67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- 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 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2623."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Stephen Epting who is with Hope Community Church in Chicago. Pastor Epting is the guest of Representative Lilly. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Epting."
- Pastor Epting: "Let us bow. God of all, blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord and the people You choose for Your inheritance. From Heaven, Lord, You look down and see all mankind from Your dwelling place and watch all who live on earth. You formed the hearts of all and consider everything we do. We pray for our state and those elected to lead at every level that we will work for Your people. We pray that we will humble ourselves to the sacred task of governing for the people of Illinois. We pray for our Legislators who care of about jobs for the unemployed underemployed, education and the opportunity for children and health care for all, especially for those most vulnerable among us. We pray for the laws that will protect and respect the earth, this planet that has been created to be the home of all humanity. We pray for wisdom, not rhetoric, generosity, not indifference and justice, not

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

patronage. We want Legislators working in unity that our differences not divide us but show us how great we can become. We pray for a just distribution in the expense of government. We pray for Leaders gifted in diplomacy, blessed with character and integrity. Leaders who know that security comes from relationships of trust communications. And for our part, God, give us patience to give our Leaders a chance to govern with grace, compassion, justice and love. Let us support sincere efforts and celebrate wise compromise. Make us accountable to our faith and so hold us accountable to serve all people of Illinois. May we never cease to pray and to hope and to work for justice for all. With a united voice, let us all say, Amen."

Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Mussman."

Mussman - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Scherer is excused today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present and ready for a long day's night."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Manley."

Manley: "Good morning, Speaker. How are you?"

Speaker Lang: "Doing just fine."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Manley: "I rise on a point of personal privilege. With me I have two Pages..."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative, bear with us. Sorry, I forgot to take the record. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 Members and we do have a quorum. Now, Representative Manley. I apologize."
- Manley: "Thank you, Speaker. With me I have two honorary Pages for the day. We have Jessica Thomas and Lauryn Thomas over... they're standing, they're waving. And welcome them. Their grandmother is Valerie Thomas, she is an intern with SEIU Legislative... she's a Legislative Intern. They're from Bellville, Illinois. And they belong... their Representatives are Eddie Lee Jackson and Jay Hoffman. And we welcome them."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Happy you're here. Mr. Demmer."
- Demmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Demmer: "I'd like to congratulate my seatmate, Representative Moffitt, who became a grandfather for the sixth time this morning. Caroline Adele Moffitt was born at 5:30. Mother, baby and grandfather are doing great."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Representative, to you and your family. Mr. Sims."
- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Sims: "With me, I have my honorary Page for the day, Molly Harms. She's standing with me. She's joining us from here in Springfield. We welcome her to Springfield."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy you're here, welcome to the House.

 Representative Bellock."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I have a Page with me today, Alyssa Piekarz, who's a junior at Grayslake North High School. I'd like everybody to welcome her. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. I also have a Page with me today. Eddie Ricks from O'Fallon, Illinois, is here visiting with his... along with his mother, Jennifer Ford, in the gallery above the Republican side. Can we please welcome them. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to the House. Representative Lilly."
- Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for personal privilege."

 Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Lilly: "Thank you. As we've been blessed and prayed for today by Reverend Epting, he bring is congregational members with him today. We have Otto Singletary and Ernest Singletary to join Pastor Epting in blessing us this day."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. We're glad you're here with us today.

 Representative Ives."
- Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Ives: "I wish to wish my communications staffer, Mark Decker, happy birthday on his 50th birthday today."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Bradley: "My oldest son, Jackson Edward Bradley, is here with us today on the floor. He's 12 years old and a student in 7th grade at Marion. So welcome Jackson here."

Speaker Lang: "Jackson, we're glad you're here with us today.

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Corrected committee report. Representative Farnham, Chairperson from the Committee on Economic Development reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted were Senate Amendments to House Bill 1544. Committee 1 and 2 Reports. Representative William Davis, Chairperson from Committee on Appropriations-Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: do pass Standard Debate is Senate Bill 2555. Representative Dunkin, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 2556. Representative Greg Harris, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 273. Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 370. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate 1245. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 360, House Resolution 375. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1063. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2869, House Resolution 377, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2378; recommends be adopted as amended is House Joint Resolution 40. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2418, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2520, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3120, Floor Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 572. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 418, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 419, offered by Representative Mayfield. House Resolution 420, offered by Representative Reboletti and House Resolution 436, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia is referred to the Rules Committee."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Members, can I have your attention. It's going to be a long day. There are a lot of Bills on the Calendar. Everyone in the chamber's got some Bills. If we keep the noise level down so that Mr. Reboletti isn't complaining too much about the noise, we can get through a lot of Bills. We can do this expeditiously and maybe get out of here earlier than we might have otherwise. So I'm asking for your attention. I'm asking you for your support. On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, Senate Bill 92, Mr. Sacia. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 92, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 92 is the result of a very lengthy workout between auctioneers and realtors that deals with auctioneers selling real estate at auction. I would note for the benefit of the Body that the department remains in opposition due to the… basically due to one word in there where we use 'certification' for certain criteria. But they told me they would not openly oppose it, it's just… it's not something they care much about and they don't want other agencies bringing that forward. But they have been working with us since the summer of 2012. We finally have a very good piece of legislation and I ask for your support and I welcome your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Riley."

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

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Riley: "Representative, just for a point of clarity. This Bill endeavors to... to license people who are... explain the genesis of the Bill, please?"

Sacia: "I... I sure will. Right now, Representative Riley... well, let me digress. Let's say two years ago... a year ago there are actually two types of licensed auctioneers. There is the 440, which I am. We're the old guys. We're the grandfathered ones. We've been auctioneers forever. We can legally li... we can legally sell real estate at auction with became additional criteria. Those who auctioneers after a certain date are... the license numbers rather than 440 starts 441. They could not sell real estate at auction without meeting certain criteria. The criteria now has been agreed to between auctioneers and the real estate profession. But again, I note that the department remains in opposition due to the word of 'certification' that we use in differentiating. Again, if I can digress and it's a little complex here, Representative Riley."

Riley: "Oh, I... I can understand complex issues."

Sacia: "No... and I didn't mean to insinuate you didn't. It's just that in this particular criteria if... if a 440 wants also to be the licensing broker, then he is required an additional hour... 30 hours and he receives certification for that. But this is a workout. It's a good agreement. It's been worked on for a long time. And I believe I'm correct in stating that the auctioneers... I know I'm correct on speaking on behalf of the auctioneers and certainly the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

realtors are in agreement. It's a good piece of legislation."

Riley: "Well, I'm going to support your Bill, Representative Sacia. But it's funny, you... you would agree though especially since at least on the analysis that you have some opposition, that from time to time we can have really good Bills that serve a purpose but we're going to have some opposition from time to time, wouldn't you say?"

Sacia: "I couldn't agree more, Al."

Riley: "Thank you."

Sacia: "I couldn't agree more."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "Representative Sacia, what does this Bill do?"

Sacia: "It... I know where you're going. What this Bill does is it clarifies auctioneers to sell real estate at auction. You know, you can... you can sell farm equipment at auction, heavy equipment at auction, household goods at auction. But real estate has some unique criteria and the... the folks that are involved in the real estate profession are rightfully so very protective of their profession."

Ford: "So, this Bill is important to you?"

Sacia: "Absolutely, Sir."

Ford: "Is it worth you calling out like an auction of getting 118 votes right now? Could you do that real fast? Could you do a auctioneer and ask for 18... 118 votes right now?"

Sacia: "I could. I could start and say, 'give me 50... \$50 bid, now 60, would you give me \$60 bid, now 70, now 80, would

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

you give me \$80 bid, I got 90, now \$100 bid and now 118, \$118 bid now. Would you give me 118 votes? That's all I want."

Ford: "You've got my vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair is speechless. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mayfield. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', sorry Mr. Sacia, with 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, effective with this Bill I'm going to enforce the Short Debate Rule and use the timer so that we can get through the Calendar as quickly as possible. The next Bill is Senate Bill 105, Mr. Phelps. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 105, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps request that the Bill be placed back...

So, Mr. Phelps, you... the Amendment's not on the Bill so you don't have to do anything with..."

Phelps: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "...the Amendment. Please proceed."

Phelps: "Okay, great. Great. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill, Senate Bill 105, is an agreed Bill. It just makes a technical change as to how to AREs... deals with incorrect bills. I ask for its passage."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

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

The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate, which means there will be one person in response. The Chair recognizes Mr.

Bost for 2 minutes."

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

Bost: "The Amendment that you were... the Amendment that was never adopted, that was the only controversial Amendment?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Bost: "And so, it's not there?"

Phelps: "And I'm not dealing with that at all."

Bost: "This... this Bill is totally agreed to and ready to go?"

Phelps: "Right."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Phelps: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 115, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 115, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is, excuse me one second. Under current law the police departments are required to disseminate certain information to news media upon an arrest, including

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

information about the arrest, information about the arrestee including a mug shot. Unfortunately, in... in Illinois, as also around the country, there have been certain news media outlets that have popped up like www.mugshots.com. These are websites that take the mug shot of the person who's been arrested, place them on the website, and then if a person is found not guilty or released, they must... these websites will not remove the mug shot without the person paying a fee for this. This law would make it illegal for these websites to solicit a fee to remove the... the mug shot of someone who has been acquitted or released from their crime. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Mr. Zalewski, do you rise in... okay. So, Mr. Franks do you rise in response?"

Franks: "I don't know... I want to... I'm not sure what it does?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks for two minutes."

Franks: "I... this is the first I hear of the Bill and I understand why you're doing it. I'm wondering though, has this been vetted constitutionally? I'm... I'd be concerned about a First Amendment right of someone. Because this is... these... these photos... these mug shots, are they public domain or not?"

Martwick: "They are public domain, yes."

Franks: "So, anyone can get them. So, I remember when... I remember when Speaker Delay was arrested in Washington and had that... or he was in Texas. They had that famous mug shot

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

when he was smiling and that was pasted all over the world. So when someone's arrested there is a mug shot. And you're saying if it's public domain, would we be infringing on someone's First Amendment rights if we say that you can't use these for commercial gain?"

Martwick: "Well, Representative Franks, I would say I'm not a constitutional expert."

Franks: "I think there's 47 of them over on that side."

Martwick: "I... I... well, but what I would say is that they are still have the access to these mug shots. All we are doing is we're regulating their ability or we're removing their ability to charge a fee to remove them from their website."

Franks: "I... I don't think it's a bad idea, I'm just not sure it's legal. Because I'm just wondering if we do it for this 'cause I know that there are some governments that I think would make money on selling some of this information to marketers for instance. Or these marketing companies, for instance, if you get a... you buy a vehicle and they want to sell parts, they're going to go and find out who bought, you know a Mercury Mariner 2006. And say, okay, your... you know, your warranty's up or something. And there's... and they have this. I'm just wondering how we can treat one group of people for pecuniary gain differently than another group for pecuniary gain?"

Martwick: "Yeah. It... it really doesn't limit their right under the First Amendment to do what they want with the photo.

All it does is says that they cannot charge a fee to remove the... for someone who's been acquitted of a crime."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Franks: "Okay. I hear what you're saying and I... I like the idea. I just am concerned, I don't know if it's been vetted that's all. And where was the Illinois Press Association on this?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, your time has expired. Please bring your remarks to a close."

Martwick: "They're neutral."

Franks: "Okay, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I know you're trying to be expedient, but I think... I'm... I'm concerned that if you only allow one speaker, perhaps on the last Bill for instance, I wasn't sure what it did. I'd prefer if we have an ability to ask the questions. I think people would rather get it right than be quick. That's all. I just think we need to slow it down and get it right."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks, the Chair intends to follow the Rules. Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris, Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1042, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1042, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. This Bill amends the Recreational Land Use Act and provides for the reinstatement of protections for landowners who open their land to the public for recreation and conservation purposes. Additionally, this Bill retains the protection for landowners who open their land to individuals for hunting and recreational shooting. I know of no opposition. We've worked this Bill out over a number of years. And I'm happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Berrios, D'Amico, Golar, Jackson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You're looking great today as usual. I'd like to acknowledge some kids we have up in the... up in the gallery from LaSalle School. One real special kid, her name is Coco. She's kind of related to me. Coco could you... can you... can you... where are you Coco? Say hi, Coco. You're amazing. If you could give them a welcome, I'd appreciate it."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Happy to have you with us. Senate Bill 10... excuse me, Senate Bill 1366, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1366, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The ... this is a gut and replace with the legislation that's named on the board. This is, in fact, a piece of legislation that will address the fact that the early retirement option under Teachers Retirement System is due to expire on June 30. This legislation will... for those folks who are what we've called in the pipeline, who have either exercised an option previously or have that... have made an election under a collective bargaining agreement, will provide them opportunity to continue to take advantage of the ERO for another limited period of time. And it will... it will cost the school districts and the employees more because the Commission on Government Forecasting and Accountability has reevaluated what the cost of the ERO is and we've included those higher numbers in the Bill. And to the extent that there are new folks taking advantage of the ERO, it will be only at the discretion of the school districts as to whether or not they want to offer the ERO. So, this is the ... it's the agreement that we've reached."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Harris, D.: "Representative, as I understand it, this extends the ERO option for only six months. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "No. It... it does two things. One is, for those folks that have exercised the ERO under the existing law but do not yet turn 55 before June 30 but retire by June 30 that extends it another six... they have another six months in which they can turn 55 and still start receiving their pension which is the deal that they cut when they... when they made that... when they retired early. Then there's a second component part to the Bill which would extend the ERO for three more years. But that would be... we would eliminate all the requirements in the existing ERO that ... that ten... that the school district must offer at least 10 percent of the workforce the opportunity to retire under ERO. This would be solely at the discretion of the district as to whether or not they want to offer the ERO. So you could... you could really say it's almost a three year extension. But it's, again, it's at the option of the district."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Franks, Mr. Reis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Franks: "Most... Mr. Speaker, I didn't vote on that last Bill because I didn't have enough information to vote. I wanted to ask a question as to see whether there was any fiscal impact to the State of Illinois. Having one person speak who didn't answer... ask that question, I didn't get my question answered. I understand you want to go fast, but I object to this. I think we're rushing this and there's no reason to rush. We've worked... we were here last week, we spent an hour and a half on the floor three of the days, we did practically nothing. We've wasted time and now we're voting on important Bills and I don't know what they mean. And I think a lot of people voted on that last Bill and they had questions and didn't have an opportunity. I'd ask you to please slow down and allow us to debate these Bills, otherwise it's becoming a farce and I won't be voting."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1493, Mr. Sullivan. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1493, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1817, Representative Tracy. Representative Tracy. Out of the record. 1842, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. 2106, Mr. Sandack. Ready and... ready to go. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2106, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2106 is a Bill that creates a working group under the Budgeting for Results Commission. It essentially is comprised of those

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Members for the purpose of developing a plan to make the state budgeting process far more transparent. In fact, as transparent as humanly possible so that publically accessible information can be gleaned. This working group shall study proposals related to transparency and accessibility in the budgeting process and shall report its findings to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the Commission no later than January 1, 2015. I'm happy to answer any questions."

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

There being no debate, 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? Beiser, Flowers, Fortner, Rita. Representative Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Jakobsson."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jakobsson: "I would like to take this opportunity to introduce and for the House to give a nice warm welcome to Paul Christiansen. Paul is an intern in my office and he had the opportunity to come over today and visit with us and see us in action. Paul is up here in the gallery standing up with my legislative assistant from my Champaign office, Teri."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Returning to Senate Bill 1587, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1587, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill deals with the surveillance by drones, unmanned aerial vehicles, and precludes the use of drones for surveillance by law enforcement with some important exceptions: to counter a high risk of a terrorist attack with a search warrant based on probable cause with reasonable suspicion that action is needed to prevent imminent life to harm or forestall the imminent escape of a suspect, to locate a missing person or to photograph the crime scene or traffic crash scene. This may seem like science fiction, but the reality is law enforcement is seeking to obtain in many cases drones which are very easy to access in terms of cost and a big threat to our privacy.

I ask for an 'aye' vote. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Bill's on the Order of Short Debate. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti for two minutes."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I... I'm not sure how many people are prepared to speak on the Bill, but I would move for Standard Debate on this Bill, if necessary, if there's a lot of speakers."

Speaker Lang: "At the moment, you're the only speaker, Sir."

Reboletti: "I'd like unlimited debate then, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Your request will be granted, Sir."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Reboletti: "Representative, you were talking about the search warrant, the necessity for a search warrant. I think we discussed this a little bit in committee yesterday. If there is an emergent situation, isn't it possible for the State's Attorney to go ahead and begin to use it for 48 hours... up to 48 hours before going to get a search warrant, so if there's an emergency they don't have to try to find a judge, get a search warrant drafted where they're... where time is of the essence?"

Williams: "That absolutely is... is allowed."

Reboletti: "And are you aware right now, currently, if any law enforcement in the State of Illinois is using drones for any searching or any other law enforcement procedures?"

Williams: "At these... at this point, I believe there are at least two law enforcement agencies that are exploring and testing the usage of drones. But the idea here is to address this proactively, and ensure that the privacy protections for citizens are in place and to ensure freedom for unnecessary surveillance without reasonable suspicion of crime."

Reboletti: "And what would the... what was the maximum time frame in which a drone could be used? I think you mentioned that yesterday in committee."

Williams: "With a warrant, it's 45 days."

Reboletti: "Up to 45 days, but the court..."

Williams: "Up to."

Reboletti: "...the court could make it shorter than that. Is that fair to say?"

Williams: "Yes. Yes, Sir, the court does have discretion."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Reboletti: "And most folks think about drones as a type of drones you see that the military uses to... for drone strikes in military action. What type of drones are law enforcement using? Something... are they using smaller drones, larger drones? What are... what are you seeing in other states?"
- Williams: "Well, there are a number of states, first of all, that have taken action to limit and restrict how drones can be used for the exact reasons we've discussed in committee. But at this point, drones are getting smaller, they're getting cheaper. They can come in a variety of types with a variety of uses. And they are very useful tools. This Bill in no way limits the use for important law enforcement needs. What it does is ensure that the privacy protection afforded to us under the Constitution, under the First and the Fourth Amendments are intact."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cloonen, Hatcher, Leitch, Morrison. Hatcher. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Moving to Senate Bills-Second Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1245, Representative Williams. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1245, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- by Representative Williams and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1547.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1547, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. 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. House Bill 1911, Mr. McAuliffe.

 Please read the Bill. Excuse me, Sir, Senate Bill 1911."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1911, 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. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2378, Leader Currie.

 Out of the record. Moving to the Order of Concurrence. If
 you see a Bill of yours on this Calendar, please be ready.

 House Bill 84, Mr. Franks. Please proceed, Sir."
- Franks: "I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 which were basically technical Amendments to the Bill that we passed here unanimously. And this was dealing with the gray marketers who were price gouging during drug shortage times."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman concurs that we concur in Senate Amendments. 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? Conroy, Drury, Dunkin, Golar. Mr. Drury, Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 84. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 189, Representative Cloonen. Please proceed. Representative, it appears you have two Motions. You have one Motion to Concur and one Motion to Nonconcur. Which would you like to proceed on?"

Cloonen: "I would like it out of the record, please."

Speaker Lang: "Out of the record. House Bill 490, Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 490. The legislation calls for universities to make a decision as to when their students will take the basic skills test for the State Board of Education and as long as they take it prior to their entering into student teaching. Senate Amendment 1 had an error in it because it included those professional services like a hearing officer or vision tester or those that provide services rather than are teaching. So, Senate Amendment 2 took that issue out. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for Concurrence. Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "So, it is... so, it's your intent to concur with 1 and nonconcur with 2?"

Davis, M.: "No, I'm concurring with both of them."

Bost: "You are concurring with both of them? Could you... and I'm sorry it was a little loud, can you repeat once again? I... I

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

understand that there was a problem with the professional licensures?"

Davis, M.: "In... in Senate Amendment 1 they accidentally removed the exclusion of the hearing officers or vision testers from being... having to take the test. So in Senate Amendment 2, they made sure that was put back to what it is currently, that they only have to meet the requirements for their profession."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you."

Davis, M.: "You're very welcome."

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? Harris, Hoffman, Jones. Please take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 490. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 922, Representative Hurley. Please proceed."

Hurley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Today I move to concur Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 922. This is an agreed Amendment and it removes all opponents to the original Bill including the Illinois Chamber of Commerce who is now in support. This will reduce the original Bill's requirement for contractors to retain prevailing wage records for 10 years down to 5 years. It also states that all records can be kept in paper... paper or electronic. Any questions and I encourage an 'aye' vote."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for Concurrence. Chair recognizes Mr. Davidsmeyer."
- Davidsmeyer: "I just want to point out that this is still a bad Bill, but we made a bad Bill just a little bit better. So, I'd urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "I... I don't know how to add to that, but I'm... I'll try. Okay. Representative, you said that... that this Amendment actually took the opponents away, but according to the other Representative that's not necessarily the case. So, what... what opponents did it remove and... and what did it do that... that they felt made it, well, a good enough Bill that they were not opposed?"
- Hurley: "The original opponents were the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Builders and Contractors and NFIB.

 They are now proponents. And it re... the Bill..."
- Bost: "What... what did the language... what was the language change that... that they needed corrected and why is it that they..."
- Hurley: "The record keeping in the Bill that was passed out of the House said you had to keep records for 10 years."
- Bost: "Okay."
- Hurley: "So now that's been reduced to 5 years and that's agreed upon. And there's also publish violations. The original Bill, you were supposed to keep the... you were published on a list for 10 years if you had two violations. This reduces that to 7 years. And it also clearly states that the records can be kept in paper or electronic."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bost: "Is that any different than what you have to already do for tax purposes or am I wrong on that?"

Hurley: "Well, tax purposes are 7 years and this has been now reduced to 5 years."

Bost: "To 5, okay."

