I guarantee you that the banks get their money cheaper from the Federal Reserve than we, the taxpayers, could get from the banks."

Davis, M.: "Well, what happens..."

Flowers: "And the banks..."

Davis, M.: "I'm just... I just want to say, there's a cost to debt. When you borrow money from private banks, there's a huge cost and this state is paying a huge cost for the borrowing that has taken place. It is not necessarily the principle that gives you this great debt, it is the constant going of the interest on the debt. It is the interest that's growing. But some people just don't like the idea of the state not operating with private industry. Now, let me give you an example. If all the people only wanted to use one restaurant in Illinois, would that be wise or feasible? No."

Flowers: "No, it would not, Representative."

Davis, M.: "No, because, for example, we have many restaurants, we have many furniture stores, so we could also have many

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

banks as we do, and one of them could be a state-owned bank. Now, of course, a state-owned bank, those who are investors in current banks wouldn't want that to happen because they would be losing some of the revenue they earned from being investors in those banks. But those of us who really care about making Illinois solvent, those of us who realize it is possible, it is possible to make Illinois solvent. We recognize that this may be a novel idea, but it is certainly a good idea. Representative, would you be willing, first of all, to add me as a cosponsor on this Resolution?"

Flowers: "Oh, of course, Representative. I'll be more than happy to."

Davis, M.: "And the other question I have is, imagine when schools have to borrow, if they had to borrow from a state bank, how much more reasonable that would be than from a privately owned bank? I mean, I just... I'll just speak to the Bill... to the Resolution, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think that all of us get very used to doing what we normally do. We're used to the names of those wonderful big banks. We're used to the big fat interest payments that we have to pay if you have a mortgage or if you have to borrow to pay for a car, or if you have a home equity loan, so all of these conditions would continue, only your state would be the recipient of those dollars. Instead of a private bank being the recipient, your state would be the recipient of those dollars, and I don't think that's too farfetched. Now, I don't want us to have to wait 'til our children come down here to replace us that we realize that the State of Illinois does not have to be in debt. We can be just as solvent as North Dakota, we can be just as

66th Legislative Day

- solvent as... No? Okay. We can be just as solvent as North Dakota. And my final question to you, Representative, is, do you think the task force... are you forming a task force?"
- Flowers: "This... this is calling for... this Resolution is calling for a task force."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. Do you think the task force could also provide financial literacy for those of us in this room today? Many of us need financial literacy lessons. All we know is how to pay. We make a few bucks and then we pay. We make a few dollars and then we pay. So, we need financial literacy so that we will know, regardless to where you're putting your income, you have an opportunity to save a little more, to get a little more back and to have a solvent state. The State of Illinois can be solvent. We don't have to read about all these debts that are unpaid, all of these doctor bills that are past due. We don't have to read about we got to put enough money wherever we have to put it to pay these past due bills. We could... those... those dollars we're using to pay debt service could now be used to pay for the things we use that money for. So..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Representative. Now you have their attention."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've said my best... Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just think it would be extremely wise for the Illinois Legislature... Legislators to realize that a task force will merely provide us with information on what it will mean for the State of Illinois to own its own bank. I would be very proud to take my checks, as small as they have become, and put them into a state bank. I would be proud to

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

say I have an account at Illinois State Bank. Would that preclude me from having accounts at some of the others? Certainly not. But it would just give us another choice. It would give us a choice to make sure our children are not saddled with the debt that we have today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and thank you, Representative Flowers."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brown."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves that the previous question be put.

Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

And the previous question is put. Representative Flowers to close a second time."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And you know, this is a very, very serious matter for the people of State of Illinois. And I hope you really take this Resolution very serious, and what this task force is... is... is the task force responsibility to at least have the discussion on if a bank is viable, a state bank is viable here in the State of Illinois. We have to remember that the banks survive, these banks are surviving today off of our fees, off of our money. And so many people have said, well, what is government doing or government can't run banks. Well, I just want to let you know that some bankers can't run banks either. And I just want you to ... I want you to know ... I want you to know that every month we're sending \$85 billion... I'm sorry... \$85 billion a month in quantitative easing to the Federal Reserve to do as they so choose to do. It's about time that we put the people first. Please vote 'yes' for House Joint Resolution 38 and let the task force have a discussion

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

on if we could do what North Dakota has been doing for a hundred years and have our own state bank. This is not a mandate; this is a mere suggestion. And I would really appreciate your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady's moved for the adoption of the Resolution. Mr. Reis has asked for a verification. Members will be at their own desks and vote their own switches. Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Jackson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 49 voting 'yes;, 67 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. And does Mr. Reis withdraw his verification? And the Resolution fails. The Chair recognizes Representative Flowers. Turning to page... Excuse me. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Go ahead, Sir."

Bost: "Thank you. You know, I think that North Dakota was brought up several times. I believe that North Dakota does many things right, many, many things, especially the fact they've been Republican controlled since 1993."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for sharing, Sir. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1723. Please read the Bill. Leader Currie."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Currie."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move that we adopt Amendment 3 and then discuss the Bill as amended on Third Reading."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. Excuse me. 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 for a third time."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill is a response to audit findings that suggest that the Illinois Arts Council wasn't always including public members in decisions about where to put public art. With good help from Representative Kosel, we've amended the Bill so as to clarify that the new procedures apply only when CDB is doing a project, not a local school board or a local community council and also, that the construction must be ... itself must be worth more than a million. There was lack of clarity in the original language that made it seem as if the art itself might be that, so the Arts Council will work with the designing architect, with members of the Illinois State Museum and the receiving agency to designate that one half of one percent of the arts should be devoted to art work in a public building. There's a further Section in the Bill which picks up a Bill that didn't move this Session that has to do with how the Capital

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Development Board works with its design-build committee making sure that the membership is full and making sure that if associations that are able to nominate people to participate don't do it, then the Capital Development Board itself will do it. I know of no opposition. I would be grateful for your support for the Bill and I'm very grateful to Representative Kosel for the improvement she made in the language."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative Currie, would it be safe to assume that any school construction project is probably going to be over a million dollars and that they would get their money from CDB?"

Currie: "They would... this Bill only applies to those projects that are actually done by the Capital Development Board, and my understanding is that that does not include school buildings."

Reis: "CDB oversees all of our school construction projects."

Currie: "Well, I am told that when it comes to that kind of construction, this language would not apply. I worked with Representative Kosel and I think she was satisfied by CBD's language that this will not affect school buildings or civic centers or local municipal halls."

Reis: "Well, I guess, in your opinion, what would... what would it apply to then?"

Currie: "Well, if there were a new State of Illinois building, if there were some kind of office... state office building constructed in Rockford or Peoria or what have you, then that

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

would be covered if the cost of construction were more than a million dollars."

- Reis: "Okay. And I know, Representative Kosel came back to us in caucus yesterday and explained that they're... you had been amenable to some changes, but when we took it a step further, all of us have had school construction projects that have, for one reason or another, not went along at the speed at which we thought they would, so we're in contact with CDB. And I guess for everyone in the Body here, I think it's the last thing that we would want to do, is all of our schools and our project... in our districts would have the chairman of the Illinois Arts Council tell us what we could and could not hang. And if... if schools are truly exempt, then okay."
- Currie: "They are. Schools are truly exempt. And if they were not exempt, she'd already be engaged in establishing what art work goes into your schools."

Reis: "That may be, but this would give her sole discretion."

- Currie: "Well... but I think the reality is, she is not engaged in defining art for purposes of school buildings in Illinois, not today and not after passage of this Bill."
- Reis: "Okay. I want to... take you for your word, Leader, and I just... I think that would bring a lot of concerns to a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle that, basically, one person could just say yes or no as to what we hang. Kind of funny yesterday, I got a school... a call from a constituent saying the Ten Commandants wasn't in a certain building. I mean, that's very important to the people in my district and I wouldn't want someone from Chicago telling me that we could not have that in our schools. So, thank you."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Currie: "Well, CDB assures me that my explanation is accurate, so it isn't going to happen today in your school and it won't tomorrow."