Hurley: "So, it's less of a requirement."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. To the Bill. Well, whoever ... I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak just the Bill. I... I think the previous Representative Davidsmeyer's thoughts were quite accurate, that we... we took a Bill that was very heinous in my opinion and have made it a little bit better. But as I said, when it first came to the floor, we are going to send out after this Session a lot of Bills and changes from the Department of Labor to every business in the state. Good businesses, businesses that may need this warning, but by and large most businesses in this state are good, solid businesses that are trying every day to provide jobs for families in Illinois. They pay a huge amount of taxes. They make a huge amount of sacrifices with their families. They take risks in trying to do business in the State of Illinois during very tough financial times. They're going to get another letter from the State of Illinois and it's going to say, oh, by the way, you may not have been doing anything wrong, but we... we think maybe we should make a solution to a problem that we're not sure even exists, that this Bill is searching to try to address something that I'm not even

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

sure has a major problem. Because in committee that was never pointed out how many times we've had a violation or what this would actually cure. We just think, perhaps, it's a good idea. Every time a business gets a letter right now from the State of Illinois it's another slap in their face. And is that really how we want to treat someone that is trying to make an economic betterment in our state by employing our citizens? So, that's why I think this is a bad Bill. It's a bit better and I applaud the Sponsor for trying to work and... and negotiate it and she worked very hard and diligently on that and I appreciate it. But point is that every change we make should have a major reason for bringing it forward because how many letters do we want to keep sending out? I had a person that wanted to start a business in Illinois. He had a business in Missouri and he was coming over to Quincy and wanted to start a business. He goes, I went on all your state websites. He goes, all they do on those state websites is tell you how to do... to call about a hotline problem or abuse of this, that and the other. Nothing on those websites tell you how to start a business in Illinois. None of them make you feel like they care if you want to do a business in Illinois. They just tell you how to go after the business Illinois. That's wrong. That's why we're where we are. We have to change this business climate around. We have that power. This Bill is not doing that. We're doing the direct opposite. And so for that reason, I cannot support it and I'd urge others not to."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I... I appreciate the fact that you did some additional work on the Bill. I can't support it, but I want to make very clear why I can't. Are you familiar with the number of Bills that we have moved in here that deal with project labor agreements or prevailing wage?"

Hurley: "I... I'm unaware of the number."

Kay: "But there's... there's been a few?"

Hurley: "Yes."

Kay: "Are you aware of the number of Bills that have encouraged the environment of the State of Illinois to encourage business to either come here or stay here?"

Hurley: "Again, unaware of the number."

Kay: "That'd be zero. I tongue and cheek said the other day that the only business Bill we passed and I would support it for that reason is the 70 mile an hour speed limit. Let me just make this very clear and again, you know, I don't support your Bill, but I respect the fact that you tried to make it better. We have businesses that are fleeing the State of Illinois and we have nobody especially interested in coming here. So when we pass Bills like this, you can call it the law of diminishing returns. And that's an economic term, but there is no return when it comes to creating jobs and bringing business to the State of Illinois. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moylan."

Moylan: "To the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Moylan: "This Bill simply amends the Prevailing Wage Act and makes a technical change in a Section concerning violations of the Act. This is only to punish contractors that take jobs and the prevailing wage and do not pay the proper wage. This is a good Bill and Representative Hurley only made it better. And I strongly urge an 'aye' vote. This has nothing... nothing to damage business in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

Cloonen: "Yes, actually, to Representative Tracy's comment about not being able to find how to start a business in Illinois. All the person has to do is Google how to start a business in Illinois and it takes you right to the website for the State of gov... the Illinois Government website, how to start a business in Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hurley to close."

Hurley: "Again, I appreciate both sides and the contributions they've made to this Bill. This reduces the record keeping to 5 years which is less than the IRS requests. And again, contractors who play it by the Rules on public works construction contracts will have absolutely nothing to worry about if this Bill becomes a law. 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? Sullivan, Williams. Please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- 922. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 983, Mr. McSweeney. Please proceed."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, I make a Motion to Concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2. This is the Bill that reforms the process for alternative revenue bonds. The Amendment simply excludes infrastructure projects such as public roads and prisons, changes the effective date to January 1, 2014. Amendment 2 is technical changes. I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 983. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1063, Mr. Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 which removes all opposition from the Bill. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please 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 1063. And this Bill,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1191, Representative Hernandez."

Hernandez: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the… of the House. I concur with House Bill 1191, Senate Amendment #1 which increases the authority to the Long Term Care Ombudsman Program to advocate not only on behalf of residents in a long-term care facility but also for individuals in their own homes on… or in community-based settings. The increase is needed to address the growing numbers of individuals who are long-term care eligible and receive services in the community. The reason for the proposed increase is to comply with the Smart Act. Thank you. I'm sorry. That would be Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "You completed your remarks, Representative?"

Hernandez: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Lang: "Have you completed your remarks?"

Hernandez: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment #2.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I remember this Bill the first time around. Were there any fees that would need to be adopted in JCAR to cover this... the cost for this? I guess it was two new hires then. Is that what it would be?"

Hernandez: "So, the... in the original Bill it had to do with the online training and to... there would be a fee charged for the providers who are already doing the online training. So

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

this is kind of separate. This is in addition. But the two positions that you're talking about in this particular Amendment would be absorbed in the FY13 funding already."

Reboletti: "And what would the cost for those two new hires be?

Our analysis says it's \$241 million. That's a... those are pretty... I assume it's not 241 million?"

Hernandez: "No."

Reboletti: "Is it \$241,000? Does that sound about right?"

Hernandez: "That's... that sounds... that sounds about right."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock, Bost, Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1191. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1335, Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1335. The Amendment was mostly technical in nature. It made a permissive Bill a little more permissive and put a sunset date of January 1, 2015 on the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur. Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Reboletti: "The Bill stands pretty permissive. Is that fair to say, Representative?"

Sandack: "It is permissive."

Reboletti: "And who offered the Amendment in the Senate?"

Sandack: "Senator Harmon offered the Amendment in the rarified air of the Senate."

Reboletti: "He's from Oak Park, right?"

Sandack: "Sorry? He is from Oak Park, yes."

Reboletti: "Very conservative bastion. I'll support your Amendment. Thank you."

Sandack: "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? Have all voted who wish? Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1335. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1544, Representative Sente."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... Speaker. I concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2. This is a Bill from... regarding DCO, They're required to develop a five-year strategic, comprehensive economic development plan with annual updates. The first plan will be due July 1, 2014. They'll be setting specific measurable, realistic, time-sensitive goals. There will be an opportunity for public input that will fit into an annual piece of legislation that will come before the General Assembly and have an opportunity for

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

approval. And there's also a 12-member private business council that will be appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate. I'm happy to take questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to concur. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "So, the Amendment basically becomes the Bill, right, Rep...?"

Sente: "Correct."

Reis: "Okay. Is there anything in this Amendment that would repeal the... what we call the 'but for' clause that is within DCO?"

Sente: "Like the claw back provision?"

Reis: "Well, it basically says we will help you as a business, start here or relocate here or expand here but for what other states might offer. And every time they go to these other states to get these competitive bids, they leave. It's something that I've been trying to change and... and now Senator Rose has tried to change for a number of years. It's a ridiculous requirement. We should be doing everything we possibly can to help each and every business here. And I was just wondering if that's in your Bill?"

Sente: "That is not in the Bill."

Reis: "Will you please help me see that that is addressed in this study or report that they are putting together? It is a ridiculous... ridiculous clause that needs to be taken out."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Sente: "The... the private businesses can bring that up with DCO and perhaps that can be a piece added to the annual legislation that spins out of this piece of work."

Reis: "I look forward to working with you on that, Representative, and I'm going to support your Bill."

Sente: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Schmitz."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Schmitz: "Briefly, I just a... it creates the Illinois Business

Development Council. Any costs associated with... Oh, there
you are. Any costs associated with that?"

Sente: "There is some cost associated with it. There are the reimbursable expenses are taken care of for this 12-member council that would meet at least twice a year. Now I do want to also explain, if the annual plan has any strategy that in... that has any fiscal impact, that fiscal impact has to be detailed extensively by DCO and then it would be... have to be approved by the General Assembly annually."

Schmitz: "So there are some costs with creating this new council then and it... I don't have all the..."

Sente: "There's no cost with creating the council that can't be absorbed by DCEO, they said that yesterday in committee. So only their reimbursable expenses are to... are... are accounted for. But I was suggesting that if any piece of the plan each year has a fiscal impact, we have the chance to approve that or not here on the floor."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Schmitz: "And I... I apologize during your opening remarks, who... how do the members of the council... what... what's the process for them to be chosen?"

Sente: "The members of the council, this isn't a... a piece that was developed extensively over the summer and the fall. This is the result of Senate Bill 2. And so, private businesses asked if they could have a part and be involved with DCO. So I just want to be sure and explain that there are 10 different businesses, small business, manufacturing, applied sciences, et cetera. Two members at large are appointed by the Governor, approved by the Senate."

Schmitz: "And Representative, and lastly, I think... I think we're dealing with a good Bill here. But my issue is, I... I've had many business owners in my district call me up and say, hey, the company down the street's leaving, nobody talked to them. And I think it's very sad that we have to set a policy for an agency that's main focus is to attract and retain employers in our state and they're not doing it. And here we have to pass a law that says, Ladies and Gentlemen, you've got to do this. It's part of your mission. Well, if we've got to pass a law that this their mission, what was their mission? Why aren't we talking with those businesses that are leaving? Why don't we take exit surveys of the ones that are going out of here? And I... I just think and it's... it's not a rip on your Bill at all. I think it's a good idea. I just think it's sad that it had to come to this. That we have an agency whose main focus should be what we're trying to outline in this Bill. And I think somewhere along the line maybe things went astray.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

But we've got to pass this and get them focused and honed in because our corporations, our small employers are leaving. And we know that and we know that by our population numbers and we need to track it back and find out what's going on. And I think I know what's going, but I think the data that you're going to collect in this and this... DCO is going to collect is going to prove it. So thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Will the Speaker yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you very much. Representative, I think you have an outstanding Resolution here. And I think extraordinarily well thought out. This is not something that was the spur of the moment or just happened overnight. I know you worked very hard on this. As a businessman who runs a pretty large company, I understand what you're trying to do here. And I think some of the questions al... although I didn't ask them yesterday of you, I think some of the questions that I was pointing to will come out in this particular survey and the work product that you're looking for here, which will help the State of Illinois. So, I'm going to support your Bill and I'm going to ask everyone on our side of the aisle do the same."

Sente: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the 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? Harris, Jones, Mell. Please take the record. On this question,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1544. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Mell: "I just... in my hands I have a flag from a friend of mine who's serving in Kandahar, Afghanistan. His name is Lee Reinhart. And I'm videotaping it and he wanted it on the floor and I just want to say that we're proud of you and we love you. And thanks for serving our country, Lee. Thank you."

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

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And in line with Representative Mell's comments, you'll recall that several weeks ago I stood on the floor and noted that retired Representative and former combat wounded warrior Ron Stephens is walking for the Wounded Warriors. He's at the 90-mile mark today, trying to make 130 miles. And many of you have made contributions to Wounded Warriors and have given me your checks and I'm grateful for them and... and former Sergeant Stephens wanted you to know that he's over the \$20 thousand mark and that's all because of you. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Sacia. House Bill 1604, Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to the Bill. The Senate Sponsor has agreed to nonconcur because on this side of the aisle we

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

have a little problem with the Rules Committee. So we'd like to nonconcur."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. The House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1604. House Bill 2239, Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2239. And this is an initiative of the Thorn Creek Base and Sanitary District and it basically extends the deadline of when the appointing authority can appoint a member to the board. I think it's May 1 now and this would extend it to July 1. Ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ford. Gentleman wishes not to speak. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Davis, Mussman, Smith, Turner. Smith. 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 2239. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2250, Representative Willis on a Motion to Nonconcur. Out of the record. House Bill 2311, Mr. Beiser. Out of the record. Moving to page 10 of the Calendar, House Bill 2408, Mr. Costello. Out of the record. House Bill 2520, Representative Hatcher."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Hatcher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2520, I ask for Concurrence on Senate Committee Amendment #1 which becomes the Bill. It adds poker runs to the charitable games on our Charitable Games Act and regulates them accordingly."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to concur. 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? Evans, Franks, Lilly, Mussman. Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2520. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2618, Mr. Brady. Excuse me, Sir. Out of the record. House Bill 2623, Mr. Fortner. Please proceed, Sir."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2623. The underlying Bill made clearer some of the abilities of municipalities under the Municipal Electric Aggregation Act. The two Senate Amendments further clarify the use and sources of power, talking about fuel type rather than sources. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments.

 Those in favor of his 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? Davis, Manley, Willis.

 Willis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2623. And this

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2720, Mr. Rita. Mr. Rita. Out of the record. House Bill 2767, Representative Kifowit. Representative Kifowit. House Bill 2773, Representative Hammond. Please proceed."

Hammond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2773. The Senate Amendment provides that dealers selling less than 25 vehicles a year are considered dealers for the purpose of the Dealer Recovery Trust Fund, but they shall not be charged the annual Dealer Recovery Fund Fee. In addition, it extends the time that a person can make a claim to the Dealer Recovery Trust Fund from 9 months to 2 years. And I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the Concurrence with the Senate Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to thank Representative Hammond for pursuing this. This initiative was from a constituent that I had and actually his business is in her district. And in response to Representative Kay is, of course an outstanding spokesperson for trying to be more business-friendly and that's what this Bill really does. It's an initiative of a business and trying to make things more business-friendly, reasonable. It's a small step, but at least it's a step in the right direction. So it's great 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Sacia: "Representative, aren't I correct in saying that there is a... a certain amount that the Vehicle Recovery Trust Fund is aiming for, and once they reach that amount of money, the amount assessed to licensed dealers will go down in forthcoming years?"
- Hammond: "That... that is the hope, Representative, yes."
- Sacia: "Well, that leaves me a little in the dark because I get assessed \$500 right now and I've been advised that it's going to go down once they obtain the necessary sum of money. I don't recall what the number is, what's... and I'm not even going to take a shot at it. But is there... was that particular issue not discussed in committee?"
- Hammond: "No, Representative. It... it was not discussed in committee, but currently, it provides that whenever the balance of the fund falls below \$500 thousand..."
- Sacia: "That's the number."
- Hammond: "...the board can begin to charge an additional assessment of up to \$50 once a year."
- Sacia: "But the current assessment apparently is not going to go down? We're just going to keep filling up the larder, is... is that it?"
- Hammond: "I... I don't believe that there is going to be a change to that \$500 figure, Representative. However, in this legislation, aside from what is included in the Senate Amendment, the fees for the renewal are being reduced. A hundred dollars... \$150 for dealers that sell fewer than 200 thousand a year, \$300 for dealers selling less than 200 but more than... over 200 but less than 300 and 500 for dealers that are selling over 300 vehicles a year."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Sacia: "But for the benefit of the understanding of the Body, the purpose of the fund is to make whole those individuals that have got caught up in purchasing automobiles from let's call them 'fly by night dealers' that move in, set up a business and then... and then leave and leave some good folks holding the bag, if you will. Are you aware of any assessments of these funds to individuals? I... I guess specifically what I'm asking, Representative, is the disbursement of any of the funds that have been brought in. Can you explain any of the disbursements? Do you have any of that information? Not trying to put you on the spot, just trying to determine what has been done with that money."

Hammond: "It... I am not aware of any disbursements. I can certainly get that information for you, Representative. The... the genesis of this legislation from the very beginning has been to assist the smaller dealerships that deal in less than 25 vehicles and certainly less than 200 vehicles a year."

Sacia: "So that they will pay a lesser fee, is that correct?" Hammond: "Exactly right."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative."

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? Mussman, Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2773. And this Bill, having received the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Drury."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Drury: "I'd like to welcome... ask everyone to welcome members of my district staff. I have my district director, Brittany Brown is here up in the gallery. And one of our summer interns, Michael Ocher, he's a sophomore at the University of Maryland, and he comes down from Northbrook. Just ask that you give them a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome, glad to have you here with us. Mr. Jones."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Jones: "Recently, there was an incident with myself and a lobbyist at Smokey Bones that has since been resolved. I want to thank the Body and the 89 Members who signed the letter supporting a resolution to the incident. More importantly, Representative Greg Harris and Representative Sue Scherer who's not here today. I also want to thank the representative of Smokey Bones who has graciously provided us with lunch today. Lunch is in M-1. So I just want to welcome my colleagues and invite everybody to have some lunch courtesy of Smokey Bones in M-1."

Speaker Lang: "House Bill 2869, Representative Harris. Please proceed."

Harris, G.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. I would like to move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2869, which is the reauthorization of the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

2009 Build Illinois Bond Act and General Obligation Bond Act which are for the construction of capital projects across the State of Illinois. This is \$2.7 billion worth of authority for the final phase of that project, \$2.2 billion in General Obligation Bonds and 5.5... \$550 million in Build Illinois Bonds. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for Concurrence. Chair recognizes Representative Tracy."

Tracy: "Okay, are we... do we... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Representative Harris, going through here in my analysis is this the prior capital Bill that was authorized in 2009?"

Harris, G.: "Yes. This is not a new capital Bill. This is the 2009 capital Bill, the next phase. And it... it... the bonds will probably not all be issued in one chunk but as the market has the capacity to absorb them, Representative."

Tracy: "And the specific projects that were covered within that 2009 capital program, are they still the ones that are going to be funded from the... the obligation bonds... the General Obligation Bonds?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Tracy: "And do we have a rate of interest for these?"

Harris, G.: "Those will obviously depend on the time in which they are sold. But right now, the State of Illinois has gotten a favorable interest rate on its most recent bond issues. These will be sold in increments as time goes on. This will probably, I'm told, not be one large issuance."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Tracy: "Does the downgrading of the Illinois' financial status, is that affecting this rate? Has it risen or lowered based on that downgrade?"
- Harris, G.: "It's my understanding on the last issuance we actually obtained an interest rate which was slightly lower than had been expected."
- Tracy: "And if we do not authorize these bonds to be sold then I'm... I'm thinking that obviously we will not be able to fund the projects that were within the 2009 Bill?"
- Harris, G.: "Right. I mean, this would stop road construction, school construction, public universities, environmental cleanup and those other projects that were envisioned in the 2009 capital Bill."

Tracy: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Zalewski: "So I have a very specific question, Greg. I hope
 it's... can be given the right answer."
- Harris, G.: "The Zalewski Memorial, is it in here? I don't know."
- Zalewski: "Part of the... the bond authorization will allow for the payment to the schools for the 2003 school construction, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Zalewski: "So, is it fair to say that once the bond authorization is done and the... that all the schools on the Capital Development Board's list won't have to wait, they'll all be able to get paid up front?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Harris, G.: "The 2003 list it would be... assume that would be a priority. Now, you know, the districts would have to then distribute those funds."

Zalewski: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

- Pritchard: "Representative, this is going to... this bond issue would be leveraged with revenue from various sources that were passed back in that 2009 Act. Is that revenue coming in at the expected pace?"
- Harris, G.: "I would think in earlier years with the economic downturn there was a slight decrease in the rate, but in recent years that revenue has been coming in at a rate that is sufficient to meet the bond payments and our projections."
- Pritchard: "So in other words, we could expect that these bonds would be issued in the next year?"
- Harris, G.: "In a period of time. Again, they would probably be under I believe it's the term tranches that bonds are issued in, you know, to be sure that we have the capacity to make those payments."
- Pritchard: "So it might take more than a year for this to occur?"
- Harris, G.: "I... I don't believe there's a specific time line."
- Pritchard: "And in reference to the question that was just previously raised, these bonds are not going to be paid or... or the revenue for school district construction is not

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

going to be paid up front, but it would be paid in a normal process of billed out?"

Harris, G.: "Yes."

Pritchard: "So there would be some delay in... in reference to that prior question. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "Representative, this is... these bonds are for reauthorization of the bonds for the capital project, correct?"

Harris, G.: "Yes, this is reauthorization."

Harris, D.: "And this is the… as I understand it, this is the last year, FY14, is that the last year of the capital project?"

Harris, G.: "That is my understanding."

Harris, D.: "That's also my understanding as well. So, we're...
we're authorizing these bonds to finish up the capital... I
said the capital project, the capital plan that is already
in place and this is simply a reauthorization. Thank you
very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr... I'm sorry. Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Davis, M.: "Now, when you say you're going to have school bonds, are there any Chicago schools that would get funds for this?"

Harris, G.: "There... there will be, yes."

Davis, M.: "For what exactly?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Harris, G.: "For... this is construction, this is construction of new buildings, Representative."
- Davis, M.: "For new... new buildings?"
- Harris, G.: "That will go to the district... to the different school districts including the City of Chicago."
- Davis, M.: "It is... is it for... will there be any for rehab or refurbishing or any of that, or is it just new construction?"
- Harris, G.: "I'm told that the correct answer is that Chicago, under the 2000 Act, would get 20 percent of the money and it could be used for new construction or maintenance and that's at the discretion of the Board of the Chicago Public Schools."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. Can you tell us some other things that are going to be in this issue?"
- Harris, G.: "Certainly. There will be \$386 million toward statewide public... toward the public universities and community colleges statewide. There'd be \$59.4 million for child care and mental health facilities, \$22.3 million for water resources, \$11 billion grants for local government. There would be four series of transportation issuances that would equal \$787.6 million. There is \$534 million for grants for local school construction. We referenced just a moment ago there are \$20 million for pollution control initiatives."
- Davis, M.: "So, but... my question is, are there any... is this funding for any old requests or new requests?"
- Harris, G.: "These are from 2009."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Greg, I'm... quick question. And I'm likely going to support this Resolution but what do you tell people who have outstanding bills for two years or whatever you call them, the new old bills or the, you know, the old, old bills? What do you tell them when we pass this kind of legislation and we don't borrow money to assist them in paying the old bills?"

Harris, G.: "Well, as a businessman I'm sure you understand there are two different kinds of budgets. There is an operating budget and there is a capital budget that we all have. These are budgets that would go in the capital side as opposed to the operations, which would be the General Revenue Fund. So it's... it's a different revenue stream. These funds would allow us to upgrade our state facilities, our schools, our libraries, our colleges, our universities. It puts people back to work and improves the infrastructure of the State of Illinois."

Kay: "Thank 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? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Pihos. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', and 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2869. And this Bill, having received

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2925, Representative Fine."

Fine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment 1 to HB2925. It amends the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. It says that any member of a governmental entity appointed by the president of a county board must abide by the same ethics laws of that county and is subject to the jurisdiction of the county's ethics officer or inspector general. The Amendment in the Bill changes it from covering just Cook County to applying to all counties in the state."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves to concur. 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? Have all voted who wish? Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2925. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3111, Representative McAsey. Please proceed."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3111, I move to concur in Senate Amendments #3 and #2. The underlying Bill is the Access to Justice Act, an initiative of the Illinois Supreme Court and particularly Chief Justice Kilbride. The Amendments are essentially technical changes made in the Senate. Amendment #3 prohibits any money that's deposited into either the Access to Justice Fund or the County Law Library Fund, it prohibits them... that money from being used directly or

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

indirectly for any lobbying activities. And Amendment #2 states that any of these moneys, subject to appropriation, are to be used by the Supreme Court. And that the moneys are to be deposited with the court as opposed to the State Treasurer. I ask for the support of the Body."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sandack: "I'm sorry, Representative, the first Amendment does what?"

McAsey: "It's a Motion to Concur in Amendments 3 and Amendment 2. So, I think that I explained Amendment 3 before I explained Amendment 2. Is your question as to..."

Sandack: "Yes. What's the first... Amendment 2, what does it do?"

McAsey: "Okay. So Amendment #2 has simple language that reads that... basically, subject to appropriation moneys that are in the fund shall be used by the Supreme Court. And then the other part of the Amendment is to change the State Treasurer to the Supreme Court. So, any moneys are to be directed directly to the court, not through the Treasurer's Office."

Sandack: "One more question, Representative."

McAsey: "Okay."

Sandack: "Is there another instance when you know of funding going right to the court rather than through the Treasurer's Office?"

McAsey: "I believe that there are other instances that, as I stand here right now, I don't have a list of them."

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

McAsey: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we talked about this some in committee, I just want to verify."

McAsey: "Yes."

Moffitt: "This applies statewide. All... there would be revenue generated in every county, is that right?"

McAsey: "With regard to the underlying Bill, the Access to Justice Act, the pilot program for pro bono legal assistance by the courts that would be statewide with one program anticipated in each of the Appellate districts. In addition, you may recall that this also creates the hotline for legal assistance to veterans that's available statewide and to... to veterans and active duty personnel as well statewide."

Moffitt: "And then one other, just a reassurance, is that many times when different things have been collected, fees have been collected, the grim sweeper has gone through here taking those fees different times. The fact that this is for the Supreme Court and is kept separate, you feel confident this will be used for the purpose that we're saying it's going to be used for?"

McAsey: "So, that is absolutely my hope that with this language whereby moneys are collected within our court by our clerks of the court and then are deposited directly to the Supreme Court that, yes. That... that these moneys could be there for immune from sweeps and would go towards those veterans... the veterans' programs, the pro bono programs as well as, I

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

think I neglected to mention, the law libraries morphing into self-help legal centers."

Moffitt: "Thank you. I appreciate your response. And certainly if it goes where it's intended to I think it could... could be a good thing. Thank you."

McAsey: "I appreciate that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "Thank you, Representative. I just wanted to ask you, permitting the law libraries to establish the legal assistance programs, what type of program would that be?"

McAsey: "And... and so, to that I'm happy to address your question. That's in the underlying Bill..."

Bellock: "Right."

McAsey: "...that already passed this House."

Bellock: "Okay."

McAsey: "The Amendments don't have anything to do with..."

Bellock: "Oh, I'm sorry."

McAsey: "...the self-help legal centers."

Bellock: "Okay."

McAsey: "But, essentially, the initiative of the courts is to...
right now, all of our courthouses have law libraries, selfservice law libraries. But they're... they're not really as
helpful as we believe that they can and ought to be for...
for persons who need legal assistance. So, you know, county
by county they'll be developing that with the help and
quidance of the Supreme Court."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Bellock: "Okay. So no money out of these fees goes to such agencies that we use a lot, Prairie State or any that are in existence already?"
- McAsey: "I don't think there's anything that would prohibit that, but what the Access to Justice Act is doing is to allow for the creation of a new pilot program for Supreme Court sponsored pro bono legal services. So there's nothing that says that the court can't partner with already existing..."

Bellock: "Okay."

- McAsey: "...like Prairie State to and help to augment Prairie State and have Prairie State provide that service in a particular Appellate district. There's nothing that would prevent it, but there's also nothing that says that, that that's, in fact, how it would be used. But... but this is really to augment the work of Prairie State and other legal aid services to make sure that we have more available for people who... who really suffer with access to justice and with... with qualified legal assistance."
- Bellock: "Thank you. I guess our only question in this is a lot of us that are concerned about fees, especially fees within our county fees. Our county has some of the highest legal fees. Even though we agree with what we're doing here, it's a hard choice."
- McAsey: "Right. And... and the fees are in the underlying Bill.

 There's nothing in the... the Amendments related to changing that."

Bellock: "Right."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

McAsey: "And... and I agree with you. Certainly court fees are an access to justice issue."

Bellock: "Right."

McAsey: "That's why in the underlying Bill there is another piece that speaks to having a review statewide of all of the different fees, including the fee that we're setting up..."

Bellock: "Right."

McAsey: "...to... to better understand what the fees are and how they do serve as a barrier to people's access to justice."

Bellock: "And do the clerks have a position on that?"

McAsey: "The... I know that I had a conversation with the clerks at one point and they... my... I don't want to say that they're in support of it. I don't believe that they have any position. They don't have any concern... have any concerns that were expressed to me that weren't worked out."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

McAsey: "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? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3111. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3120, Mr. Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 3186, Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3186 is also an initiative out of the EMS

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Task Force. We've had several other Bills this year that address that. This is regarding continuing education hours that are required by EMTs. The Bill started out that 50 percent of it could be recognized in military experience. We changed the language in the Senate at the request of Public Health. And now they will recognize military training, medical training as... in consideration. And also the required continuing ED hours every four years will now be for an EMT-P 100 hours, for intermediate will be 80 hours and for basic will be 60 hours. We believe this will be help in recruiting and retaining EMTs, especially in volunteer rural areas. It's an agreed Bill. Appreciate your consideration. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments. 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? Drury, Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', O voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3186. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Returning to page 5 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading appears 1659, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1659, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2381, Mr. Sandack.

 Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2381, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Jefferson."
- Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly.

 Just like to a ask for a point of personal privilege,

 please."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Jefferson: "I just want to recognize... take the time to recognize my chief of staff from the great City of Rockford, Illinois, Doctor Litesa Wallace, who is the chief of staff in my office. Please give a warm welcome to Springfield. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy to have you here with us. Senate Bill 2378, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. This has been approved by committee. What this measure does would be to bring the Secretary of State's Office in line with other Constitutional Officers, permit them to rent space in parking lots. I know of no opposition and I'd be grateful

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

for your support. A question came up in committee about how much money the Secretary of State has in the maintenance fund, it's now about \$168 thousand I'm told, and generally, they hold on to that money until there's enough to pay for some new project."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Pritchard. Mr. Pritchard does not wish to speak. Mr. Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Harris, D.: "Representative, you mentioned that there's about \$168 thousand in their fund right now. This would allow the Secretary of State... the Bill itself would allow the Secretary of State to rent parking spaces which are not used in other facilities. They already do that in Springfield, as I understand?"

Currie: "I don't ... yes, yes. That's exactly correct."

Harris, D.: "So, we're just extending to the rest of the state..."

Currie: "Right."

Harris, D.: "...what we do in Springfield?"

Currie: "So we can build up the fund."

Harris, D.: "And although I understand if I'm correct, that in the appropriations we only authorized \$100 thousand worth of spending. So they really can only spend \$100 thousand even though they have \$168 thousand in the fund?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Currie: "At a time. At a time. Right. But... but next year may be another story and if the fund is more flush, they might want to spend a little more."

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

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

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

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

Speaker Turner: "On page 8 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 996, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr..."

Speaker Turner: "Lou Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in the Senate Amendments. This is a Bill that deals with charitable games; it passed the House. The Senate made a couple of changes. First, they decided to keep the regulatory duties for charitable games at the Department of Revenue rather than move it to the Illinois Gaming Board. Second, they decided that a municipal facility can have up to 48 games a year not... as opposed to 16. This is not additional gaming, it's just how many times a location can be used. It does not change the number of charitable gaming that can take place. And the third thing the... the Amendments do is something that already passed in one of Zalewski's Bills. It allows the Illinois Gaming Board to use one or more outside testing laboratories to test machines. So, I would ask your support."

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

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Leader, I was... on the municipal portion of this where this is now permitted, could you just expand a little bit on when it's permitted, in what instances?"

Lang: "Well, many municipalities have facilities where they hold these charitable game nights, like Las Vegas nights. And in come communities, as you know, there are only one or two places you can have these games. And so, this would allow municipalities to create their own Rules. Let's say it's a park district facility or a municipally-owned facility, this would allow them to have up to 48 of these Las Vegas nights a year but does not increase the number of Las Vegas nights in the statute."

Sandack: "Okay. One more follow-up, again, because communities are Home Rule or non-Home Rule, would this preempt Home Rule?"

Lang: "No, it does not."

Sandack: "Thank you, Leader."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Representative, would this Bill move us any closer to a casino in Danville?"

Lang: "I sure with it would, Sir."

Hays: "Okay. I appreciate your Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 996?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bradley, Chapa LaVia, Gordon. Mr.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 70 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 996. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2432, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. I move for Concurrence in the Senate Amendment. The Senate Amendment became the Bill and it became exactly the same language in a Bill we passed overwhelmingly previously that deals with ATMs. It would say that the previous law requiring a sign to be posted on an ATM regarding fees does not have to apply... you do not have to post the sign if there's a video terminal that announces what the fees are. So, if it says on a video terminal what the fees are, it does not have to be posted with a sticker on the machine. That's all the Bill does now. We voted for this previously. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2432?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2432. And this Bill, having received the favorable Majority... Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2832, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As you'll recall, this was the Bill proposed by the Recorder of

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Deeds, Karen Yarbrough, our former colleague, to deal with the fraudulent filing of deeds and other documents at the Recorder's Office. As you'll recall when the Bill left the House, there were some opponents and I pledged to you that we would resolve the issues in the Senate. Amendments 1 and 2, they came out of the Senate are the agreed Amendments. So, as far as I know there are no opponents to this Bill. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2832?' All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Christian Mitchell, Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2832. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Leader Lang in the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "Again, a warm greeting is appreciated. Thank you very much. Chair recognizes Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Zalewski: "While we have this pause in the action, can the Body recognize the herculean effort of the Chicago Blackhawks last night in that Game 7 victory? And beat... beat L.A. starting on Saturday and the Cubs won again. So, some of us are happy about that too."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Under the Order of Resolutions appears House Resolution 350, Mr. Arroyo. Please proceed."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 350 urges the United States Congress recognize the 65th Infantry Regiment from Puerto Rico, that is also known as The Borinqueneers. The Resolution also recommends that a group of Army soldiers receive the Congressional Medal of Honor due to their distinguished service in battle, particular the Korean War. On February of this year in the State Legislature of New York, my aunt, Representative Carmen Arroyo, introduced a very important Resolution. And on April 25, 2013 in the House Representatives, Congressman Bill Posey, Republican from Florida introduced House Bill 1726 and it's being introduced in other states as we speak. And here in the Illinois my colleague, State Representative Iris Martinez, is introducing it in the Senate. House... House... House Resolution 1726 requests Congress and the President of the United States to recognize and consider the Congressional Medal of Honor for the 65th Infantry for their record of achievement on the battlefield in three United States Wars: World War I, World War II and the most noticeable, the Korean War."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To continue on, after the Spanish-American War, Puerto Rico became the property of the United States Government on March 2, 1899. Congress then authorized the first body of native troops in Puerto Rico and by 1901 these troops were called the Puerto Rico

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Provisional Regiment of Infantry. During World War I, they were assigned to defend the Panama Canal and upon their return in 1919 were renamed the 65th Infantry Regiment by the Army Military establishment. However, amongst the foot soldiers they self-identified themselves as Borinqueneers, a word stemmed by the native inhabitants of the island known today as Puerto Rico prior to the colonization of the island by Spain. During World War II, the 65th Infantry served gallantly in North Africa and Europe, Italy, France and Germany."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. To continue on, when North Korea invaded South Korea in 1950 the 65th Infantry Regiment was deployed to Korea. When United... U.S. First Marine Division and the U.S. Army 7th Infantry Division were forced into a major retreat after being encircled close to the Manchurian border Borinqueneers opened a 13-mile wide retreat path for and successful in protecting their fellow soldiers were withdraw and supply lines and overall mission of the U.N. When General Douglas MacArthur became aware of the actions of the 65th Infantry Regiment he said, 'the Puerto Ricans of the gallant 65th Infantry on the battlefield of Korea by valor, determination and result... result... resolute will be... will to victory give daily testament to their incredible loyalty to the United States. They write a brilliant record of achievement in battle and I'm proud indeed to have them in this command. I wish that we might have more like them. We would be honored to have the rest of the General

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Assembly Members join us on this Resolution, to be added. And we ask for your favorable vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady asks leave that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors. Is there leave? Leave is granted and all Members of the House will be added as cosponsors. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Brady, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to waive the posting on House Resolution 383."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in... Gentleman moves to waive posting on House Resolution 383. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Joint Resolution #39 and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1006."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee announcements. The following committees are meeting at 3:00 Personnel and Pensions is meeting in Room 114, Revenue & Finance is meeting in Room 115, State Government is meeting in Room 413. At 3:30, the Judiciary Committee is meeting in Room 114 and the Executive Committee is meeting in Room 115."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to caucus."
- Speaker Lang: "The Republicans will caucus in Room 114 immediately, then committees and then the House will reconvene at the hour of 4 p.m. Supplemental Calendar #1. Mr. Clerk, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading there appears Senate Bill 2255. Excuse me. Senate Bill 2555, Representative Will Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2555, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 2556, Mr. Dunkin."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2556, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2243. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 383. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions reports the following committee

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2767, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1245, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1687. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1329. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1443, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1006."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a special guest so if Members will be in their chairs and staff will retire to the rear of the chamber. We're very pleased and fortunate today to have the Vietnamese Ambassador with us. Ambassador Nguyen Quoc Cuong, accompanied by his spouse Madame Hoang Thi Minh Ha, Economic Counselor Le Chi Dzung and First Secretary Nguyen Hong Quang. Please... please... please greet the Ambassador."

Ambassador Cuong: "Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and distinguished Representatives of the people of Illinois, I'm so honored to have the... such an excellent opportunity to speak before you in the ripe Land of Lincoln. And I know that you are stressful now with the... a lot of legislation to be finished before midnight tomorrow, so I'll be very, very short. I come here with a very short message that is Vietnam as you know a country of 90 million people... 90 million people. Ninety percent is under 60 years

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

of age, 30... 60 percent under 35 years of age. So we're a young nation, energetic and eager to move forward. We've been under reforms for almost three years. And GDB growth rate is between 7 to 8 percent annually. And Vietnam offer a lot of opportunities for U.S. businesses and Illinois businesses as well. I know that all of you care about growth and jobs. So just a few facts and figures for you to think about. U.S. exports to Vietnam increased about 300 percent in the past 5 years, amounting to 5 billion U.S. dollars. And many of the products U.S. exports to Vietnam have come from the State of Illinois, from (indiscernible). The agricultural products like soybeans, corns, dairy, pork, beef, soybeans, last year it was 333 million U.S. dollars we imported from... from Viet... from the United States. And then understand a lot of these is from the State of Illinois. And also cows, industry and education as well. Now, in Vietnam we have 60... 16 thousand students in the United States and many Vietnamese students, bright students are studying in the State of Illinois. So I just want to draw your attention to these few figures. And I wish that you could encourage and support the businesses in your constituencies to new business for Vietnam especially now that Vietnam and U.S. are in the final stages of the TPP, the most ambitious trading arrangement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. So thank you very much for your attention and please be assured that whatever I, as Ambassador of Vietnam to the United States and the Embassy of Vietnam, here in Washington D.C., whatever we facilitate your can do to businesses and

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- constituencies in Vietnam, we are very willing to do so. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The Ambassador will be in front of the Clerk's podium for pictures or for comments from all of you. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell."
- Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Mitchell, B.: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, behind me is Scott Busboom, he's with Talk 101 in Decatur. He has been broadcasting live this morning and just visiting the Capitol this afternoon. So give him a big warm Illinois welcome."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. The Chair recognizes Mr. Ford."
- Ford: "Representative... Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I just want to give you a compliment on a great job that you did introducing our guest. I think you did an excellent job and I couldn't have done it better myself at all."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. One of the tougher things I've done in quite some time. Chair recognizes Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Conroy: "I'd like to ask the Body to help me celebrate Laura Fine and her husband, Michael, are celebrating their 20th anniversary today."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Representative. Representative Tracy."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Tracy: "Well, thank you. It must be a day of nuptials. This is Representative Kay Hatcher's anniversary, is it 22, 21. So, we wanted to..."
- Speaker Lang: "Congratulations, Representative. On the Order of Concurrence on page 10 of the Calendar appears House Bill 2418, Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2418. This is the Election Omnibus Bill, which we do pretty much every year at about this time. I will describe the highlights in the Bill as it would be amended by the ... by the Senate Concurrences and then, of course, I would be open to any other questions you might have. The highlights as I see them start with the opportunity to join 12 other states in online voter registration for Illinois. Online voter registration, as I say, operates in 12 other states and we would begin this process in July of 2014. The match would be made by the state board of Elections with information from the Secretary of State's Motor Vehicle Division so as to make sure that people who register do in fact live where they live, and the State Board would then notify the appropriate election authority that these people are there. Many people worry that online voting is just a great device for young and wealthy people to participate in the election process. Let me tell you that in California last year they instituted a five-week online registration opportunity, more than 800 thousand people signed up. And the majority were not wealthy, the majority in fact were lower income. Almost 25 percent of those who

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

registered were Latinos, women were more likely to register than men, and of the men who did register on the Internet most were over the age of 35. As it turned out, people who registered online were more likely to vote in the coming election. There's a lot of good to be said about an online voter registration system, including the fact that it saves Maricopa County in Arizona In the authorities discovered that they were spending 83 cents to do paper registrations, that went down to 3 cents a voter when they went to an online system. So that, I would say, is a distinct highlight of the Bill. It will encourage more participation in the electoral system and that to me is good news for a Democratic form of governments. Second, it would require, outside of Cook, some state colleges to open for early voting. In both Peoria and Lake County, there would be a new electoral county board appointed by the ... by the chief judge of the ... of each of those counties. We would change the threshold for... for disclosures by political committees from \$3 thousand to \$5 thousand, clarify that if somebody's withdrawn from the ballot then that individual's name will not be available for the casting of votes. School board election challenges would go to the County Election Board rather than to the school board itself. There was earlier legislation that would have applied that across the board to other local elections as well, that is not ... it didn't make the final cut. I think that was very good legislation, but I consider this to be an important first change in the petition There's a requirement for people running for alderman in the City of

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Chicago from 2 percent to 4 percent. And finally, the measure clarifies and standardized the ballot language for a referendum that would either create or eliminate Home Rule authority for a municipality, language similar to a Bill introduced by Representative Sosnowski. Those I think are the highlights; there's a lot more in the Bill. It's a long Bill and it is comprehensive. I'd be happy to answer your questions and I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the House concur with Senate Amendments to this Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Osmond: "Leader Currie, I have a few questions that you touched on, but I think I need a better understanding of it. Does this legislation create a County Election Commission in Cook County?"

Currie: "No, it does not. As you know, we have a bifurcated system in Cook County. We have a Board of Election Commissioners in the city and we have a County Election Clerk for the suburban part of the territory."

Osmond: "What changes does this make in Lake County?"

Currie: "This creates an Electoral Board in Lake County consisting of five members appointed by the chief judge. I think that the partisan break down is two, two plus one. And the county board would be in a position to set the salaries and establish the... the parameters for actions."

Osmond: "Do you have any idea of the costs that will occur in Lake County?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Currie: "I can tell you that the county board will have responsibility for setting the salaries and for funding the operation, so that's up to the members of the Lake County Board. And I would advise you to consult with them to get the answer."

"Well, I have a rough estimate and the issue in Cook ... in Lake County is the fact that we have had a clerk existing there for 19 years. She's done a very fair bipartisan elections over and over again. She has brought in our election results between 9 and 9:30 every election night. She was one of the first persons in the state to sign a contract to have optical... optical scanning and this was done just prior to the problems that were... that occurred in Florida with the hanging chads. She is an outstanding clerk and what we're doing here is changing her position to one that will only be vital records. And I don't understand why we are not letting the public have a say in this? Why we're doing this legislatively when no one, to my knowledge, asked for this, especially Senator Link who said to the papers that he didn't know where this was coming from. So, do you have an idea of who... who is behind this?"

Currie: "Representative, I know that this idea did not originate in this House. This is a measure that came to us from the Senate. So I anticipate that somebody or some people... some interests that have the ear of the Members of the Illinois State Senate were the people who initiated this proposal, not my idea. I never saw a Bill in this chamber. I never heard anybody in this chamber say this is

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

a really good idea. But this is a measure that came from the Senate and it is embedded in a larger measure that embodies a lot of really important items like online..."

Osmond: "And I agree."

Currie: "...voter registration."

Osmond: "Right. And... and I agree. And that's my... my puzzle to this whole thing. Is the fact... is there anyway that you could pull this out of the record, do a Floor Amendment, and take Lake County out of it?"

Currie: "This is a..."

Osmond: "And we would be very happy to support the rest of this Bill."

Currie: "This is a Concurrence. There's no opportunity to amend the Bill."

Osmond: "Can you nonconcur?"

Currie: "I could, but I'm not. I'm... my Motion is to concur because I think there are some very important items in this Bill including... including the online opportunity to register to vote."

Osmond: "And I agree with you."

Currie: "And I..."

Osmond: "That portion of the Bill is good. But... but the problem here is that we're taking away the ability for the people of Lake County to say if they want this commission or not. And I think that that's wrong and I would hope that you would try to reconsider and maybe even do a trailer Bill by tomorrow that will take them out of here."

Currie: "Thank you. I certainly will give serious consideration to that suggestion."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Osmond: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Fortner: "Leader Currie, like the previous questioner, I think there are parts of this Bill that are certainly to be commended. The... the expansion into online registration I think has some real benefits and some real merit going forward. I'd like to ask some questions; however, about the changes to the provisional ballot portion in this Bill, if I may. And what I understand is that the... the intent seems to be to say, if someone has voted in the wrong precinct we want to make sure that their votes, that would have been valid had they voted in the right precinct, be correctly counted. Is that... is that a reasonable..."

Currie: "That's exact... that's a really good statement. That's precisely what we're trying to do. As you know, if those individuals voting in the wrong precinct cast ballot for federal offices today they are counted. This would say that provisional ballots that ultimately are counted that you would count the votes that those individuals make for state and local candidates as well. And remember, most people go to the wrong precinct not on purpose, they go to the wrong precinct because they didn't know where they were supposed to go. And frequently, election judges permit them to vote in the wrong precinct. And then that means that if they're in the wrong precinct, under today's law their... their legitimate votes don't count."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Fortner: "And ... and I understand that, but here's... here's the concern I have. And I can imagine that if I was within a single election jurisdiction, I was in my county but I voted in the wrong precinct in my town, I can... I can imagine that being handled that way. My concern comes when I vote, for instance, in the wrong county. I live in DuPage County. Suppose I voted instead in a precinct in Kane mistakenly thought that I was over in Kane County. The problem and the concern I see is that in order to comply they would have to get that information back to the correct county that I live in. Is that... I mean, I don't know how else you would do it other than the county I mistakenly voted in would have to..."

Currie: "Well, I assume... Yeah."

Fortner: "...get it to the correct county."

Currie: "I assume that already applies if you're counting votes for federal candidates because that is current law. So whatever procedure is now in place for counting those ballots then that would be the same procedure that would qualify for people who voted in the wrong precinct in the wrong county."