Reis: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "As I'm reading our analysis, Representative, is there a dollar amount certain that needs to be spent? Is there a requirement..."

Currie: "Yeah. It's one... that's ended up that that's already part of State Law, one half of one percent..."

Franks: "Okay."

Currie: "...of the cost of construction for state buildings goes into the purchase of works of arts."

Franks: "Okay. So, that's already mandated?"

Currie: "That's already mandated."

Franks: "Okay. So for every million dollars, you have to spend five thousand bucks?"

Currie: "Right."

Franks: "Okay. So, what does this Bill do different?"

Currie: "What this does is respond to audit findings in which some... sometimes when establishing what art work would go into a CDB construction project, there is supposed to be local participation. Frequently the county board didn't appoint somebody or the municipality didn't, sometimes the building wasn't even in a municipality, so what we're doing is to say that you don't have to have that kind of local participation in order to go forward. The audit findings were that there

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

were some projects in which there was nobody local who was involved. Now, under... under this... this language, the Arts Council would be working with the designing architect, with the Illinois State Museum, and with the receiving agency. And I'm informed that when there is a public works project, frequently the local community does get involved and sometimes helps raise money to build a better work of art than would have been possible under the one half percent rule."

Franks: "I was going to ask is there any provision they're allowed for possibly a loan. You mentioned the Illinois State Museum and others that are involved. Could some of their works of art be placed on loan in some of these... in some of these buildings and could that count for the one half of one percent if you look at the value of that work of art?"

Currie: "I don't believe so. There can be loan projects, I know that. I've had in my office, from time to time, works from the State Library that had been on loan to me, but I don't believe that that would satisfy the one half of one percent requirement."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just trying to think outside the box. But that makes sense of what you're trying to do."

Currie: "I love it when you think outside the box."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kosel: "I want to thank her for working with me on part of this Bill that... that we were able to get... to get some clarification

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

on. I was very, very concerned that this would open the door to all kinds of construction and all kinds of ... kinds of intrusions into local schools. And... and she... we do have some language I think that really does clarify that part. But let me tell you that I am still very concerned about some other parts of the Bill. In the original part of the Bill we had three local people that would participate in the selection of the art projects that would go to the Capital Development Board and that Capital Development Board multiple people would make the final selection. Under this Bill, the art projects... the number of local people is limited down to one, not three, and them they pick three projects and then the final project is selected by the chairperson of the Arts Council. We have a very good Arts Council chairman now. I don't know if that will always be true in the future, and so I'm concerned about the lack of community participation in it, and I am concerned about the future going forward that this rests in just one person instead of a board. I'm willing to work on seeing if we can get more community involvement. I understand that that was a problem in the past, that people weren't made appointments, but... but I am still concerned about it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This was, as I say, in response to an audit finding. There often were not locals who participated. The chairman of the Arts Council or his or her designee will be working closely with the designing architect, with the Illinois State Museum, and with the receiving agency before selecting an appropriate work of

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

art. And remember, too, that frequently the community decides to participate by helping to raise money so that you can spend even more than that one half of one percent. This is cleanup language. I would appreciate your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Durkin, Kay, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Zalewski: "I'm sad to report that the... for the second and consecutive game, the Cubs have prevailed upon the White Sox. So, hopefully everyone can rebound tonight and we can urge the Blackhawks to a game seven victory over the Detroit Red Wings and get them to the next round of the NHL playoffs."

Speaker Lang: "Returning to Resolutions, House Resolution 301, Mr. Sims. Please proceed."

Sims: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 301 recognizes Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity Incorporated for its annual Alpha Phi Day at the Capitol. For 106 years, Alpha Phi Alpha has served as the voice for the voiceless as the first African-American fraternity for... fraternity here in the co... in the United States. And we want to recognize May 8, 2013 as Alpha Phi Alpha Day here in the State of Illinois."

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted.