Fortner: "Well, I guess one of the fears I have and I understand that's current law, one of my fears is that counties aren't always able in any easy way, there are different ballot types, different ballot styles, different counting machines even county to county. My fear is that they're not there and in order to comply with this... Let me extend my analogy. Suppose I voted in the wrong county, my concern would be that you would have to have a county clerk

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

open up a provisional ballot, that provisional ballot they would have to then have the proper ballot type from the correct county. They would be filling out the correct ballot and then they would have to refill out the cover form for the provisional ballot to say and then... this is what it is, and then send it off to the right jurisdiction. And I have a really big concern if that because if that's the way I get that ballot back to the county, essentially I've completely eliminated the secret ballot for that person because you would have had to have a person who actually inspected the ballot, knew both the name of the voter as printed on the cover of the provisional ballot application as well as the contents of the races that were transcribed. So... to the Bill. I just think that this part of the Bill does not seem to have been really thought out about how to deal with this situation when it goes from county to county. I think it opens the door to really exposing people's ballots to inspection in a way that gives away their very important right to the secret vote. I understand that we're supposed to do something like this in federal races, I don't know how counties are doing that now, but I have a real concern by making this larger without knowing how we do this. It really opens up a can of worms, and I cannot support the Bill with this provision here. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you the question, how many of you have a good relationship with your county clerk, your local

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

elected official that is in charge of running your elections? So tell me before you vote for this, how many of you enjoy the relationship with your clerk and think that they might do a good job? Because for us in Lake County, we have a good relationship with our clerk; she's one of the best clerks in the state. She works hard; she's done more for this state to make sure that the election process is fair and honest than about anybody that I know. So when I ask you if you have a good relationship, tell you after this Bill is passed or should it pass, we're going to lose that relationship with our clerk. And are you next? Are you next in the list of lines of people that are going to lose their relationship with their clerk? 'Cause if they can do it to Lake County, they can do it to anyone else. All we ask for is let our voters speak. Now I've... I have voted on so many referendums or front door referendums for so many people in this group or in this chamber that's all we're asking for. We're asking for one thing. If this is such a good idea, let our people vote for it. If it's such a good idea, why aren't we doing it for all the counties? Why is Cook County exempted from this? Seems like you have a pretty good clerk there. Why don't you take his power away? That's not what's going on. This is political; it's political from one person who denies it. Nobody in the Senate other than one person voted for this on Democrat or Republican side. And I don't think you're going to have anyone from Lake County vote for this now. So Ladies and Gentlemen, ask yourself the question, are you next? Oh, and

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Mr. Speaker, should this get the requisite vote, I'd like a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. That's acknowledged. Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair first."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Reis: "I believe the Representative said that this would overrule some Home Rule. So I would ask the parliamentarian if... how many votes this would require. And you can get back to me after my questioning."

Speaker Lang: "And we will do that, Sir."

Reis: "Okay. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, with regards to absentee ballots, can you explain that again what this change will do to having to post who voted absentee?"

Currie: "So, what this measure does for absentee ballots is that they... the state board would have to report the requests for absentee ballots and the returns of absentee ballots to political Parties on request. And it would allow voters to ask for an absentee ballot on the Web."

Reis: "So, will it require the State Board of Elections to submit on their website who actually has returned that absentee ballot or just who's applied for one?"

Currie: "No, no, no, no. I think all this says is that if you're a voter and you want to apply for an absentee ballot you can do so on the Web. What it does say is that the board shall let the political Parties know who has applied for an absentee ballot and who has actually returned an absentee ballot. And the reason for that is so they can

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- follow up or not knock on the door on Election Day if they know somebody has already voted."
- Reis: "That's my... my real question. So it will be posted online whether or not they returned that absentee ballot?"
- Currie: "I don't think that this is required to be online. I think it can become available to the parties, if they ask for it. I'll double-check, but my thought was just that this means that the… the board has to supply that information to a political Party upon request."
- Reis: "So how will the county clerks get this information to the State Board of Elections?"
- Currie: "The state board will give them information about how they can do it electronically."
- Reis: "And will this have to be done daily or weekly or... I mean, this... this sounds like an awful lot of work for the County Clerk's Office to... for 45 days out keep all this information current."
- Currie: "I believe they do it, and first of all, it would be required daily, but second, I think they already do it for ballots that are mailed in."

Reis: "Okay."

Currie: "And just on the Home Rule question, my reference to Home Rule in respect to this Bill is not that it's a preemption of Home Rule but we have taken language similar to that introduced in a Bill by Representative Sosnowski that would establish what the ballot question looks like if the voters are given the opportunity to repeal Home Rule or to create Home Rule."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Reis: "Okay. Representative, last year we thought we had a change in the last jumbo Election Bill, last year..."

Currie: "Sorry."

Reis: "Representative, last year we thought we had a change in last year's Election Bill that dealt with what we call the 'sandwich provision'. Where if one... if somebody donates \$1 that the county Democrats or the county Republicans have to report that \$1. And I think it's been brought to all of our attentions that that's really very egregious and very time-consuming. And I had introduced a Bill this year and I kind of called the Sandwich Bill, that you can go into a fundraiser at a street fair or whatever and buy a pork burger and the county organization, regardless of whether they're Democrat or Republican, doesn't have to post the name and address of that person."

Currie: "Yeah."

Reis: "Did we fix that this year?"

Currie: "And I thought... I thought we did... a year ago I thought we said that you don't have to report... I think it was up to \$50..."

Reis: "No."

Currie: "...at a raffle, at a barbecue."

Reis: "We thought that, Representative, and you gave me that assurance, but the State Board of Elections has told us it only applies to raffle tickets."

Currie: "Oh, okay."

Reis: "And they are telling every county chairman, Democrat and Republican, for the last year that you have to report every

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

single dollar. And it's hurt... it's hurt our PR, it's hurt everything."

Currie: "Well, then, I'd... I'd be happy to take another look at that with you, 'cause I thought we had taken care of the problem. If you're telling me we didn't, I'm a part of the Task Force on Campaign Reforms, funding reforms, and I will certainly make sure we bring that up."

Reis: "Well, it's House Bill 2903, if you can figure out how to get it through in 48 hours... 24 hours."

Currie: "Thank you, Sir."

"Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and those who are listening, you know every year we do this, we come in the last couple days with a big giant Election Bill, maybe three or four things are good in it, but the vast majority of it is very concerning to the Minority Party. And each one of these provisions, I don't know if there's 19 or 20 of them, could have been their own Bill, introduced, debated, discussed, aired out and allowed everybody to see what happens. But no, we roll them all out in one big Bill the last two days and expect everybody to know what's going on. And that more importantly, it's even drafted right. So you know once again, I'm going to call this the 2013 Democratic Incumbent Protection Act, because most of these Bills are going to help the Majority Party. You can tell by the way it's drafted; you can tell by the way it's being rushed through. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

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

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kosel: "Thank you. When we were in committee, we talked a little bit about some changes that are going to be made to the residency requirement for sheriffs in the State of Illinois. And I believe what's going to happen is they're going to change the date of residency requirements from one year from the date you become a candidate to one year from the date you take office. You said you were going to find out what the reason for that change was and I was hoping that you had that information."

Currie: "I have. And the information I have is that for every other office of that kind, the residency requirement is a year from the date of taking office. I'm not sure, it may have been someone in Will County who brought this discrepancy to our attention, but the reality is that for recorder, for all the other county offices, the residency requirement is one year before the date of taking office. The sheriff's residency requirement was the odd... odd man out and this corrects that discrepancy."

Kosel: "So every other county officer, i.e., county board
member, clerk, what else?"

Currie: "That's my understanding. Our staff did go back and research it and they said the reason for the change is because this would be the residency that applies to everybody else."

Kosel: "I... I guess I'm trying to figure out what everybody else
is?

Currie: "Yeah."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Kosel: "So, it'd be county clerk, it would be county board
 members, auditor?"

Currie: "I believe so, yeah. Yeah, the staff people tell me that it's the… all the other county officeholders: Recorder of Deeds, state's attorney."

Kosel: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. And just to the Bill. I know that it addresses a couple of problems that have taken place in my county and has... they've caused some confusion. And so this is helping to take care of those with regard to grace period voting and also with respect to counting ballots when someone has withdrawn from the candidacy once the ballot is already printed. So this is a very good Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Tryon: "Representative Currie, you presented this in committee and I had some questions then and I've had an opportunity to think about it. And I rise in support of the statement that Representative Sullivan said. I don't under... one thing people in the State of Illinois expect is a fair, honest election cycle that's consistent throughout the state, election processes that are consistent. Is it not true that in other counties that have the similar proposal that's being made in this Bill to Lake, they've had an opportunity to vote that in themselves?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Currie: "And in Peoria County under this Bill, they will."

Tryon: "Why is it not the case in Lake?"

Currie: "Representative, I think I answered an earlier question by suggesting that this is a measure that came to us as a package from the Senate. This idea did not originate in the House. It is part of a much larger Bill... a larger picture, so I cannot answer your question."

Tryon: "Wouldn't... wouldn't anybody in this chamber, before they vote on that, want to know why one county is being singled out and being forced to take away the current election authority that exists similarly in almost all counties in Illinois, and not given the right to vote this in themselves? I mean, it would seem to me whoever wanted that in the Senate would have had that into some kind of Bill analysis. It's not in ours. Is it in yours? Nope."

Currie: "In... in my... in my county, as I earlier said, we have two different jurisdictions for elections. We have a Chicago Board of Election Commissioners and in suburban Cook County there is a Cook County Clerk who oversees elections."

Tryon: "Well, I... honestly, that to me... to have this process forced down one county to me is wrong. It's not right. And it... it is purely political in my... my opinion. I also have another problem with the Bill and I think this is true of any election authority that's going to have the chief judge which is in my opinion the same person who's going to be making the appointments to the Election Authority, who's also overseeing the court that is going to adjudicate any kinds of cases that come forth. I think that's a potential

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

problem. I realize that exists in other election authorities and I think that's something that should be worked on. I don't think... I don't think that... that... that's correct and maybe next year we can work on that. But... but for this, to have one county singled out and have it forced upon them by the General Assembly, as if their voters aren't equivalent to the voters in Peoria County, I think is wrong. And I think every Member in this House should vote 'no' until this provision is taken out. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kay: "Leader Currie, with respect to municipal officers, my analysis says a person is not eligible to take the oath of office for a municipal office if owing a tax debt or debt to the municipality or convicted of an infamous crime, perjury or felony. My question is this, what if a person simply can't pay their taxes for a short period of time and their property is sold at a tax sale with the understanding, as I... I believe it to be, that they can purchase that back within 6 or 12 months?"

Currie: "Yeah. And... and apparently there had been a court case that ruled that the language only applied to candidates for office. That was not everybody else's understanding. This restores language that we thought the... the provision meant. But I did talk with the Municipal League and with members of the... the Executive Committee and I think we may want to consider drafting slightly tighter language so as to avoid an inadvertent discovery that someone is in arrears,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

somebody who didn't realize that their property tax was due and didn't pay it for 2 weeks. So I have agreed to work on that language in a trailer Bill."

Kay: "Well, that's part of... that was part of my question, but the other part is supposing the person, simply like many of us in this room do, we have a need for a credit card from time to time, and from time to time somebody may not be able to pay their tax bill and their property goes on an... on an auction... a reverse auction. And I guess my question is, we know those... those reverse auctions happen and people have the ability to come back in and repurchase their property. Is that person ineligible from being a municipal officer?"

Currie: "Well, I think that would depend on a court to decide.

But my view is that this language is drafted more... in a way
that is not as clear as I would like it to be so that
someone who is not deliberately defaulting on payments,
whether it's the water bill or the property tax, should not
therefore be bounced from office."

Kay: "Well, here again is... is this not a reason, though, Leader, for us to pull this Bill apart and handle it as separate Bills? Because there are so many questions here tonight that have really begged good... good answers and this is just one of them. Wouldn't... wouldn't it be better if we took the time, pull these Bills apart, made them separate and dealt with them on an individual basis?"

Currie: "Representative, this language is status quo anti and has been part of the statute for years and years and years

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

until being misinterpreted by the court. So I think this language is pretty sound and I stand behind it."

Kay: "Well, here... here's my point though, again, I understand what you're saying, but I think this just was filed what, Tuesday, and we're getting it today and we're deciding key issues here on a Bill of I think relative importance to many, many Representatives who have already spoken against your Bill. So, wouldn't it indeed not be wise to pull something out that can't be vetted properly?"

Currie: "Remember, we are voting on Amendments from the Senate.

We can no longer amend this Bill."

Kay: "Well..."

Currie: "There's a lot of good stuff in the Bill, have another look, Representative."

Kay: "Okay, Rep... Thank you, Representative. I'm going to... I'm going to encourage an 'aye' vote like many of my... or a 'no' vote like many of my Members who do not simply believe that this is fair, has no balance to it. So, we're going to be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader yields."

Reboletti: "Leader... Mr. Speaker, I... it's pretty loud here in the chamber. Thank you, Speaker. Leader, as I look here it seems every year we're always tweaking the ability for students at universities to get to the polls, which of course we want everybody who is eligible to vote to get out and vote. That is their constitutional right. What is a high-traffic location at a public university?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Currie: "I think what happens is, that in a lot of public universities, local voting sites... early voting sites are not easily accessible. So this just makes it easier for college kids to exercise the franchise, to exercise their right to vote."
- Reboletti: "All right. So I went to Eastern Illinois University and I lived in Taylor Hall. Does that mean that in Taylor Hall before I go to Coleman Hall to go to a Political Science class I can vote because it'll be easier there? It's a high-traffic area and a thousand people live there. Would that then qualify as a high-traffic area?"
- Currie: "I... I think the election jurisdiction in conjunction with the universities can make that determination. And if you think they made the wrong determination, you can take them to court. I think that language speaks for itself."
- Reboletti: "Well, great, it'll be a jobs Bill for attorneys that could sue our public universities or the election system. With respect to online voter registration, how do we know that the person registering is actually the person that is putting their information into the computer?"
- Currie: "Well, there is going to be a double-check, a cross check with the Secretary of State's Office. That's the way it's done in other... other states that have already adopted... 12 other states that have already adopted online voter registration. So, if anybody of the same name at the same address is already registered, then they obviously can't register as a second person a second time. In addition, they have to provide the last four digits of their Social Security number."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Reboletti: "Leader, I could..."

Currie: "That's an individual identifier."

Reboletti: "I can appreciate that, but we don't allow people to get driver's licenses online because we want them to present all their information to a live individual who can look at all the identifying whatever... identifiers, any of their documentation to make sure that the person who's submitting the information is really the person. So here's a situation that'd be ripe for fraud. And..."

Currie: "Well, remember, we can register today to vote by mail.

So you don't have to stand before somebody. You can fill

out a form and turn it in at the Secretary of State's

driver's license facilities; you can mail it in. What's the

difference?"

Reboletti: "There's also a signature request. Will there be an electronic signature, so you'll print your name and that will be your signature and that will suffice online?"

Currie: "What they'll use is..."

Reboletti: "Is that fair to say, Representative?"

Currie: "What they'll use is the signature that is at the Secretary of State location. So that will become your voter registration signature."

Reboletti: "What if you don't have a driver's license?"

Currie: "Then... then you can't get it online, unless you, of course, have a state ID. That would count the same as a driver's license."

Reboletti: "And... and the Lake County Election Commission, are... are we just getting involved in a dispute between an

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

elected official in that body and so we're going to fix it here in the General Assembly? Is that what this really is?"

Currie: "I... I certainly expect it is not."

Reboletti: "Well, I would..."

Currie: "Rarely do we engage in that kind of activity here on the floor of the Illinois House of Representatives. This is a matter of public policy. We are... the suggestion is to make a change in how the elections operate in the county of Lake, there's also a change in how elections operate in Peoria..."

Reboletti: "What's..."

Currie: "...in this Bill. And there is a change in..."

Reboletti: "Leader, then what's the genesis?"

Currie: "There's already been a change in your county as I understand, Representative."

Reboletti: "And it was a request from the county; Lake County did not request this. So it's an interesting provision that a county, one of our largest counties, didn't ask for. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we see these every couple of years right before a Primary into the next election cycle where these things are rolled into one big Bill that has almost no time to be vetted. Why weren't these concerns addressed in February when we spent maybe one overnight here? Instead it gets rolled out with about 30 hours left to go before we adjourn. I'm surprised that we don't allow people to show up at the polls a day later and then indicate they wanted to vote and then actually submit a vote and then count that vote, but it seems we're progressing in that direction. Why are we getting involved

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

in a dispute in a county who hasn't asked for any help whatsoever? But now we're going to put a mandate on them for over half a million dollars so we can get involved in somebody's frustration or own personality conflicts with their own Election Commission. That's wrong to do. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "Madam, when exactly will this take effect if passed as far as the Lake County provision?"

Currie: "I think the board is appointed 60 days after the law becomes effective."

Bost: "And then what happens to the existing clerk? Just kind of shoved off to do other things or how does that work as an elected official?"

Currie: "It... it may be 90 days. But there are many other responsibilities that fall to the clerk of a county. Those responsibilities would continue."

Bost: "So, are we going to... are we going to..."

Currie: "And of course, the county... the county board might encourage the clerk to continue participating in election activities."

Bost: "You know, I... my clerk in my home county of Jackson, even though they're from a different Party, that person is liked very well and... are we thinking about coming back and do all 102 well..."

Currie: "I have no intention of so doing."

Bost: "So this is just a real special county?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Currie: "Apparently the Senate thought so."

Bost: "Okay. Ma'am, you could have nonconcurred with that part.

We could have done that. That... that seems sensible. I

under..."

Currie: "Representative, pe... people have pointed out that we're one day from adjournment."

Bost: "You know..."

Currie: "I would say there isn't time to go back to the drawing boards."

Bost: "If... if you're only..."

Currie: "There is a lot of very good stuff in House Bill 2418 with the Senate Amendments and I encourage you to join me in voting 'yes'."

Bost: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. The Lady has said that we're only one day from adjournment and that's why we've got to do this. Just because we're one day from adjournment is no reason to pass a bad Bill. It sets a very bad precedent. We, this Body, interfering with local elected officials to a point of this level. It's not the way we should be doing things in this House. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. Online voter registration is something I've been hankering after for a long time. Twelve other states do it. This is our opportunity to see to it that a lot more people, not just young people, not just rich people, have an easy way to participate in our democracy. I strongly encourage your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved for Concurrence in the Senate Amendments. Mr. Sullivan's going to ask for a verification

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

of this vote and to answer Mr. Reis's question, this Bill will require 60 votes, Sir. 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? Cabello, Franks, Walsh. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And Mr. Reis, do you persist in your request? I'm sorry. Mr. Sullivan, do you persist in your request? Gentleman withdraws his verification. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 6 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1687, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1687, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Nekritz."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hoping that we could adopt Floor Amendment #2 and then debate the Bill on Third Reading."

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

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

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

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1687, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Session, as well as the previous Sessions, we've had a number of Pension Reform Bills. Senate Bill 1687 is yet another component part of... of the pension reform that we are undertaking here in the State of Illinois. And this is an important reform because the... it's... I think it's important that we align the... and make... make our incentives for ... for setting wages salaries and benefits and keep those... keep those incentives within the same body so that an organization, a community college, a university that is setting wages takes account of the full cost of the wages and benefits package. Right now that doesn't happen. They set the salaries and then the pension cost come to the State of Illinois. So this is meant to align that and make sure that the full costs of wages and benefits is taken into account when setting those... when setting that ... that package. I'm just going to go through a few portions of the Bill itself. First of all, we are going to be shifting the normal cost... the going forward cost of the pensions to the actual employer. These are employees that have never worked for the State of Illinois and we are going to be asking their employer to pick up this cost. But we're going to do that in a gradual way so that it can be accommodated in the... in their budgets over a number of years. The cost shift will... the first aspect of the cost shift won't occur until FY15 and

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

it will occur at one half of one percent of payroll per year. There's a lot of con... there was a lot of concern and continues to be I think about, you know, well, now that you've asked the ... the community colleges and universities to pick up this cost, what's to prevent you, the General Assembly, from passing a benefit enhancement and just making us pay the cost? So, this Bill contains two levels of protections against that. First, it... if the General Assembly passes a benefit enhancement, the State University Retirement System, SURS, has the opportunity to accept that or reject that. And I would be hoping that they would do that based on their fiduciary obligation to the health of the fund. The second thing is, if SURS approves the reg... the benefit enhancement and each individual institution, the universities and community colleges, has the ... also has the option to accept or reject that benefit enhancement. We make some changes to the SURS Board to make it absolutely clear that it is an even board between labor and management. The six elected trustees that are in labor remain the same. We then take the other six, three will be selected through the community college election process and three will be selected through a university election process. There's two other... several other components. As we were passing along this... this costs to universities, we recognized that this is a burden and we wanted to do what we could to ameliorate that. And so, we asked them, well, what... what would help you become more efficient, to lower your costs, to be more flexible in how you... you could do this? And what we... what they came back with were some

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

procurement changes, so we have included those in this Bill. We are including the provisions... the underlying provisions of Senate Bill 1687... 1687, which are the returnto-work provisions that... they would be changing. And then finally, we had... we are lessening the requirement that they... on their inventory control program. One other item I would mention, we do increase the threshold for any benefit enhancement that the General Assembly would be considering, so that to move a Bill, a benefit enhancement, from Second Reading to Third Reading would require a three quarter Majority vote by the General Assembly. With that, I'll take questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Senger."

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

Senger: "Good. I just... I have a question here on... on an increased benefit. If... is there anything to stop a university from basically saying that we think our salaries for university professors are too low? They need to have a higher salary, so we're going to increase their salaries, which will then increase the cost of the pension benefit?"

Nekritz: "No, Representative, there's nothing to prevent that today. There was nothing in this Bill that would prevent that, but what would happen then is they would bear the full cost going forward and the impact to the pensions on that. And that's exactly what we are trying to make sure happens."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Senger: "And the other question I have is, given the mechanism right now to approve a benefit increase due on our behalf, I know one of the last steps is basically saying each employer, which is now in a university, will have a yes or no vote on the benefit itself? Is this something that can lead up to different universities now having different benefits?"

Nekritz: "It is."

Senger: "And my fin... this is to the Bill. This is extremely premature at this point in time. We do not know until we know what our pension fix is what normal cost is going to We do not know until we know what our correction and reform is what the duration of time will be for this to be implemented. More importantly, than anything else, we don't have anything in place today to pay for our sins of the past, which is the unfunded pilot liability which we're on the hook for. And I would be very hesitant if I were a university to say, oh, yes, I will pick up costs, in the meantime, go ahead State of Illinois, if you don't make your pension payment, that's fine. We're going to pick it up now. It has been on record that this is a tuition increase and it is also been out there to say this will be an increase in property taxes. The... finally, the comment about how this is a free lunch and yes, you know, universities and school districts have been part of the state system, but can they not be part of the state system is a policy question? But this is not a free lunch. Taxpayers pay for tuition and the taxpayers will pay for the property taxes increases that can occur here. Finally,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

after 10 years or whatever period of time, they will pick up the full cost including the unfunded liability. And right now, if this Bill passes, tomorrow morning you're going to have the bond houses looking at our universities and downgrading their bonds 'cause they are picking up the unfunded liability, not the... not the sins of the past, but the ones going forward as soon as this Bill is signed. I would strongly, strongly urge a 'no' vote at this time. This is poor policy. We need to make sure we get some pension reform done first. And as we well know, we do not know what this cost will be until we have some pension... pension solutions in hand. So to do this right now does make no sense whatsoever."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "Representative Nekritz, I'm... I'm an example of somebody that's living in the suburbs and has kids in college, so I understand the pain that somebody in the collar counties feels in their property tax bill and somebody in the university system feels when their tuition continues to rise as they send their children to college. So I have some questions. First as it relates to the community colleges, there's a part of our statute which limits the amount that the tuition can go up on an annual basis. So if we shift the employers cost of the pension which we've already... always picked up for SURS, and some community college has an issue with the statute and how they can raise tuition, what will they be left to do in order to absorb that cost?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, we give them some ability in this Bill for some efficiencies and flexibility which is what they sought. And I think that they would... could look to those items to... in order to be able to absorb this cost."
- Tryon: "Will... will they be able to raise tuition above what the statutory ceiling is?"
- Nekritz: "There's nothing in this Bill that would allow them to do that."
- Tryon: "Okay. So they would probably cut services or run referendums and put it on property taxes, correct? They could certainly do that, right?"
- Nekritz: "They... they could do that. You know, we... as the previous speaker mentioned that it was on the record, that will be a tuition increase. It was also on the record in committee this afternoon that it will not be a tuition increase and that testimony actually came from the people who set the tuition, not the people who don't set tuition. So, I... you know, I guess I would believe the people that set the tuition."
- Tryon: "Well, we've... we've heard both sides of that. We've heard that in the university system that each want one percent increase of employer shift will increase the tuition by two percent."
- Nekritz: "Well, they testified today that it will not increase tuition."
- Tryon: "Well, that... that needs to be straightened out. Let me explain to you what I'm going through. I sent a child to college, the University... Northern Illinois University in

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

2003, room, board and tuition was \$11 thousand. I sent a child to Northern Illinois University in 2007 and tuition, room and board was 17 thousand. I sent a child to the University of Colorado, the out-of-state tuition Colorado and the University of Illinois were the same. But the in-state tuition at University of Colorado was thousand. Our in state tuition was 32 thousand, our out-ofstate tuition was 40 thousand for room, board and tuition. Our... our Illinoisans and our Illinois families are finding that a college education is out of the reach of their... of their children and their families to be able to send them to college and they're looking at other states. In fact, if you go to University of Iowa it's cheaper to send your child there than to the University of Illinois. It's cheaper to send your child to the Indiana Universities than it is to send them to Illinois State. It's cheaper to send your child to the University of Missouri than it is to Illinois... to the University of Illinois. The tuition has been going up at four and five percent a year and I can't do anything that's going to require that kind of tuition cost shift. When it comes to the community college and I look at property taxes and I look at what we're paying in the suburbs and I the complaints that I get back home relating to property taxes it's incredible. A \$300 thousand... a \$341 thousand house in the City of Chicago in Cook County, which is equalized at 10 percent is paying \$4900 in property taxes. That same house in my community would be paying \$10 thousand in property taxes. So anything that's going to promote any

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

kind of cost shift on residential real estate I cannot support. In fact, when I look at a \$300 thousand house that the Governor of the State of Illinois lives in and pays only \$4 thousand in taxes and I live in a house that's 30 percent less than that and I pay \$7 thousand in property taxes, I have a problem when we're talking about a cost shift on to residential real estate. I will have that problem for community colleges; I'm going to have that problem for school districts. There are other ways to make the school districts and the community colleges responsible for any kind of end of career pension negotiations or any kind of costs going forward. We can certify the payrolls at those facilities today and say that the state will continue to pay that amount and going forward you're going to pay that amount. There are all kinds of things we could talk to, to fix the problem that you're trying to fix. And I support doing that rather than risking an increase in property tax, which I think this Bill will ultimately lead to. I don't support it and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Nekritz, could you tell me what is the status of pension reform in Illinois right now? Where are we with this?"

Nekritz: "I believe the Bill that the House has approved just got assigned to Senate Committee. It will be heard this afternoon."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Ives: "Do you have any indication that we're actually going to see significant pension reform in the next 48 hours?"
- Nekritz: "I... I'm... I always believe there will be significant pension reform."
- Ives: "Do you know if that is actually going to occur?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I... I guess that if I had... if I had those capabilities, I wouldn't be in the Illinois General Assembly. I'd be a magician or something else."
- Ives: "Okay. Well, that's an important note because don't...
 would you feel better if we had done pension reform first
 before doing cost shift? Would you just feel better about
 the whole scenario that's going to be unwinding right now?"
- Nekritz: "I... I would believe that the... that the... the... we would have more certainty about what the cost is to be shifted."
- Ives: "And hasn't uncertainty driven some of our unfunded liability in the past? Isn't that important?"
- Nekritz: "No, I don't believe it's uncertainty that's driven that, I believe it's a failure to adhere to actuarial science and underfunding and a number of other factors."
- Ives: "Well, how about the uncertainty of the market?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I... Okay. The... the returns for this pension systems have been very... have been right in line with what... with what they expect over the last 3 years. So, yes in any given year."
- Ives: "Except that anytime you fall short of those returns. In one year you significantly change the amount that you're going to get in the next year. So when our pension reform only returned 4.6 percent last year and less than one percent the year before that, that's going to be a huge

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

impact on the... what the unfunded liability ends up being.
Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "And that will remain a state obligation."

Ives: "Yes, I understand that. To the Bill. I... I tell you what, this is absolutely the wrong thing to do without pension reform first. There is so much uncertainty in what this is going to cost. We don't know what the unfunded liability will be for the local districts at ... at any point in time from now on. And until we do pension reform and have a complete idea of what the cost is truly going to be, you're putting everybody in a trick box. Nobody is going to know what to... how much they're going to have to pay for in the future. This is so premature to do this before pension reform. We've all known. We all went and walked our districts and told people, most of us, that pension reform is the #1 challenge in Illinois. That's what we did. And what are we doing? We're doing a cost shift instead. And there's no doubt in my mind that at some point people are going to say that this cost shift is really the pension reform for 2013. And that's the wrong answer. We're not shifting our burdens to the local property tax district and especially to the collar counties that are paying the freight for the rest of the state. This is uncalled for. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's at least among just about everybody in this building that's following the pension issue, we have been told over the last 24, 48 hours that Senate Bill 1... that Senate Bill 1 that's sitting over

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

in the House, that actually from a substantive standpoint does the most regardless of where you are on the issue, does the most in terms of benefit reform to have cost savings and is not going to survive. That the President of the Senate is going to call it for a vote and it's going to die. 'Cause he doesn't like it. He has made the decision that it's not constitutional, at least that's what he claims. I don't know how anybody could make that claim except for the people over at the Supreme Court. But the reality is, we've all been told that Senate Bill 1 is dead. And as Representative Ives just said, I think... and was so eloquent, that the only issue or the ... one of the most important issues of this General Assembly this year is pension reform. We have to do a budget, but if we don't solve the pension problem today or tomorrow in substantive way, our world continues to crumble. We all know the numbers, \$100 billion of unfunded liability, billion dollars. Seventeen million dollars a day, the crowding out. The bond houses knocking on our doors saying, your ability to borrow money is going to cost you more. We may get to a point where it will be almost impossible to borrow money. We have got to do pension reform. And yet, this chamber and the chamber across the way has not found a way to close the deal on pension reform. We talk a good game. We send a Bill over; they send a Bill over, but today 24 hours from adjournment we have not done pension reform in a final way to send it to the Governor's desk. Done a lot of other things, we just passed an Election Bill that was not designed to solve any problems we had but was

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

designed to further your side's success in political campaigns. We looked at some abuse up in Lake County that you said you were after, but we all know what that was about. I want to just highlight some of the incredibly important issues that we face this Session instead of making sure pension reform is done. We passed a Lemon Law dealing with puppies. Thank goodness we got that done. We spent an hour one day debating and talking about how to handle the eating of lion meat. Thank goodness we were able to spend a whole hour on lion meat. We talked about trans fat, what a great debate. Did that solve the pension problem? I don't think so. We spent a great deal of time talking about lap dogs, dogs in our laps while driving. What did that do to solve the pension problem? Yesterday we talked about the creation of a state bank. What did that do to solve the pension problem? Oh, and don't forget... don't forget two of the biggies, we were able to raise the fine for people that littered, raise the cost of the fine for people that littered. And for those of you that threw a cigarette butt down, thank goodness we were able to raise the fine for all of you. Now, those may be important issues to each and one... each and every one of you in some way, but I would like to think this chamber and the one across the way would like to do the one and only issue that matters right now, and that's pension reform. And as Jeanne Ives said, and I think she was dead on, this issue, whether you agree with the idea of a cost shift or not, is premature. All of our energy in whatever role we have should be devoted to making sure a real Pension Bill... a real Pension

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bill ends up on the Governor's desk. He said ... I think he said he'd sign Senate Bill 1. He should sign Senate Bill 1. It was a collaborative effort with Representative Nekritz, Representative Senger, Daniel Biss, the Speaker. Give all those people credit. They know the problems we have, they know we need to solve the problem. They're willing to do what it takes to solve the problem, but yet, 24 hours today... from today we are going to be adjourning and it's very possible we don't do real substantive, comprehensive pension reform. So what does that mean for universities? We, at one point this spring, remember the date and I don't know what it is today... what the figure is, we owed the University of Illinois \$450 million. We will have a bill... an undue bill number of 7.5 at the end of this fiscal year, \$7.5 billion. We owe our universities millions of dollars. And now we come along and say to our universities and why on earth... why on earth they would agree to this is beyond me, is absolutely beyond me, incredible that they would go in and try to negotiate what I would argue is a very bad deal and it's... it's sad that they did. But what we're doing to them is we're saying, we caused a huge problem with the pension systems, this General Assembly did, not all of us. Many of you on the other side of the aisle were here in the mid-2000s when we didn't make a pension payment, Speaker Madigan and Governor Blagojevich. The unfunded liability back then was \$38 billion, today it's over \$100 billion. It's a huge part of the problem. So we owe them hundreds of millions of dollars, we wrecked the pension system. There are other

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

causes of the problem, but primarily, or at least 50 percent of the problem, is we didn't make pension payments. And now we come along and say to the universities, we want you to be in... be involved with fixing a problem created by the Illinois General Assembly. Welcome to our mess. That's what we're saying to them. And oh, by the way, by the way, we haven't solved the pension problem either. We did a Bill, we sent it over, they sent one over here, we're going to get to it I'm sure in someday ... some fashion, but we just haven't done it. So we're going to rush ahead and pass a shift bills to the university and we know, as Representative Tryon said and no one's disputed it, for every one percent of normal cost we assess to universities, it's going to be a two percent cost tuition increase, 2 percent. We were also told that the potential normal cost liability may be as high as percent. You do the math. You do the math and you tell the students in your districts... you tell the students in your district why their tuition is going up. Because one, the General Assembly didn't do benefit reform, and two, it transferred the cost without fixing the problem to the universities. Now the universities, apparently in committee said, well, we don't have any tuition cost. We'll we'll find efficiencies and make sure we keep those down. They're just now finding efficiencies? Where have they been the last 2, 3, 4, 5, 10 years? Do we really think they can find efficiencies to the tune of the liability we're going to put on them? Of course not, of course not. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, there may be merit someday... sometime to the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

discussion of who's responsible on paying pension liability and we've seen abuses at the TRS level from local schools; we've seen abuses at the SURS level. I know that. I'm not ... I'm not going to sit here and say that that doesn't exist and that needs to be addressed. And we're willing to do that. But before we go down any road... any road whatsoever on... on cost shift, we need real substantive pension reform that hasn't happened. I hope and I pray we're not seeing the old typical game play by your Leader and the Senate Leader of crossing fingers and saying, oh, he's got it, no he's got it, and get out of here without doing anything 'cause that would be a tragedy. We demonstrated a capacity to get it done yet. I hope in the next 24 hours we actually get a real Pension Bill to the Governor's desk. So for that reason... for those reasons and others, I will not be supporting this. And I suspect most everybody, if not everybody on this side of the aisle, joins me in those feelings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. I've heard a lot of folks speak on this and I guess there's enough blame to go around on this whole issue. But I don't want this to become a partisan issue where we're pointing fingers and saying folks didn't get stuff done. I mean, the fact of the matter is we only had 22 votes on that side of the aisle on our pension reform and hopefully we're going to be getting that back soon. But I think... I think the Minority Leader makes a very good point. About 3 months ago I put together a sign totaling... with a running total of our accelerating pension debt. And

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

since that time, I just did the calculations, our debt has increased over one and half billion dollars. That's one and a half billion dollars, just in the last 3 months. And as we all know, Illinois has not only the worst funded pension system in the country, we also have the worst credit ranking in the country, and that's not a coincidence. We have billions of dollars in unpaid bills and we also have the second highest unemployment rate in the entire country. Millions of our citizens live in or near poverty. So I we're failing. We are failing all constituents. Now, we're supposed to adjourn tomorrow, but I'm asking that we all pledge to stay here and not leave until we fix this pension issue. Because we've heard over and over from our Governor and from the Leaders that this is the most important issue, but still with 24 hours to go before we're supposed to adjourn, we don't have a real plan. I think our state's in crisis. And I hope in the next 24 hours that we can come together and solve this issue. And hope that we can stand together and demand that that pension problem be fixed. Now the Bill in front of us, in theory, may make sense. That the ... with the cost shift. Unfortunately, you can't look at this in a vacuum because we have an antiquated school funding formula. I'll use my school district where my kids go for an example. Marengo, Illinois, the schools receive about 8 percent of their funding from the State of Illinois, much less than the average of other areas in the state. So this Bill, if it were to pass, would increase property taxes on the... on our area. We already pay one of the highest property taxes,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

not only in the state but in the entire country. I believe we're 21st in the entire United States of America. That's not something I'm proud of. And that's because we have a funding formula which doesn't make sense. So, to try to only fix one portion of it and to say that we're going to do a shift without fixing the funding formulas for our schools makes no sense. And Mr. Tryon talked and he gave some good statistics about the cost of colleges and he's a hundred percent right. A one percent increase here on the cost shift will increase tuition. And this will hurt primarily those community colleges. Now, the community colleges are those that are trying to be economic engines in our communities. And when we have the second highest unemployment rate in the entire country, to take moneys away from those schools and not to help the people who need the most, doesn't make sense. So, this Bill may make sense at some time, it does not make sense at this time. And I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. Being on Appropriations-Higher Education and representing a university myself, quite frankly, I still continue to be stunned by the cost of what we owe our universities when we entered into negotiation... budget negotiations this year. And just... just for the record, at that time... when we entered into those negotiations, Chicago State University was owed over \$29 million, Eastern Illinois University was owed over \$35 million, Governor State University at that time over \$19 million, Illinois

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

State University, the university that I represent, was owed over \$59 million, Northern Illinois University was owed over \$30 million, Northern Illinois University owed over \$74 million, Western Illinois University owed over \$41 million, Southern Illinois University owed over \$161 million. And as Leader Cross spoke to the University of Illinois, at that time was owed over \$537 million. What a novel idea it would be to pay our universities first what we owe them before we strangle them with a cost shift for pensions. I intend to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Representative, just a... one quick question on the enhanced vote threshold, something in the analysis that I saw that I didn't really understand. It says that in order for a Bill that increases the benefit under the Pension Code to move from Second to Third Reading here in the House, a three-fourths Majority by recorded vote is required. Is that... that correct?"

Nekritz: "That's correct."

Martwick: "Can you tell me, was there some reasoning behind picking such a high threshold?"

Nekritz: "Representative, you may recall last year the General Assembly put a measure on the ballot to amend the Constitution to require a three-fifths Majority in order to do a benefit enhancement on any pension matter. I think this is along the same vein of, you know, that we obviously have a very, very big hole that we're trying to dig out of,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- and we have to find very, very big solutions to do... to get our way out of that, and this is one of those solutions."
- Martwick: "Do you know if... are there any other vote thresholds here in the House according to our Rules that require a... such a high threshold, a three-quarters Majority?"
- Nekritz: "I'm... I... yes, there are... there are... in House Rules there are some requirements for Supermajorities to move a Bill from Second to Third."
- Martwick: "Okay. I... it just seems exceptionally high to me and I... I'm not really sure I understand why that provision was necessary. I understand that past Legislatures have been somewhat irresponsible in the way that we have agreed to pension enhancements. But for instance, we have this Tier II which we've... which has been talked about quite a bit and these Tier II benefits by all accounts are exceptionally low benefits as part of this fix. In fact, during many of the pension discussions it's been talked about changing the Tier II benefits, trying to alleviate some of the... the... move some of those benefits. So for state universities to move those Tier II benefits would now require, before there could even be a vote on the House Floor, would require a three-quarter Majority just to move the Bill to the Third Reading for a House Bill. Is that correct?"
- Nekritz: "That's correct, Representative. And I would argue that we better get it right so that it's got strong bipartisan support when we do that."
- Martwick: "I... I have a... I'm... I'm very troubled by that. I think that this is a good idea, I think the cost shift in general. I listened to the testimony in committee and I

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

liked it. But to me this seems like it changes the tenets of democracy and I think when we start establishing some high thresholds it opens the doors to other things. I really don't know how I'm going to vote on this. I'm going to listen to some more of the testimony, but I think that this is something that the Body as a whole should consider. This is changing the threshold from a simple Majority or even a Supermajority to an exceptionally high Supermajority and... and I'm just not really sure that that's a good idea."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kay: "Representative, I'm somewhat struck with the idea that we're here the last two days... two weeks ago or maybe a shorter period of time a lot us... at least 22 of us voted for a Pension Bill that I thought was a pretty good one. Is this now going to be our pension reform in the State of Illinois?"

Nekritz: "Representative, no one has worked harder than me on making sure that that gets done. And I... so, I would... I would... I am... remain hopeful that this is not it. But this is... this has always been part of the proposals that I put forward and I think that this is an important component part of pension reform."

Kay: "It seems to me that this is our reform. And I think everyone needs to listen tonight because this may be it. And if it is, I want the Body to understand some things. First of all, I want to ask the Representative if you're familiar with the original constitutionally-passed

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

provision with respect to pension payments? It was... it was a good number. It provided well. Is that not the case? When we pa..."

Nekritz: "Representative, are you talking about... you talking about the 1970 Constitution?"

Kay: "That's correct, yeah."

Nekritz: "Yeah, I've... I've read it a time or two."

Kay: "Okay. And... and it was fair. Are you familiar then with what we did subsequent to that?"

Nekritz: "Representative, why don't you just tell me rather than quizzing my knowledge?"

Kay: "Well, four... okay. Fourteen times we gave enhancements to the pension fund that we couldn't afford. And on top of that then we had a lot of folks who thought Senate Bill 27, House Amendment 1 was a good deal; where we stopped paying the fund. And then in addition to that we never had anyone crank out the numbers and statistically validate what the retirement systems investments were doing. And maybe, maybe, a year or two or three out of four decades they hit their number. So, I would not want to leave the impression tonight that the taxpayers have not done their job up to this point because they paid for this pension system one time every year. Is that not the case?"

Nekritz: "Well, I... I wouldn't want... want to speak for the last... since the pension systems were formed in the 1930s, as to whether the state has made a payment every year, but I'll take your word for it."

Kay: "Well, I... you don't need to; it's really factual. I'm just really recounting historically what's going on here. But I

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

want to talk about cost shifting for just a moment because it's been talked about in a lot of different ways, and I want to talk about it in somewhat of a different way. As I understand it and I'm looking at funding requirements here, the employer becomes the school system. Is that correct? Or school systems? It won't be the State of Illinois."

Nekritz: "I... I'm not sure I understand. I mean..."

Kay: "Well, where if you cost shift something the... the person who is employing that person changes from the State of Illinois who's now paying the pension to the local district who will be paying it and you're really saying the employer now becomes responsible?"

Nekritz: "I thought you meant... I thought you were asking was there language in the Bill to do that?"

Kay: "yeah. No. No. No."

Nekritz: "I don't... I don't... there's not language in the Bill, but effectively I would agree with you."

Kay: "Okay. So, my question is, when these school districts
 are..."

Nekritz: "This... this doesn't apply to school districts,

Representative."

Kay: "Well, let me... let me just finish. Okay. Let me just ask this. When you cost shift anything and you change it from Springfield to Edwardsville or Collinsville somebody different will pay the bill. Is that correct?"

Nekritz: "Well, those same taxpayers are paying for the bill now. And... and they would be paying for it again. Just to... yeah."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Kay: "Again? Well, that's right they did pay for it one time.
 And now, but we are..."
- Nekritz: "But... well their income taxes and sales taxes and other... other state taxes are paying for it now. And it will be a different pot of money after this is done."
- Kay: "Yeah. A different formula, right. My... my question is though, what if, what if, the cost shift is not affordable when we put it in place? What happens then?"
- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, what... we can always have the opportunity to come back and take a look at that. But right now, you know, the State of Illinois is looking at a \$2 billion budget for Higher Ed. And the first year cost shift will be \$18 million."
- Kay: "Well, let me just be real specific. In truth, we're going to put the taxpayer on the hook if the employer can't pay the cost shift. Is that not correct?"
- Nekritz: "The... the taxpayers are already on the hook, Representative."
- Kay: "Well... but they're going to be more so on the hook because we're going to increase their stake in the game if the local employer can't pay the bill. Is that not right?"
- Nekritz: "I... I disagree. I think... I mean... if we don't pay the bill they're on the hook as well. So, I don't..."
- Kay: "Well..."
- Nekritz: 'I don't see the tax... the taxpayer... it's the same pocket. So, I don't understand how we're making it worse by doing this."
- Kay: "Well, I... we're making it worse because at the present time we have taxed people to the extent that they can't

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

afford it anymore. Maybe in your area, you can, but as Representative Tryon mentioned, the rest of us deal with different rates. We don't deal with the rates you have in Chicago. We wish we could. But my question is this, are you saying that there is no backup plan. There is no Plan B if we can't pay the tax at the local level. If the cost shift fails, are you..."

Nekritz: "Representative, the employers that are assuming this cost have agreed that they have the means to be able to do that. I... I don't... I think... I'm not going to speculate about what happens if they..."

Kay: "Okay."

Nekritz: "...if what..."

Kay: "Well..."

Nekritz: "If they can't, they've indicated that they can."

Kay: "Delinquent payments, as I understand it under your Bill, would be assumed by the taxpayer and if not the taxpayer then you could... you could further go to court to make some sort of arrangement for collection. And I think that's a bad plan. Let me also..."

Nekritz: "Well, that's exactly what we do with IMRF right now."

Kay: "Yeah. Well, let me just..."

Nekritz: "And they're... that's the best funded system..."

Kay: "Maybe so."

Nekritz: "...we have in the State of Illinois."