  Returning to House Resolution 299, Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. House Resolution 299 is the Gang Violence Task Force, gives an extension. It will be making a report back to the General Assembly on October 15, so we can take any legislative action for Veto Session if necessary. I'd urge your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Burke, Durkin, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 303, Mr. Martwick. Please proceed."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 303 honors and mourns the passing of Eddie Blazonczyk. Eddie Blazonczyk was a Chicago native who was nominated for 14 Grammies, received one for his album Another Polka Celebration. He, at one point, toured with Buddy Holly and others. He is... he passed away at the... last year, and this Resolution would honor his life and his... and mourn his passing and it would establish his song Polka Celebration as the official polka song of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "We all hope he will."

Davis, W.: "Representative, I remember when you were walking around soliciting support for this Resolution. I thought in

66th Legislative Day

- response to my support that you were going to do something. Did I misunderstand?"
- Martwick: "Well, there were a number of Representatives who... who actually requested to dance the polka when we passed this. However, I just thought given the busyness of our schedule, the lateness of the hour, it might be best to dispense with that."
- Speaker Lang: "It's important to keep decorum in the chamber, Representative."
- Martwick: "Well, that's true."
- Davis, W.: "I would just simply argue, and I appreciate what you just said, but I think we might actually need that kind of break right now. What do you think?"
- Martwick: "I... I don't think perhaps the Clerk would approve of such a measure."
- Speaker Lang: "We could all vote 'present' on your Resolution.

  Those in favor of the Gentleman's... Excuse me. Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Just so the Sponsor would know, if you would dance the polka, it would not be the first political career that has been ruined by dancing the polka."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is thankfully adopted. House Resolution 306, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 306 is calling on Congress to support Congresswoman Karen Bass' Resolution in regards to Student Loan Fairness Act of 2013 in support of that Bill which would create a 10 by 10 standard for loans repayment where an

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

individual would be required to make 10 years of payments of 10 percent of his and her discretionary income. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on House Resolution 306 for the students and the repayments of their loans. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield one more time for me?"

Speaker Lang: "If necessary."

Flowers: "Students..."

Reis: "Representative..."

Flowers: "Yes."

Reis: "...so, I heard you right, and I think a lot of people read about this. If someone had a student loan under this proposal, if it was allowed to get through Congress, that would mean they would only have to pay 10 percent of their discretionary income each year for 10 years to repay their student loan no matter how big their student loan was at?"

Flowers: "And..."

Reis: "Yes, yes?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. So, let me give you an example, \$35 thousand a year. You have 120... 130 thousand dollar loan and say you graduated making 35 thousand a year. You'd make \$3500 a year for 10 years. You would only have to repay \$35 thousand of \$120 thousand... \$130 thousand loan, not counting any of the accrued interest. Is that right?"

Flowers: "You know, Representative..."

Reis: "Yes or no? Yes?"

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Flowers: "I can't answer yes or no because I'm not a mathematician, but let me tell you what I do know..."

Reis: "Are you..."

Flowers: "...that these are taxpayer's dollars. And I do know that we have bailed out banks, we have bailed out car manufacturers, we have bailed out insurance companies. It's okay for us to bail out students. We're not saying that they don't have to pay their loans back. We are saying that within the 10 years, because income is going down lower, they will pay 10 percent of their income. And that's it."

Reis: "You are saying they don't have to repay their loan. You're saying that they only have to pay about a fourth of it back, not counting interest."

Flowers: "I'm... I'm..."

Reis: "And what happens..."

Flowers: "I am still waiting on the banks to repay their loans.

I'm still waiting on the insurance companies to repay their loans or their grants or their giveaways and other businesses."

Reis: "Who repays the rest of that loan then?"

Flowers: "The same people that's going to repay those other loans I just enunciated, we the people. And at least with the students, there will be other returns on the dollars because they will be educated, they will be working, and they will be making a contribution. They will not be a burden on the State of Illinois."

Reis: "So, what happens if they go to school for five or six or eight years. When does... when does it kick in that they actually have to start repaying?"