Kay: "Well, that's curious. Why... why would we pick that model up some time ago. But let me just say this, I know you've worked very hard on this. I know you've worked very hard on this, but not the cost shift. Two weeks ago when I voted

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

for... I guess it was your Bill, to move the... the pension issue forward, I asked the question, would cost shift be a part of the ongoing conversation? The answer was yes. And I said, would it be better if we had done this 41 years ago? And the answer was yes. And I submit to you tonight the answer is still yes. That all we're doing is trying to clean-up the books here in Springfield and shift it down to the local level. And I think that's wrong today. Forty-one years ago it would have been fine. Representative, let me just say this, this Bill should be called pack your bags and leave Illinois because that's exactly what we're asking. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Nekritz: "And Representative, I would say..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, were you responding?"

Nekritz: "Well, I was going to say that... to the Representative, that as a businessman I'm sure you would understand that every employ... every employer pays the full cost of wages and benefits for their employees. That's what we're asking these employers to do as well."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. Let me congratulate the Sponsor of this legislation. She has worked arduously for 2 and a half, 3 years as well as the universities. If you look at who the proponents are, they all signed on this. The universities don't have a problem with paying their fair share of benefits. They've agreed to this. A year and a half ago, they were the first ones out of the box who saw the rationale... the financial rationale and reality of where it is that our state is and where they

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

need to be. So I am thoroughly perplexed to find out what it is that we're talking about since they've agreed on this. We're talking about the universities that have incredible business schools, some of the best researchers, some of the best actuaries and accountants. They were the ones who were meeting collectively to find out the best approach with this. This is what they want. So this is a great Bill, not a good Bill. The other point is, the moneys that are owed to state universities, it's always there. It may not come when you want it, but it's always there and on time. They receive their dollars before the fiscal year is over with. Yeah, we're delayed, but they get the money. Keep in mind, good people, state universities, just like private colleges or for-profit colleges, they have grants that they can extract dollars from. They certainly have alumni donating tremendous amounts of dollars and other resources to them. They engage with private corporations on research endeavors. But their biggest source of revenue comes, not necessarily from the state, but from their income fund. State colleges and universities have an income line to help offset whatever delays, whatever shortcomings financially that the State of Illinois presents itself towards them. Again, this is what they want. This is what the universities ask for. That's why they are supporting the cost shift. They have not skirted their effort and ability to deal with this real financial issue. And here's another best kept secret, state universities... they're not state employees. They don't run Departments of Corrections, DCFS, State Police. They do

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

their own income generation, their own hiring, and now they want to be responsible for their own cost benefits and who they pay benefits to. This is a great thing. This is a wonderful time to hear someone, universities which are businesses like anyone... anywhere else here in the state, wanting to pick up, finally, the responsibility of them paying the costs of their benefits of their particular employees. So I applaud all of those universities who are doing the right thing, who see to it that our State University Retirement System is going to become solvent. Because if not, it'll just be the upside down opposite. So I applaud the Sponsor and to all of these universities who want to do this, who elected to do this, who organized early to do this because they have a vested interest in seeing to it that their pension is solvent now and in the future. I would encourage a strong 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been around here a few years and it always seems to me that, you know, I've heard many times that there's not a vote that you can take on this floor that will truly affect your elections. Well, I'm going to tell you that this one sure can. If you're a downstate Legislator, if you are a Legislator that is the burbs, if you are a Legislator that is just outside the City of Chicago, if there's one thing that your constituents I'm sure have said to you is, my property taxes are high enough, high enough. Ladies and Gentlemen, all you're doing is socking them with another bill. So now go back to your

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

constituents and tell them how you're really for them, go ahead, but I'm going to tell you, I hope whoever makes a vote on this Bill has their opponent standing at the door telling exactly about this vote. You don't care about the taxpayers. You aren't wanting to deal with the real pension problem, you're just wanting to shift it off. Shift it off, blame it in another way. Take it... take it, just go ahead and throw it on so that... so that the people who are trying to stay in their homes can't stay in their homes 'cause every time you turn around your property taxes are going up again. And then, let's do this, too. There are many of my constituents that love the fact that they went to a state university in the State of Illinois, wherever that might have been, Northern, Eastern, SIU, U of I. But now... you know, it's cheaper to send them to Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana. And what are we going to do now? We're going to go ahead and force them to raise tuition again. Folks, pay attention to what you're doing. And as I just said, if you vote for it, I hope there is a person that is your opponent that comes after you like a rabid dog."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I may, to the Bill. The Lady knows that I'm probably one of the few people on this side of the aisle who is willing to en... entertain the idea of a cost shift. The speaker's logic here makes some sense. The people who work for TRS, the people who work for SURS have never worked for the State of Illinois. So, why should the State of Illinois be paying their... their pension benefits. However, the Lady made a

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

statement which troubles me greatly. And that statement is when she answered a question, is this pension reform for the State of Illinois? And she said I hope not, but it could be. If all we're doing is shifting the cost to save the state money, it's wrong. We're putting the cart before the horse which I think the Lady who is the chair of the Pension Committee knows full well and has worked harder than anybody else in this chamber to get pension reform, but I think she would agree we are putting the cart before the horse. Let's do pension reform first, let's get that passed. And then let's come back and say, there is a reasonable case because we know what the impact of that pension reform is. There's a reasonable case to do a cost shift. But to do this now first before we have pension reform is inappropriate, can't go along with it. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Leader, I'm looking at the proponents and the opponents and I'm somewhat perplexed because it seems to be a mixture and it also indicates there's no opponents. So I wanted to clarify who the proponents and opponents were as based off what your analysis indicates or what you're aware of from committee?"

Nekritz: "Representative, I... I believe that the... the opponents that testified in committee were from the IEA and the... Illinois Education Association and the Illinois Federation

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

of Teachers. Those are the only two that spoke in opposition. Oh, SEIU, AFLCIO, AFSCME..."

Reboletti: "Are the... so the... the community colleges and the universities are for this?"

Nekritz: "They are."

Reboletti: "And..."

Nekritz: "And they spoke to that in committee."

Reboletti: "...and... and what type of saving will the state realize in FY15?"

Nekritz: "The total shift in... in FY15 is \$18 million."

Reboletti: "Does it really cost the state \$80 million in FY15?"

Nekritz: "That would one eight, \$18 million."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I thought that I... I actually got new glasses not that long ago and I thought I was maybe reading the opponents and proponents incorrectly. Why would a university want to take on additional cost when the state owes them money? I know it's really loud in here so I will be louder to try to make sure everybody in the state can hear me. At my alma mater of Eastern Illinois University, 137 percent increase in tuition from 10 years ago when it was \$3500 to go there. Now it's \$8300 to go there and their enrollment is down 7 percent. This ought to help attendance and enrollment in helping the working class and the middle class and everybody go to school. Certainly it won't. I can't imagine the College of DuPage is for this or the taxpayers of DuPage County where the tuition there is almost as much as going to one of the directional university. I can only imagine what it took to make the universities and the community colleges proponents of this.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

I would anticipate that what they stood to lose in GRF was a heck of a lot more than what this pension shift would be. Only in Illinois can we take a victory lap and celebrate savings to the state while sticking it to the families and the students that go to our universities, and now we can take money and spend it somewhere else. We can start to shovel all of our saved money into Chicago Public Schools Pension System which is bleeding profusely and needs a billion dollars to make it somewhat solvent. Talk about putting the cart before the horse. For those of you who voted for Senate Bill 1, I appreciate that. You thought that was the right way to go. We still have no idea what's going to happen over in the other chamber. For Senate Bill 2404 here, we're still waiting for a vote. We have less than 30 hours 'til we adjourn. Why isn't that Bill being called? There might be enough votes to pass some pension reform, but here we are. Almost a year ago to the day I stood on this floor and asked for some type of pension reform to be passed. Three hundred and sixty-four days later, we are absolutely in the same position. Isn't that shocking? We'll probably adjourn without doing nothing more than shifting burdens to local taxpayers, taking more money away from students and calling that a victory. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my time to Representative Senger."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And... and what I'd like to do right now is share with everyone a conversation

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

we had in the... not today's committee but in the hearing we had on... on cost shift, particularly with the universities, and why I think this is important to understand. One of ... and I'm not making judgment here. But one of the biggest problems the universities have right now with our Senate Bill 1 has to do with the salary cap that is in there. And what they feel about that is that they can't compete with the cap that's in there. So the universities and again, I'm not making judgment, but where they are on this is that basically they want to basically pay the salaries they think they can pay. They don't like that cap in there. And as I asked the Representative earlier, yes, they will do whatever they need to do. If it's end of career bump ups or whatever they need to do to keep... to keep people here and that... that cost will be taken on by the universities then if it affects their pension and it does affect their pension. And yes, that will be a tuition increase and yes... yes, that'll be a property tax increase for the community colleges. I mean, that's where it is. They do not want to deal with the cap we have in Senate Bill 1. They don't like it. And the reason why that cap is in there is to keep some of the abuses, which are primarily most blatant on the university level, from happening. I mean, that's where this is. This is not the time to implement this Bill. Absolutely not the time. We need pension reform first. We need to get the salary caps in place. We need to fix Tier II. We'll be ... if we don't fix it today, it'll be another cost on us. And finally, we haven't even talked about some of the alternatives we could have

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

here. In fact, Representative Biss and Representative Nekritz and Cross came up with a very good alternative solution to this shift, which was a hybrid plan for Tier II. That's not being done and why that's not being talked about and why we haven't had a chance to share what's the best way to do this is beyond me. I am fearful what's going to happen here before we go home, we're going to have a cost shift and nothing else. Do not vote for this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We... we've had debate even this week about the cost of higher education and I just want to make sure that everybody in here, it's been said, but I want to make sure that everyone hears it again, if you vote for this Bill, you are voting for a tuition increase in the State of Illinois. We... we heard it before. Our surrounding states have lower out-ofstate tuition than our in-state tuition. Make no mistake that our best and brightest in this state can do the math. They can do the math and realize that it's better to go to an out-of-state school... go to an out-of-state school who also has a lower unemployment rate, which means they go out of the state, they stay out of the state. They employed, they may come to visit their family, but they stay out of the state. We lose a Congressional District every 10 years. We are hemorrhaging people. We are losing our best and brightest and the only way to get out of this is to return to a strong economy to keep our best and brightest here in the State of Illinois and these schools are the best way to do it. I urge a 'no' vote."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Roth."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to read a headline to you in the Tribune. The University of Chicagoland at Missouri... yeah, let me repeat that, it's the University of Chicagoland at Missouri, and the reason for that is because 20 percent of Missouri's freshman class is from the State of Illinois. Thirty-three percent of the freshman class at the University of Iowa is from Illinois. We are going to have a property tax increase with this and you're going to see a huge tuition rate increase, between 10 and 15 percent is what we're being told. And so, what we're going to do is we're going to push even more kids out of the State of Illinois and go to college somewhere else, whether that's Iowa, Missouri, Wisconsin, Indiana, Florida, pick it. It's going to be somewhere else. And how many of those kids do you think come back after four years? Not many of them I'm... I'm being told. We are shipping kids out of our state because of our tuition rates and this is just one more tuition increase. The newspaper also found out in the fall of 2010, one quarter of all the first-time students left the state, up from 17 percent just a decade earlier. Thirty thousand Illinois freshman left the State of Illinois to go somewhere else. So, I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. I would like our students to stay and be educated in our state in our schools and create economic opportunities in our state, not someone else's. Thank you. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. We... we... in this particular debate we've reached a stunning level of disappointment on what we're doing when it comes to this issue, and that's saying something this particular Session. Have you really reached the point where we're wishing opposition on each other over the issue of pension reform? Is that what this Body has come to? We're asking for our colleagues to get opposition in the form of a rabid dog? That's the level of discourse the pension reform debate has come to right now? We had people ask about the motives of the universities. What's their motive? Why would they want to do this? God forbid, they want to do the right thing. God forbid, it's so unbelievable that it makes sense for the policy of the State of Illinois to be for universities to accept the pension costs of employees. That's so unfathomable to some us in this Body. We had three hearings on this matter, three hearings, and each time, the university professionals came to us and they said, they're ready to do the right thing. And now we're going to hit our 'no' buttons because it doesn't make sense for us. That's the way pension reform is going to go from here on out. Three weeks ago we put 62 votes on a comprehensive pension reform proposal that's going to save this state. We managed that issue, we took the courageous vote. None of us can control what's going to happen in the Senate. So, it's time to do the next right thing. If you have problems with the policy articulated in this Bill then vote 'no', but keep the discourse as a respectable level and let's make sure that our eye remains on the ball."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Willis: "Representative, I just have a... a very simple question and I just want it for clarification. This cost shift will be strictly to the community colleges and universities, not to our local elementary and high school districts, correct?"

Nekritz: "Correct."

Willis: "Okay. And I was in on a couple of the pension hearings that we had over the last couple of weeks and as Representative Zalewski said, they all totally support and want to take over this pension cost shift, correct?"

Nekritz: "I would say that they are willing to because they understand the long-term implications of this. I'm not sure that they're... you know, that they're excited about it."

Willis: "Okay. That's fair enough to say. To the Bill. One of the things that I want to point out to this is, one of the concerns I think that the universities presented was they wanted to be able to be at the table to have some input on that. And we're taken care of this in the SURS Board, putting them on as part members on that. Another thing, last night on the news many of us were watching and heard that the University of Illinois's basketball coach just got a raise. His current salary is \$1 million, he got a \$200 thousand raise and his salary next year will be \$1.2 million. Now, that's wonderful for him and it's wonderful for the university of basketball and I happen to be a U of

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

I alumni, I got my Master's through there, and I think that's a wonderful thing. But I think if they can afford to pay \$1.2 million for their basketball coach, they can certainly afford to cover the cost shift without relaying that on to more taxes. I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Lang: "Excuse me, Representative Flowers, would you suspend for a moment? Ladies and Gentlemen, please, it's late in the day, we're getting nervous, we're getting tired. Why don't we just sit quietly and rest while Representative Flowers speaks. Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the previous speakers spoke about the time that was spent on a banking Bill. And I just want to reassure the speaker and anyone that was listening that that banking Bill was to address the very issues in what... in which we're talking about today, in regards to the pension. I don't think that we should be taking away anyone's pension. I don't think we should making... be making any types of cutbacks in anyone's pay. I don't think that we should be taxing people more while their tax bills are getting bigger and their paychecks are getting smaller. And the purpose of me introducing that Resolution to have a discussion on how to bring more revenues to the State of Illinois, on how to bring more jobs to the State of Illinois, on how to bring education more affordable to the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

State of Illinois. And as I stated yesterday, I will state it again today and I will continue to say it until such time that Illinois has its own bank, that North Dakota is not suffering. North Dakota is not having this debate in regards to pension. North Dakota is not raising taxes on the people of North Dakota. North Dakota's young people are able to go to schools, jobs are created. So I don't want anyone to misunderstand the fact that that Bill was a very serious piece of legislation and I guarantee you, you will see it again real soon. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The simple question, there's just one simple question. Is... is this Body willing to cap future spending in order to... so they don't... they don't blow projected savings? I think that's something that we have to remember in this Bill. I urge a strong 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are legitimate policy reasons to be pursuing this cost shift and there are reasons to do it at this time. We need to assure that like everything... like every employer in the private sector, we take... that the employer takes account of the full cost of wages and benefits. We hear all the time, why doesn't government run more like a business? Why doesn't government take... keep accounts like... like the private sector does? This Bill makes the employer responsible for the full cost of the wages and benefits. That's the right thing to do. I have to say I think it's... I... I have to agree with one of

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

the previous speakers that this debate was a little astounding. And I... I think it's really inappropriate and uncalled for to mock Bills of ... of Members in this chamber. We are entitled to come here and represent our constituents and bring their ideas forward for this Assembly to consider. And SO to mock those ideas is inappropriate and should never happen on the House Floor. I think also that to... to say that the universities and the community colleges, the academics in the State of Illinois, the Presidents of those institutions, were too stupid to figure out what this did and why would they... why would they take this on? Of course they know what they're doing. And I'll tell you why they did it, because in the long-term this is the right thing to do. And we rarely take a longterm view in the Illinois General Assembly, but in this instance we need to be looking 20 years down the road and say, we got to get those pensions paid off and we've got to get this fiscal ship righted. This is a long-term solution for that... for ... for these issues. And it's the right solution for... for these issues. This is not been the hyperbole around this. This is not going to be a huge tax increase. The universities testified today in committee that there will be no impact on tuition. Now, I don't set tuition, you don't set tuition, they set tuition. And so, if they say that there will be no tuition increase, I will take them at their word on that. The shift itself is \$18 million, \$18 million in the first year. We, as the State of Illinois, send them \$2 billion this year. That doesn't take account of their tuition, of their property taxes, of all

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

the other revenues that they have, \$18 million. Not 'b' with a... not billion with a 'b', million with an 'm'. So, this... it's not going to be easy. We have made these cuts, but the reason we've had to make cuts to higher education is because of the pension payment. So this is... this is... this all has to come together and be part of the solution. So this is the right solution for this particular time. I think it's important that we get this component of pension reform done just as I would like to get something... the other component and get Senate Bill 1 done. But this is every bit as important and needs to be done at this time. Thank you."

- Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 55 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken May 30, 2013: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 20, and Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1910."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 20, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. Mr.... Take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. The Order of Senate Bills-Second

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Reading, page 6 of the Calendar, there is Senate Bill 1715, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. 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. Please read the Bill for a third time."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1715, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradlev: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a long time in coming. The State of Illinois currently has fracking going on, horizontal high volume hydraulic fracturing taking place within the State of Illinois. This is the result of months, if not years, of bipartisan, bicameral negotiations between the industry, the environmental community, the Department of Natural Resources, the Attorney General's Office, the Governor's Office, the Environmental Protection Agency. It's been an open process; we have been inclusive. We have asked people to be a part of this and to be involved in this. And this is the result of months and months and months of work. I'd like to compliment several of the Representatives in this room: Jakobsson, Representative Currie, Representative Representative Williams, on our side; well as Representative Bost, Representative Reis, Representative Cavaletto, Representative Tryon, Representative McSweeney and Representative Fortner who have been involved in the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

discussions on the other side. We have created what many have called a model for the nation that creates the strongest regulations, environmental regulations, which creates a reasonable taxation process for this industry and which allows the industry to develop in a responsible manner. Provides for testing, it provides for water quality and post. It calls for air testing, pre standards, it calls for setbacks, it calls for a process of applications, it calls for a process of permitting, it calls for a public hearing process. It has pieces of good ideas from around the country. And I think everyone that participated in this process is proud of the result that took place. Horizontal high volume fracturing is occurring in Illinois currently. And it's important that we get out there and put in place legislation and regulations to first and foremost protect the groundwater of the State of Illinois and the people of the State of Illinois and to allow an industry to in... to invest in Illinois, to develop and potentially turn around the economy of southern Illinois. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to give you a little background and context about this Bill and to clear up some of the misconceptions some of us may have heard. This Bill was part of a strategic decision-making process that was made by many of the proponents of the Bill, a few of who I'm going to list for you now. Proponents include the Illinois Attorney

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

General, Department of Natural Resources, the Environmental Protection Agency of Illinois, the Illinois Environmental Council, the Environmental Law and Policy Center, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Protestants for Common Good, Faith in Place and others. If you have any familiarity with the environmental community in Illinois, you know that these are the leaders in protecting the environment and have been for many years. Last year along with several of my colleagues who are very focused on the environment, we made a strategic decision to move forward and pursue regulations for fracking. Last spring I joined colleagues, advocates in pushing for a moratorium fracking. I voted for it, I cosponsored it. But we were unable to move a moratorium forward due to a significant lack of support. At that time, key Legislative Leaders were working for a more industry-friendly version and moving that language forward. Along with many of my colleagues and leaders in the environmental community, we decided to push most stringent, restrictive regulations for the possible. We worked hard and spent hours, days, weeks, months to make sure that we protected our air, land and water. I think it's important to note that this Bill is not about a choice between fracking in Illinois or no fracking in Illinois. The choice is this, fracking in Illinois with no regulation or fracking in Illinois with the tightest, most stringent regulations possible. I think this Bill is really about a practical environmental advocacy. When it comes to making laws to protect the environment, we can't afford to be basing our advocacy ideologically. This is not

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

the answer to protecting our air, land and water. We need to use environ... reality-based environmental advocacy and that's what this Bill is about. There are those that just want to say no to anything to have to do with fracking. I get it. I'm not excited about fracking coming to Illinois. I'm not excited about coal mining. I'm not excited about fossil fuels, in general, but at the end of the day, not passing this legislation leaves our environment unprotected and ren... renders our residents vulnerable to any risks that might be a part of fracking. In terms of fracking in Illinois, the status quo is absolutely unacceptable. As you may or may not know, there are millions of acres of land leased up in southern Illinois by companies prepared to move forward with fracking. There are several test wells. And in fact, most recently the AP reported I think as early as two days ago that Director Mark Miller reported that based on some very basic information that they found in some ... in the two-page application that's required now to start drilling high volume hydraulic frac... horizontal fracturing is happening. Now, the Vice President of the Illinois Oil and Gas Association was careful and accurate to point out that the company is doing nothing wrong and that's the problem. Right now, you can... and fracking is happening in Illinois. It's not something that's coming, fracking has come to Illinois. So, again, our choice here is fracking with no regulation or fracking with the strictest laws in the country. Speaking of these regulations, I'm sure another speaker will go over the specifics, but we have the opportunity to learn from other

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

states as to where they went wrong in terms of fracking. This is not to say fracking is not without risk. Certainly there are risks in any extraction of natural resources from the earth. But our job as Legislators is to mitigate these risks. Every step of the way this Bill does that. We don't stop thinking about the environment once the fracking permit is issued. This Bill contains constant monitoring. It contains opportunities to address issues and problems as they arise. And it provides for extensive participation all along the way. I, as many of you are, am a strong supporter of renewable energy. The extraction of fossil fuels from the earth poses environmental risks, we can't help that, but unless and until we can be assured that there is no fracking in Illinois, we must pass these regulations in order to ensure our environment protected. We need to push for policies that encourage the use and development of renewable energy such as wind and solar and others, but the reality is, we want our lights to go on when we flip the switch. We want the ability to drive from place to place. So, we have to provide for fossil fuels responsibly and we have to provide for fracking responsibly. Part of our job as environmental advocates is to ensure we have the strongest safeguards in place during this process. This Bill does that. This Bill... a 'yes' for this Bill is the pro environmental vote. A vote 'no' is a vote to allow fracking to continue in Illinois with no regulation. Again, 'yes' is the environmentally responsible vote in this case. And I urge an 'aye' vote. I would also like to just express my sincere thank you to the staff who

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

worked tirelessly for hours and hours and hours on this Bill over a period of months. Justin Cox from the Democratic side of the aisle and Laura Roche from the Republican side, I'm sure there'll be accolades for you later. But thank you for all your hard work."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