66th Legislative Day

- Flowers: "Upon their graduation and they find employment and they will pay as the Resolution called for, 10 percent of their income, 10 percent."
- Reis: "So only once they get their degree?"
- Flowers: "Well, if they don't have a degree before then, as long as they're in school why should they have to pay? They are still students in school. They're not working, they are still students."
- Reis: "Unbelievable, Representative. I'm not sure what else one can say about that. I'm sure there's some other speakers, but once again, Representative... Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call on this."
- Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Representative Flowers to close."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I mean, we could really find lots of things to really debate about, but let's give the people, let's give our taxpayers a break. Their children want to be educated. We know that the cost of education has gone sky high. We do know that our income have not been keeping up with inflation. We do know that it costs more for incarceration than education. Can we help our state out? Can we help our state out by having students going to college so they can get a job to pay into our General Revenue Funds and not be a burden? I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Your switches are right in front of you, Members. Bost, Crespo, Franks, Sente, Sullivan, Unes.

66th Legislative Day

- Please take the record. On this question, there are 74 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 310, Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 310 designates May 14, 2013 as Apraxia Awareness Day to raise the awareness of this neurological, very, very severe speech disorder and especially in this case in children. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The Resol... The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 314, Mr. Verschoore."
- Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen.

  What this Resolution does is ask the cities of Rock Island,

  Moline, East Moline and Silvis to rename a street after former

  United States Representative Lane Evans."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 317, Mr. Turner. Out of the record. House Resolution 322, Mr. Sims."
- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 322 urges Congress to pass a Bill declaring the area of Pullman as a National Historic Park. Historic Pullman is located in my district. It's an area that's full of history and we're looking forward to having a National Park... having it be established as a National Park. And move for its adoption."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 332, Representative Senger."

66th Legislative Day

- Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 332 urges
  Congress not to double the rates on interest for student loans
  which are due to expire and due to be doubled on July 1. I
  ask for your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Returning to House Resolution 317, Leader Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. House Resolution 317 recognizes the Youth Democracy Day be held in Springfield on May 14, and thanks the Chicago Area Project and Illinois Council of Area Projects for all they do to encourage the youth of the state to be more involved in community and government."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 347, Representative Will Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution endorses and encourages the use of the Illinois Snapshot of Early Literacy, or affectionately called ISEL, by the Illinois School... by Illinois schools and by the additional 21 states within the Partnership for Assessment and Readiness for College and Careers or called the PARK Consortium."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 361, Mr. Sims. Out of the record. Senate Joint Resolution 1, Representative Mayfield."
- Mayfield: "This Resolution basically just extends the date to coincide with the 90th General Assembly. I urge an 'aye' vote."

66th Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 27, Representative Nekritz. Representative Nekritz. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to return to Senate Joint Resolution 1. That was Representative Mayfield's Motion that should have been a Roll Call vote. Senate Joint Resolution 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? Dunkin, Feigenholtz, Hays, Kosel, Pihos, Sandack. Kosel, Sandack. Please take the record. On this question, 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, messages from the Senate."
- Clerk Hollman: "First Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 2555, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2556, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Senate Bill 2555 was also offered by Speaker Madigan. These are referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately. Chair recognizes Leader Currie for a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I move to suspend the posting requirements so that Senate Bill 2555 can be heard in Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary and Senate Bill 2556 can be heard immediately in... in Appropriations-Higher Education."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motions will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Franks, Harris, Jackson, Sosnowski. Please take the record.

66th Legislative Day

- On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

  And the Motions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees are meeting immediately after Session. The Executive Committee is meeting in Room 114, Revenue & Finance is in Room 115, Higher Education is in Room C-1, Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges is in Room 413, and Economic Development is in D-1."
- Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Thursday, May 30 at the hour of 11 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House stands adjourned 'til Thursday, May 30 at the hour of 11 a.m. Go Blackhawks."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

  Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1911. Representative John Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted as amended is House Resolution 389. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Joint Resolution 39. Representative Beiser, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 374. Representative

66th Legislative Day

5/29/2013

Farnham, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Development reports the following committee action taken May 29, 2013: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1544. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 572, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Senate Bill 1341, a Bill for an Act concerning conservation. Senate Bill 1409, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Senate Bill 1496, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Senate Bill 1659, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Senate Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. Senate Bill 2187, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Senate Bill 2243, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Senate Bill 2381, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."