"Well, both Representatives gave both sides of this and they did it very well. I call this a battle of two passions. You know, we have an industry and a... and a New Albany shale play that people know there's hydrocarbons in, industry's ready to go. We also have a very active and aggressive environmental coalition here in Illinois who are interested in protecting every... the groundwater and the atmosphere and all the other things like that. And we share those concerns. So, I want to echo and compliment Representative Bradley for some very, very intense not only face to face meetings but conference calls. We have worked nonstop on this since last October. And as Representative Williams said, I want to thank Justin Cox and Laura Roche. This was a 90- or 100- page Bill, folks. And there was a lot of changes made at each one of our meetings. And they kept it all together and got it in the final version. Representative Bradley hit the high points of what this does, but I also wanted to say it also establishes in statute well casing specifications. We went farther than any other state to make sure that the first 1500 feet or so where groundwater contamination can happen during the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

fracking process is prevented. It's in statute. It also creates a task force on hydraulic fracturing regulation to monitor what goes on and to report back to the General Assembly so that we can make... keep our eyes on what's going on. This... this Bill also implements an oil severance tax. And even the most conservative states that have fracking going on have a severance tax. This is an resource, most of the companies that are drilling are out of state, a lot of the royalty owners obviously are in state, but this is an Illinois asset and we should be keeping some of those assets. And it spells out the severance tax. It also sets out fees. So many times we create new programs and then don't fund the departments that are responsible for implementing the program. This also spells out the fees for both DNR and the Illinois EPA, which will do the groundwater testing and monitoring. So it's been a long list of people that came together on this. And I know when we had our press conference in March down on the second floor it was... it was quite a cast of characters. Representatives like Bradley and Ι Representatives like Currie and Williams, the Business Coalition, the industry, labor and unions, Farm Bureau, environmentalists, EPA, Attorney General's Office we were all standing there and we all had to look twice, but it happened. As Representative Williams said, we have to have regulations. We know that going forward because we have an... an unregulated industry right now. We understand on the industry side that we had this play and there's natural resources to be had there and wealth to our state and our

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

residents of our state. We had both forces working together in a bipartisan manner that, quite honestly, I haven't seen here in my nine years. And they also had a long list of people that joined and set up the growing resources and opportunity for the workforce in Illinois, business and industry, labor, again, Petroleum Council, Merchants, Chamber of Commerce, Chemical Industry, US Steel Corporation. A lot of union jobs from the steel casings and drilling shafts that are going to be made. Association, most of the sand is going to come from LaSalle County and probably, a lot of trucking firms are going to be picking on that business. A lot of mayors, a lot of county board members, IEBW, we crossed the gamut. It's been reported by the Illinois Chamber of Commerce study that this could create upwards of 45 thousand jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue to the State of Illinois. So I think Representative Williams, in closing, highlighted a lot of their concerns and I know people have seen the videos that are less than flattering to this industry. I want to point out to folks, I've been to these well sites. I've been to Ohio, I was in Oklahoma City three weeks ago. This is a major part of their business, major part of their state's economy. There are 1.3 million fracked wells in the United States. The company that took us on a tour out there has 13 thousand fracked wells and the worst thing that they ever had happen was that a tornado went over it and took a bunch of government surplus recycled unused products and whipped it through their \$200 million gas processing plant. Government caused the worst problem and accident that

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

they've ever had. Folks, we have a great Bill here. It... it covers our bases, it protects our environment yet allows the industry to grow and prosper here in Illinois. I want to thank everybody for their hard work, again, and encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First off, I would like to also go down the road as the previous speaker in thanking staff on both sides of the aisle. I don't know that I've worked on a Bill that has been worked on more in a way that tried to bring groups together. And I want to thank the Sponsor and everybody on... on both sides of the aisle on how they worked together on this particular Bill. You know, myself and Representative Reis and Representative Bradley and the other Legislators that are from that area, our concern was many of the same concerns you have. We wanted to make sure that this industry was operating in a way that's safe, because that area that will be affected isn't some other part of the state, it's the part we live in. That's why a lot of these things were put in place. However, the jobs and benefits that will come from this industry are not just in that area. Yes, that's where it will be going on, but I think it was mentioned a while ago the places where the drills and the steel that are used to create and... and do this work would come from many areas from around the state. The sand actually from... from another Legislator that would be providing from their area the sand and the products that would be used while... while doing this process. The... the fact that we were able to unite environmentalists,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

business, Republicans, Democrats, folks, we had people standing together and I know it was mentioned a while ago, that you would never, ever get them to stand together jointly on a Bill. I do want to thank the Sponsor. I think it's time this Bill has... is ready to be passed. Some wished it hadn't gone as far as it does, some people say they wished it'd gone a little farther, but that's a sign that we've done it very, very well. I think we've done it well also by listening to where other states were, what they've done and what they haven't done. This is a Bill that has truly reached its time and I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mell."

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mell: "Representative Bradley, counties Johnson, Pope, Harden, Union, Jackson in southern Illinois and the cities of Carbondale, Murphysboro, Alto Pass and Carlyle have all voted for moratoriums on fracking. What kind of local authority aside from public hearings that carry little weight through outcomes, does this Bill allow for residents to control fracking in their communities, including unincorporated areas?"

Bradley: "The... the State of Illinois has regulated the oil and gas industry for decades, if not hundreds of years. The State of Illinois is not willing to give up this authority to regulate the oil and gas industry. I would say that those communities stand... those communities stand in

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- opposite of many other communities in southern Illinois that are in support of giving this industry a chance. And I would also say that there will be little to no fracking activity in any of those areas that you've just mentioned."
- Mell: "Okay, great. So that's... that's quite a lot... big band down in southern Illinois."
- Bradley: "The other thing I would notice is currently under Illinois law, under the current oil and gas statute... under the current oil and gas statute, municipalities have an absolute right to ban any and all oil and gas activity within their municipal boundaries. They have an absolute right to ban any and all oil and gas activity within their municipal boundaries."
- Mell: "Okay, thank you. Three to seven million gallons of water is used per... per well. Are there any restriction in place how much freshwater that can be used and where is it coming from?"
- Bradley: "I don't know that I accept the premise of three to seven million gallons. However, there are strong requirements and standards regarding water usage, regarding water disposal, regarding water containment, which I believe that the Environmental Coalition will tell you are the strongest in the United States."
- Mell: "Okay, great. I understand that these companies have to disclose the chemicals used in their fracturing fluids to doctors. Is there anything in the Bill that prohibits companies from enacting a gag order or forcing doctors to force confidentiality... confidentiality agreements?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Bradley: "The Medical Society is fine with the language contained in this Bill."
- Mell: "Okay, great. There's about 750 compounds that are... have been listed additives for fracturing in a report to Congress. Will the public be notified as to all chemicals that are being used in fracking as well as the chemicals that cause illnesses?"
- Bradley: "The chemical disclosure concept of this is groundbreaking for the United States. It was the result of negotiations between the Attorney General's Office, the Environmental Coalition and the industry. The vast majority are disclosed. There are limited trade secrets, which I believe are protected under a process which was agreed to by the environmentalists as well as the industry, the Attorney General's Office, the Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Natural Resources for the limited ability to use a trade secret but making sure that the information necessary to protect the general public and the public welfare is available when necessary."
- Mell: "Thank you. The Journal of Genealogy (sic-Geology) said that the 5.7 earthquake that hit Oklahoma was a result of injecting wastewater underground. In the State of Pennsylvania, fracking companies are hauling wastewater to Ohio and disposing via underground injection Ohio... in Ohio and there's been several dozen small earthquakes. Will fracking be prohibited in earthquake zones? Does the Bill do anything to address the risk of increasing seismic activity with disposed wastewater as other states have seen?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bradley: "Yeah. We have a process in place to take into account and to deal with caution regarding seismic activity and I live in that area. Right? My child, standing behinds me, lives in that area. And we don't want to have earthquakes caused by any kind of activity, whether it's fracking or anything else."

"Okay. 'Cause you do know that there's... we have a big Mell: major fault line going through Illinois? To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I understand that there's been a lot of work done on this and... and I appreciate it. And I... I definitely don't think that southern Illinois... I... I think they value their land and their water and their environment, but twe... 17 countries, Vermont, New Mexico have a ban, New York State has a moratorium and over 250 communities in the U.S. have passed resolutions to stop fracking. And I understand that California is moving Bills to enact a moratorium in their state. Now I was carrying the Bill for the moratorium in our state and you know, a lot of people talked about the moratorium part but I think what got lost in that Bill was just the two-year... you know, just to wait and to study the effects of fracking on our environment. So I will be voting 'no' for this. I do ... I do appreciate all the work that has been done. And I, you know, I just hope that we're not making a big mistake here. And I just wish we could, you know, just kind of stop the clock a little bit, especially when there's some major studies that will be coming out in 2014 about environmental impact and health studies. So, thank you very much to the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Sponsor and everyone who worked on his Bill. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to commend all the Representatives who put this Fracking Bill together. Marion County in which I come from in southern Illinois is the largest oil producing county in the State of Illinois. And what that means to us is that this Bill will help put 11 percent of the unemployed people in our counties, in our district, back to work to help pay bills in southern Illinois and also tuition for their kids to go to school, to college. This Bill means a lot to a lot of people in a lot of counties at home. And we don't have many jobs, they don't come around much. But this is one in which we went from the coal mine to the oil fields. And it's a big thing for us and it will mean a lot for us. And it will mean a lot for the State of Illinois. I want to thank you very much for all you did in putting this Bill together creating jobs for us back home. Thank you."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill also. I'd been working on it for a few years when people first came to me and talked about this and along the way I certainly learned a lot more as other people were doing. So I think this is a Bill that we worked on very hard. It was, at times, really exciting to be in the room and see both sides of the aisle discussing, not just both sides of the aisle, but the industry and the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

environmentalists and everybody working together to get the best Bill that we could have on regulations for the State of Illinois. To the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Jakobsson: "Representative..."

Bradley: "Yes, I'm sorry."

Jakobsson: "...is it... is it true in this Bill that among the regulations that are included, I know some people have mentioned some, but that there is public participation in the permitting process?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "It includes the public notice and public comment periods?"

Bradley: "Yes, Ma'am."

Jakobsson: "Is it true that there's chemical disclosure?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "Both before and after the hydraulic fracturing takes place?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "And also, what about water testing? Is that going... is the water going to be tested before and after?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Jakobsson: "I... I think those are really good things. And one thing that came up, and I was talking about abandoned wells. Is... it's also in the Bill that there's going to be plugging of the abandoned wells?"

Bradley: "Yeah. That's a significant problem downstate. And this Bill actually has the potential to actually make things better than they are currently."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Jakobsson: "And... and abandoned... plugging the wells as well as restoring the lands that have been disturbed by this process?"

Bradley: "That's correct."

Jakobsson: "Thank you. I think it's... really behooves us all here in the State of Illinois to pass the best Bill that we can prob... we have put together for regulations on hydraulic fracturing. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, I would like to thank the Sponsors for their work and all the efforts that they put forward to create a regular... regulatory process in Illinois. Policies that we make today will influence our future. We have a responsibility to protect the long-term public interest. New York State, as was mentioned, has a two-year moratorium because the studies are not all in on the effects of horizontal fracking. I have a number of issues, just four quick issues that I just have some concern about with fracking. One is the leakage of enormous amounts of methane gas, which are 72 times as potent as carbon dioxide in trapping heat in the atmosphere. Some studies have shown that the benefit of natural gas to coal is completely negated because of the methane gas leakage. Second, there are large amounts of water that are needed for the fracking process. We're talking about 80 thousand gallons of water for every well drilled. Today, Lake Michigan is at one of the lowest levels it's ever been at. And it's not just because of drought, but it's also because of evaporation which is only going to increase with more

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

carbon in the atmosphere. Our aquifers that we're so concerned about, where we plan to get the water to do this ... to do the drilling, there was a big article in the Tribune the other day that they are at extremely low levels. Third, the fracking also can contaminate underground aquifers inadvertently by the upward migration of both methane and drilling fluids. And the fourth point is this disposal of fracking fluids as toxic waste. So we put 80 thousand gallons of our precious clean water into the ground with chemicals and it comes out all toxic chemicals and we have to figure what to do with it. There are really no laws that we know that can prevent these problems from happening. Our future is in renewables. We need incentives to decarbonize the environment and reduce pollution that affects climate instability. You know, we need... right now Illinois is an exporter of energy. There is no emergency and I really think we need to develop a path and a transition to renewables. I have grave concerns about fracking, I understand that this is a... a regulatory... that we are passing... that this Bill will more than likely pass and there will be some good regulator processes in place. But I just have to state that I do have grave concerns about fracking in this state. I support a moratorium and I know that the Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Fund agree that the ideal would be a moratorium for Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, I want to thank the Sponsor, Representative Bradley has done a

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

fabulous job pulling together people from all parts of this issue and Legislators from both sides of the aisle to put this Bill together. It was a year ago, last week of May, end of Session, when a Fracking Bill came to the House from the Senate, a pretty thin piece of legislation. And at the time people came to me and suggested we need a moratorium, we need to study this issue. We should wait a year, you know, what's the rush? Now, what Representative Bradley and our group that worked together did is we did much of what that moratorium said we should do. We studied the issue. We brought in experts from all parts of the fracking industry and the environmental groups, scientists, people who knew the issue and could advise us on what's worked, what's not worked. We, here in Illinois, have had the advantage of more than a dozen... almost a dozen and a half states have active hydraulic horizontal fracturing going on right now. We can see what's worked. And we've been able to take advantage. That's why everyone describes this as the best set of fracking regulations of any state in the U.S. What should be a model for every state to follow because, to the extent we have that data and we had a wealth of data, mountains of it to look at, we were able to put together and say, what does it take to protect the health and safety of the people of Illinois, protect their environment. This Bill incorporates all of that. Some people have suggested, well, we still need a moratorium, there's more studies. In science, if we're doing our job, there are always more studies, we're always learning more. And we should always be incorporating this. And this Bill is built to do exactly

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

that. Not only would the Department of Natural Resources be able to do its normal Rulemaking, but this law will set up a task force specifically designed over the next few years to report back to the General Assembly in 2016 or sooner if necessary with legislation we should consider to make our regulatory framework even better. So I understand those who are concerned, they're afraid that given the affects in some states that have been publicized that there should be some concerns. Some of those things that have come are reason for concern, and we've looked at that; in this legislation we've addressed that. Water quality, quality, earth quality, public notice, public information on everything related to this. This is the model of how good legislation takes form and again, I want to commend the Sponsor and everyone, staff and Legislators who have worked on this. I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. First, a reminder that fracking is happening in the State of Illinois, there are no Rules and regulations to make sure that it's happening in a safe manner. People have said that this is a really strong regulation. I'd just like for the Members to... to understand what that means in specifics. First, it means no open-air ponds for wastewater storage, not a single one, which means that we minimize the risk of water pollution, closed tanks not open ponds. Second, comprehensive water monitoring requirements, not just before fracking happens but afterwards as well. Frackers are assumed to be the problem if, in fact, there is some

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

contamination of nearby water. So, if there's contamination the onus is on the frackers to prove that they were not the reason for it. The Act setbacks for water sources are about the strongest in the nation and the well construction standards require best engineering practices. They will have the strongest chemical disclosure provisions in the nation, chemical disclosures before and after fracking. We also have a comprehensive water management plan both before and after the fracking happens. Public notice and comment strongest in the nation. Permit application are the published twice in local papers, delivered directly to the owners of property near the proposed site. Public comment for 30 days; if a hearing is held, DNR can extend that time. Anyone adversely affected can ask for a public hearing, a contested case hearing. And finally, in addition the Attorney General and the state's attorney's opportunity to file a lawsuit, any adversely affected person including environmental groups can sue fracking companies for violations of the Act and can sue the Department of Natural Resources if the suggestion is they were not being appropriately in charge of their own responsibilities. This is the most comprehensive, the most stringent set of fracking regulations in the country. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I also rise as chair of the Energy Committee, I also rise in support of the Fracking Bill. I've also worked with the Green Caucus, my colleagues here in the House, to come to this decision.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

This is a good regulated Bill. Also has the support of the Sierra Club, which I really appreciate and respect. Please join me and support Senate Bill 1715. It's a 'yes' vote and it's a vote... and it's the right vote. It is a jobs Bill that's really going to help the state and the people that live in it that we represent. Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to stand up here today on a monumental issue that's really, really going to help a lot of parts in southern Illinois, especially. First and foremost though, I want to commend my neighbor, Representative John Bradley, for his leadership and his hard, tireless work on this issue. It's hard to bring those kind of groups together, John, and you did it. We're proud of you. I also want to thank my other neighbors, Mike Bost and David Reis. But I also want to make sure that somebody gets a lot of thanks tonight, one of our House attorneys, Justin Cox. Justin, thank you so much for your hard work. We really appreciate you. A lot of people in this state are worried about this, Mr. Speaker, but this Bill before us has the strongest and strictest regulations in the country to make sure we do this right and we do it the safest way possible. We are finally going to use our own resources of our state to get off the total reliance of foreign oil. Let's help our state by creating hundreds of jobs and bringing in a lot in millions and millions of dollars and this Bill will do that. Just look what happened in North Dakota. John, again,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

thank you for your hard work. I really appreciate you. This is monumental and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not work on this Bill. I live in the western suburbs of Cook County and we don't frack there. Up until the last year, I really didn't know much about fracking. But what I did a few months back is that I went to a movie, something called Promised Land that was a movie that I think had a Matt Damon and a few other stars in it that was going to talk about the negative affect of fracking, hydraulic fracking has upon our... our precious soils and our... our farmlands and our natural resources. But I also, afterwards... I was not impressed with the movie, I don't know if anybody else agrees with me, but I also, what I found very troubling was the fact that the movie was... was produced and it was financed by the State Media Company for the United Arab Emirates. That is the third largest OPEC producing nation in the world. You wonder why they want to produce this movie; it's quite obvious. They feel competition from what's going on here in the United States. But from a guy from the suburbs, I really didn't know much about this issue. So what I do is I rely upon my friends to the right from southern Illinois, the ones who live there, the ones who understand the economics of what this Bill does. They also understand the environmental impact it'll have upon that area. And I want to thank them, the Republican side, but also my friends on the Democrat side for educating me. This should be a great template of how we can move forward, hopefully the next 24,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

hours but also next Session. We have some verv complicated issues that we deal with and sometimes we have to look at the regional impact but also the people who have the closest instincts and the close... and the most personal knowledge about some of these issues. And today, again, is a great example of how many of us, particularly us from the suburbs, have been able to rely upon our friends from southern Illinois to tell us the myth... to tell us the difference between fact and fiction. It was something which I saw in that movie was mainly, a lot of it's fiction. But they gave me a better understanding of how this is going to help the Illinois economy, particularly in southern Illinois, which we know is starving for jobs. So I, again, thank you, great job, everyone. And again, this is a great template of how we can move forward in this state. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Yingling."

Yingling: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Yingling: "All right. Even in my district by the Wisconsin border I have heard from my constituents about their concerns regard... regarding potential environmental impacts of fracking in Illinois. Jack Darin from the Illinois Sierra Club has this to say about the best state policy concerning fracking, 'Fracking poses grave dangers to our communities, land, air and water and contributes to our continued destabilization of our climate. The safest and smartest way to protect ourselves would be to immediately enact a moratorium to allow for thorough study of the risks

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

of fracking and to learn from experience in other states in regards to major health... excuse me... and major health studies currently under way.' I agree with organizations that support the moratorium and I have signed on as a cosponsor on the moratorium legislation. While I believe that the moratorium is the best policy solution, I also a realist and recognize the fact that the moratorium simply does not have enough support to pass in the final hours of this Session. And in the absence of a moratorium, there are limited regulations in place to ensure responsible conduct. I do applaud the Sponsors of this Bill and the environmental organizations that have worked tirelessly on this legislation, specifically the Illinois Environmental Council and the Sierra Club. This will be the most comprehensive regulatory Bill passed in the United States to date. While it will not make fracking safe, this is a critical step to make sure that Illinois has some protections to prevent environmental degradation. I reluctantly support this legislation and would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Flowers: "Representative, I didn't have the pleasure of participating in the meetings regarding fracking and I understand that fracking is going on now. And so, we do need some regulations and this Bill will strengthen the regulations. But I do have a few questions."

Bradley: "Sure."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Flowers: "How will fracking affect the City of Chicago, please?"

Bradley: "It won't."

Flowers: "I understand that anyone could apply for a fracking permit at \$100. Is that still true?"

Bradley: "No. The fracking permits... the permit to the Department of Natural Resources is over \$11 thousand. Permit to the Environmental Protection Agency is, I think, is it 3500 or 2500 dollars, \$2500. They have to go through a thorough permitting application. There are civil and criminal penalties for falsifying the application, for falsifying anything in the permit. We do a background check, they have to put up bonds, they have to declare insurance. You just can't walk in off the street and get a permit to frack or do horizontal high volume hydraulic fracturing in the State of Illinois under this law."

Flowers: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative DeLuca."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

DeLuca: "Representative Bradley, there's... there's been some talk about putting people back to work. I don't know if you said anything in your opening. Do you have an estimate of the job creation we're looking at here?"

Bradley: "Well, they're estimating... the estimates that I've seen are anywhere from 5 to 10 thousand to 76 thousand people. And when the coal mines closed, we lost tens of thousands of job downstate. The economic impact here... Daniel Yergin... Daniel Yergin, who is President Obama's

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

energy advisor who is a proponent of horizontal high volume hydraulic fracturing, has indicated that this is making American manufacturing competitive again. Because not only is it driving American manufacturing, but it's keeping the cost of energy down alluding to what the Leader from the west side of Chicago alluded to earlier. We're in competition now with places we haven't been in competition with, job creation and affordable energy."

DeLuca: "What was that number of jobs again?"

Bradley: "It's between... I've heard as low as 5 to 10 thousand and as many potentially as 76 thousand."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you. And what about revenue for the state?

Do we have some estimates on that as well?"

Bradley: "Well, the... the revenue for the state is based on a sliding scale of 3 to 6 percent of an extraction fee. We estimate that this could be in the tens, if not hundreds of millions of dollars per year."

DeLuca: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Again, I want to thank all the Members of the General Assembly. And to have been involved in this process and played some small role in bringing all these groups together and having people get up on the floor with such different points of views normally on issues and to stand up in support of a compromise forged through the democratic process of Democrats and Republicans, northerners and southern Illinoisans working together, labor and business, environmentalists and business, Farm Bureau and industry. The AFLCIO supports this Bill because there's local jobs

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

involved. The Farm Bureau supports this Bill because we're communities. protecting the farm The Environmental Coalition supports this Bill because we're protecting the environment. The industry supports this Bill because in developing responsibly. they're interested Department of Natural Resources supports this Bill because it's going to sufficiently fund them to make sure that people don't mess up what they're not supposed to mess up. The Environmental Protection Agency sponsors this Bill and supports this Bill because it provides the strongest regulations for the environment regarding this industry in the United States and could serve a model for the rest of United States. This is potentially a model for the rest of the United States and everyone in here that participated in that and that's a lot of people in this room. That's a lot of people in this room. And that's a lot of people that have been around this issue and have worked together. And this is an example of how democracy is supposed to work. And I would ask an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1715 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Riley, Sims. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes, 9 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1715, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost has filed a Motion to reconsider the previous vote. Representative Bradley moves to Table the Motion. All those in favor say

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is tabled. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2378, Representative Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "...Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill would enable the Secretary of State to collect fees for parking lots other than in the City of Springfield the same authority given to other constitutional officers. I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2378 pass?' All in favor say... vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes, 0 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2378, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1547, Representative Lang. Please read the Bill. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1625, Representative Chapa LaVia. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Representative Chapa LaVia, for what reason do you seek recognition? I'm sorry.

 Representative Chapa LaVia, Senate Bill 1625. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill for a third time."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act concerning

education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and the Members of the House. This is identical to the Bill we passed out of here that got put on reconsider for vote because some of the Republicans voted 'no' and they wished to vote 'yes'. What it actually does, it amends the School Code to provide the law enforcement drill shall include evacuation or reverse evacuation for shooting incidents and provides that the school administrator... or and local law enforcement will mutually set a date and time for the drill. So, I'll take any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, there's a number of hazards that might occur in a school, does this require that this one take precedence over other kinds of safety drills?"

Chapa LaVia: "No, Representative. Thank you for that question. Currently law provides that there are four types of school safety drills, school evacuation, bus evacuation, law enforcement drill and severe weather and shelter in place drill and it doesn't. Currently school evacuation drill and law enforcement drills are both based on incident involving... They already are done, but they only have to do the four types, and they choose which ones they would like to do."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Pritchard: "Okay. Now there are also in some more rural communities might be difficult to have a full safety drill where law enforcement is there going through different protocols. Does this give some flexibility to the type of drill?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Representative. Also, it gives the flexibility that there is... there only needs to be one law enforcement element added to that drill. So it could be one law enforcement officer from a police department or a sheriff's department, et cetera."

Pritchard: "Is there any estimate as to what this might cost a school district to have this additional mandate?"

Chapa LaVia: "None that we know of."

Pritchard: "Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

- Flowers: "Representative, does this put in place shelters for those schools who are in the tornado alley that do not have shelters, underground shelters?"
- Chapa LaVia: "I'm not really abreast of that, Representative.

 All we're doing is changing the law so they'll add in this...

 this drill, law enforcement drill for evacuation and reverse evacuation."
- Flowers: "Okay. Because I see where current law does speak of shelters that's in place but the types of shelters for the tornadoes is becoming more severe."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Chapa LaVia: "Right. And I understand where you're going. The season's been particularly rough. But you know, I don't think... well... in this Bill itself doesn't cover any of that, but I understand your suggestion."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Okay. Thank you, Ma'am."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, is this... does it specifically require this type of drill or it's added to the list of those that have to be considered?"

Chapa LaVia: "It's added to the list of those that have to be considered. The local school district would... would choose which drills they need to perform."

Moffitt: "The local school board would... administration would have the final say, but this would be one of them?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct, Sir."

Moffitt: "And I think it's unlikely, but we're talking a very potentially, very emotional situation and that has been public comment, just a question raised, is this almost too intense possibly for some children? Not all. Can a parent opt out if they don't think... I mean, it would be rare?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, the parent could opt if they wish to".

Moffitt: "If their child would..."

Chapa LaVia: "But this is not going to be the severe case of commando going in the building and going crazy. This would be more like the drill, showing the kids where they need to go for safety, if something does happen in this situation,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

because we're very sensitive towards that in the discussion because of everything that's happened and unfolded in the United States over the last year. So, the school districts have had the ability... flexibility to produce the drill in which... in the... they see fit with law enforcements consulting them."

Moffitt: "Representative, I appreciate that sensitivity to this and it, I mean, could vary with the individual child and the community. It's sad that we need to even consider this, but the reality is, we need to be prepared and have that as an option. So, I commend you on your work and the sensitivity to allowing that flexibility and the final say with the local school board and the administration."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "I think you've done good things, thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I think that you're going in the right direction with this. I think this is something that we should encourage school districts to do. We don't necessarily need to require them. I think they should want to do it on their own. My understanding is this... this is a requirement that they do this. I... I will be voting 'yes' on this Bill this time, but I really think it should be an encouragement rather than an requirement."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and the speakers that spoke before that. I humbly ask and request an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1625 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes, 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1625, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1911, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1911 would McAuliffe: create the Hepatitis C Task Force. Viral hepatitis affects million people nationwide. The United States Department of Health and Human Services says hepatitis C virus and B account for the vast majority of hepatitisrelated deaths in the United States. However, 65 to 70 percent of infected Americans remain unaware, which prompted the U.S. Centers for Disease Control Prevention to label this virus a silent epidemic. hepatitis virus causes chronic liver diseases such as cirrhosis, liver failure and liver cancer. The five-year survival rate for primary liver cancer is less than five percent. These viruses are the leading cause of liver transplantation and there... while there is a vaccine for

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

hepatitis B, for hepatitis C there's some antiviral treatments, but... to improve the prognosis or clear the virus. However, most people are unaware they have the virus. We need to educate the public of this virus. Prior to 1989 the virus went undetected according to medical researchers. The American Association for the Study of Liver Disease recommended that primary care physicians screen all patients for a history of any viral hepatitis risk factors. According to the U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs, as well as other health and medical research organization individuals contacted, these are some of the reasons of which may have caused... which an individual may have got hepatitis C. Anyone who has received a blood transfusion prior to 1992, anyone who is a Vietnam-era veteran, anyone who has abnormal liver function tests, anyone infected with the HIV virus, anyone who's used a needle to inject drugs or possibly a tattoo, any health care, emergency medical or public safety worker who has been stuck by a needle or exposed to any mucosal fluids of an H... HCV-infected persons and any child born to HCVinfected mothers. There's a lack of knowledge and awareness about chronic viral hepatitis, part of the health care and social service providers. My experience from this is that many physicians are not prepared to deal with hepatitis and what we need to do is have the family physicians refer someone that has hepatitis C to a liver specialist. I've seen firsthand people that have suffered through this disease. I've had a father-in-law pass away. I've seen a brother-in-law who had to take his daughter down the aisle

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

to die three months later. I currently have an uncle that has hepatitis C and he's in very bad shape. Also, since I've introduced this Bill last Thursday, I've talked to Members in the Stratton and here on the House Floor, and there's many, many more people around this whole state and on this premises that also is being affected by hepatitis C. What I want to do is create a task force through the Veteran' Affairs group, Department of Human Services and the Department of Public Health so we can find out who's responsible for some of this. We need to educate and make the public more aware because right now there's people around this building right now that are probably have Hepatitis C and they don't even know that. And I'm just trying to save some lives and save some families some of the distress that I've seen and witnessed myself. I'd also like to thank Speaker Madigan for letting this Bill come out very quickly. And also, chairman and my good friend, Representative Dan Burke for his help. And also all the colleagues that signed on a letter of a petition to get this Bill out as fast as we can so we can get this task force up and running. And let the people and the public and the people here in the State of Illinois know that Hepatitis C is here. It's not a dirty disease. And we need to let... we need to help people that have Hepatitis C. And I'd be happy to answer any questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dan Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in full support of this initiative and

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

like Representative McAuliffe, would like to extend our great thanks to the Speaker and staffs from both sides of the aisle to find a vehicle Bill for this matter to be considered at the 11th hour of our Legislature. Representative McAuliffe insisted, so many in our society and in fact, our country, are infected with this horrendous disease, hepatitis C. Very often we discover that those that served in the military were exposed to this virus through no fault of their own as they stood awaiting inoculations in service. I believe that the attention that receive media will Bill will in the opportunities for those who would otherwise go undiagnosed and would suffer the consequences very much like Mike's father-in-law, who unfortunately succumb to the virus and ultimately died of liver cancer. I would encourage all of my colleagues here to not only vote for this legislation but go home to your districts and as often as you can, remind your constituents that they need to know desperate circumstances they would confront if they had been exposed to hepatitis C unwittingly, and certainly there are opportunities for them to be diagnosed and treated. And I think as a result of this attention, we will afford some lifesaving solutions to those that need it desperately. I would encourage your support and your 'aye' vote in this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd just like to commend the Sponsor on bringing this legislation about.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Hepatitis C is a silent killer, affects many veterans and thank you. Representative McAuliffe. I urge an 'aye' vote."

 Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe to close."
- McAuliffe: "Again, thank you... thank you all the Legislators that helped sign the letter. And again, thank you to Chairman Burke and Speaker Madigan and everybody to get this Bill out there. And if anyone has hepatitis C, please go see a liver doctor and get the best care you can. And I'd ask for a 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1911 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1911, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie for purposes of a Motion."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. I move to suspend Rule 41... House Rule 41 so that Senate Bill 20 might be subject to immediate consideration in this chamber."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Motion, we have Representative Sullivan."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under House Rule 49, I ask for a Roll Call vote on the Motion. Five people behind me have raised their hand and ask as such."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to address the Motion as well. The Lady wants to suspend House Rule 41 so that Senate Bill 20 can be considered. The... the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

significance House Bill 41, excuse me, House Rule specifically House Bill... House Bill... excuse me, House Rule 41, paragraph (1)c) (sic-(C)(1)), deals with the quick-take provisions that were... were put in these House Rules not by us, but by the Majority Party. And it says that you have to follow certain procedures if you're going to pass a Bill that deals with quick-take. Senate Bill 20 deals with quick take. You shouldn't be overriding the Rules simply because we want to pass a Bill that deals with one single element, in this case Peotone Airport. We shouldn't be overriding the Rules the last day or the second to the last day of session simply to accommodate one specific item in one or a very lengthy Christmas tree Bill. It is inappropriate to override the Rules. Again, you wrote the Rules at least follow the Rules that you wrote. I object strenuously to the Lady's Motion and hope you will vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Just to make the point that we suspended this Rule when we approved a quick take for the Illiana Expressway, nobody complained that time. And let me also make the point that this is a very specific footprint, it is not the entire footprint of the airport that would be subject to quick-take. But we know what it... this is, we know where this is, we know what it is. We've been talking about this airport for the last 12 years. Ordinarily when we deal with quick-take, suddenly someone comes along we don't really know what it is all about, but this one is clear. We have a procedure in the Rules to suspend this Rules in... suspend

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- the Rule for circumstances just like this one. I urge your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves for the adoption... I mean, the Lady moves to suspend Rule 41. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 68 voting 'yes' and 47 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the Lady's Motion... the Lady's Motion prevails. And now, Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 20."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 4 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie. I'm... Representative Bradley on Floor Amendment #2."
- Bradley: "I'd ask this be adopted and then debated on Third."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor
 Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20. All in favor...
 Representative Reis."
- Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair before we move this to Third."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."
- Reis: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are a lot of very major issues in this Bill and I would... my inquiry is to the parliamentarian is if this Bill violates the single issue requirement set out in Section 8 of the Illinois Constitution?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Turner: "The parliamentarian advises me that it does not."

Reis: "With all due respect to the parliamentarian, how can all these issues be germane to each other and be encompassed in one Bill? Just the issue of quick-take alone has specific Rules. We're talking about a lot of different things here and I... I guess that it's guite unfortunate that a Bill that Representative Brown worked so hard on is going to be included with so many things that each of us may be individually against. Farm Bureau has worked very hard on the farmland assessment. Farm Bureau is very much against quick-take. This is a terrible way to do a Bill on the last day and this has nothing to do with the Sponsor, this has to do with the back office. This is terrible. And it's uncalled for. We just showed everybody how we can all work together to create common goals. And I guess, I would still object to the parliamentarian's Rule that this Bill is germane."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you've read this Bill or if you're taking the time to read it quite a few of us in here with a military background and there's a word that we used to use it's an acronym, it's BOHICA. And I'm not going to tell you what is stands for, you can talk to any of the military guys and they'll explain what BOHICA is. But that's exactly what this Bill is. This Bill is a sham, Ladies and Gentlemen, an absolute sham. To put in 1 or 2 items that make some sense and then 8 or 10 that absolutely rape your

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

communities, rape the working people. How can we do this? Why can't they be treated as individual pieces of legislation instead of cramming it down our throat on the 11th hour of the 11th day? This is horrible, Ladies and Gentlemen. You're going to have to vote your conscience. You're going to have to go home and deal with it but it has a tremendously strong odor to it."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we all know what this is; it's the Economic Development Act of 2013. It includes the seed fertilizer plant in Tuscola, it includes the enterprise zone trailer Bill, it includes a Brownfield Redevelopment Program in the south side of Chicago..."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley, this is... you know, we're dealing with Amendment #4..."

Bradley: "Oh, #4."

Speaker Turner: "...right now, first."

Bradley: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "I think this is a technical Amendment. I'd ask it be adopted and moved to Third."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 20. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. Representative Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to know what is the technical Amendment? Just, you know, give us some idea."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "It's a page and line Amendment. It fixes the date regarding the adoption of the Midwest Redevelopment TIF District Ordinance. The Amendment changes the date to May 27, 2000. It's a typo."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 20. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 20 for a third time."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."
- Bradley: "All the items in this Bill are related to economic development. This is the Economic Development Act of 2013. These are many good ideas that have come from different places and different parts of the state. There's... there's incentives and economic development, job creation for downstate. There's incentives, economic development for Chicago. There's incentives, economic development for

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

northeastern Illinois. And there's statewide economic development and incentives for job creation in here. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respect the concerns of my friend and colleague Representative Harris, the spokesperson of the Revenue Committee. And we get to the end of session these are not always ideal the way these things go. And I apologize to him for any discourtesies that he felt that the Revenue Committee or personally received as a result of this Bill. Having said that, there's a lot of good things in this Bill for economic development and for job creation. Downstate we have Representative Brown's idea with regard to the seed fertilizer plant in Tuscola, creating billions of dollars in investment and thousands of local jobs in our area, both in terms of construction and permanently. We also have TIF extension and language that is necessary to continue a TIF program in Grundy County. This is very important to Representative Roth and Representative Mautino. We have a tax exemption issue that's come up with the Department of Revenue for the Washington Area Community Center near the Peoria area, which is very important to that area. We have the income tax TIF for East St. Louis, one of the most impoverished and underdeveloped opportunities in the State of Illinois, which is very important to Representative Jackson and Senator Clayborne which is included in here. Statewide we have more resources going into the LUST Fund with EVA having the ability to use project labor agreements similar to what the... the Capital Development Board does where appropriate. And again, statewide we have the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

farmland assessment which is vital to downstate farmers that this assessment program continue so that we continue to feed the rest of the world. For northeastern Illinois, there's the Rosemont Convention Center which doesn't cost the state any money but which allows them to have greater flexibility in the spending of moneys already received. We have the municipal McPier issue, which allows them to develop the construction of a DePaul arena, acquisition of land, changes for audits. Again, no specific cost to the state, allowing them greater flexibility for funds and for bonding authority that is already there which their first and primary responsibility. We Brownfield Redevelopment for the City of Chicago. And we have a TIF District for the west side of the City of Chicago. Again, statewide we have the enterprise zone trailer Bill. Last year we worked together in a bipartisan manner to reform the ways in which we do enterprise zones. There's cleanup that was needed to be done with this and a trailer Bill that was needed for this. And as a result of a year's of being smarter and learning more about this, we now know that this needs to be done. And then finally, and something that's been around for a very long time and is an attempt at a compromise on this issue, is to give the Illinois Department of Transportation to enter into publicprivate partnerships similar to the successful Illiana project for the third airport in Peotone. And so, again, this is a statewide Bill. There's pieces of this that certain areas like; there's pieces of this that certain areas of the state don't like. But again, I think that

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

overall this is hopefully a balanced Economic Development Act which will create jobs and economic opportunities throughout the state. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brown."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

"To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the fertilizer plant portion of this proposal. I've worked long and hard on this proposal with folks from across the aisle, with folks around the state to make this project a reality. And I just want to tell you how important it is to my locals. I hail from Decatur, Illinois, the Soy Capital of the world and to have a fertilizer plant 40 miles down the road that produces urea, a key component to growing soybeans or grasses, even lawns up in Chicago, is hugely important. Not only to my constituents but also to yours as well. I rise in support of this Bill because it helps agriculturally around the state where 30 percent of our jobs are tied to the agricultural sector either directly or indirectly. But most importantly I rise to this Bill because of the financial impact not only to my district where it creates 1500 construction jobs, good paying, labor-supported construction jobs and 300 permanent jobs in my district, but it also pumps 1.2 billion dollars into the Illinois economy. It pumps business for our transportation as it sits on a railway hub. It pumps money again for transportation as it sits at a vital impasse for I-57 as well as State Route 36. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

while not perfect, will push economic development in the State of Illinois. I ask for a green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mayfield: "I just have one question. Representative, I see that the Illinois Petroleum Council is an opponent. Can you just tell me why?"

Bradley: "I assume it's over the LUST Fund."

Mayfield: "Pardon?"

Bradley: "I... I have met with them and am trying to address some of their concerns, but I assume it's over the LUST Fund."

Mayfield: "They are still opposed and you're trying to address their concerns?"

Bradley: "Yeah, yeah, they're opposed. They're going to be opposed to it, but I think that their concerns are workable. But I wouldn't say that they'll ever reach the point of not being opposed to the change to the LUST Fund."

Mayfield: "Can you share what their concerns are?"

Bradley: "The PLA's."

Mayfield: "Pardon?"

Bradley: "PLAs, Project Labor Agreements."

Mayfield: "Oh."

Bradley: "It's a policy difference. Yeah."

Mayfield: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank... thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. First of all, I would like to thank the chairman of the Revenue

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Committee, I think you've done a very, very good job. Thank the… one of the Sponsors, Representative Adam Brown. He's worked very, very hard for his district on this… this issue. I think the… Representative Brown said, this is vitally important for central Illinois. Do we… do I like everything in this Bill? No. But this is a district, this is a county right next to my district that's going to provide up to 2 thousand jobs. I was reading a… a statistic this morning in one of the national newspapers, the percent… listen to this folks, the percentage of Americans with a job is at its lowest level in 34 years. The workforce is down because people don't have work. This is a very important to Representative Brown's district, to my district. It gives work, construction, as well as permanent jobs. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And let me just address the Bill for a few moments. You know, Repre... the Gentleman who needs... on our side of the aisle who needs the fertilizer plant had a very responsible Bill, House Bill 2496, and he had that early in the session. And we amended that Bill to include the Chicago Port Authority, the forgiveness of the Chicago Port Authority loan as something which the chairman of the House Revenue Committee wanted to put on the Bill. And we put it on the Bill. And we could have passed that Bill a month and a half ago. A month and a half ago. But you know, no, we don't want to pass it too early because we want to load up a Christmas tree Bill with everything that is in Senate Bill 20. Load it up. We could

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

have done it, we could have taken care of his issue, we could have taken care of the Chicago Port issue which, oh, by the way, the Chicago Port issue isn't even in this Bill. But we could have taken care of those issues a month and a half ago, but no, we saved the Bill for the very last end. Well, let's look at what's in this Bill, this 373-page Bill that we got about three and a half or four hours ago, just so that you know what you're voting on. And there's goodies in here for everybody, but you need to know what you're voting on. We talked about the fertilizer plant, the McPier Expansion Bill. You know, that's probably... there's probably a reasonable inclusion here because they're not really asking for dollars from us. They're simply asking for authority to use some dollars that they already have from their TIF's. But you know, we never held a committee hearing on the Bill other than subject matter only, just to briefly describe it. Similarly, with Rosemont the Convention Center. The Rosemont Convention Center came to us in a subject matter only hearing and said, we want to use the money from the convention that... that you give us from the Convention and Visitors Bureau to backup state bonds. Well, we're not doing that. Instead, we're allowing them to go for bonding backed by the state's portion of sales tax revenue generated at the new fashion outlets. Now, most of you have probably not been to Rosemont, but what they have done up there is outstanding, outstanding. It would have only been capped if they had gotten the Cubs, but they're getting premium retail outlets that estimated is going to generate as much as 300 million

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

dollars in retail sales generating perhaps 20 to 25 million dollars' worth of sales tax for the State of Illinois. Hey, that's a great deal. But you know what, I've got Schaumburg in my area with Woodfield Shopping Center. Some of you have shopping centers in your area, what about Oakbrook or Old Orchard or those other great shopping centers that ring those municipalities get Do special treatment from the sales taxes that are generated from their sales taxes to back state... to back the bonds that they want to issue? They sure don't. The farmland assessment, we understand the farmland assessment important. Again, simply a subject matter only hearing. Let's talk about the LUST, the Leaking Underground sales ... the Leaking Underground Storage Tanks that referenced here earlier. Why are the Illinois Petroleum Marketer's against it? Because this is a big deal. You just don't go down to the union hall and hire a guy with a backhoe to take out an empty Leaking Underground Storage Tank. You've got to go in now with a project labor agreement, with the EPA and the EPA is not used to dealing... doing project labor agreements, you gotta go in with the EPA and do a project labor agreement to make this happen. That's not easily done, it's not quickly done. But it's still got to be done. The Brownfields Redevelopment Zone probably... may be a worthwhile project, but do we know what's really involved? It's setting up a governmental entity, a separate governmental board. What are the powers of that board? What's the Constitution of that board? Again, we really don't know. My point here is

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

simply this, there's an awful lot in here that you don't know what you're voting about. And I want to come back for a second to Peotone. You know, when was the last time we talked about Peotone? And we're... we've suspended the Rule, a Rule which was written by the Majority Party, so that ... so that quick-take, eminent domain authority, can be used in... in the Peotone area. What sorts of things are supposed to happen that this Legislature should oversee when we take quick-take? Let me just briefly read to you from the Rule that we suspended, the types of information that's supposed to be given to the chairman and the Minority Spokesman of the Executive Committee when we do quick-take. The legal description of the property, the street address of the property, the name of each State Senator and State Representative who represents the territory that is subject of the proposed taking, the dates or dates on which the state or the unit of local government contacted each State Senator and State Representative concerning the intention of the state or unit of local government to request approval of legislation by the General Assembly authorizing the state or the unit of local government to acquire the property by eminent domain using quick-take power. That's only 4 requirements, Ladies and Gentlemen and there's a list of at least 10 or 12 requirements. It shouldn't be done easily. It's the wrong thing to do at the end. The Gentleman deserves the ... the fertilizer plant. The Lady deserves the assistance she needs in Grundy County. There's some other good thing in this Bill. But it shouldn't happen the way that it's happening, it shouldn't happen in the

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

last few days... the last few hours of session. And there's a lot of things in here that I think you will probably, notwithstanding the good, a lot of things in here you're probably going to regret voting for later on. I do urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "I wanted to ask under #3, McPier Expansion, if there was any money in there for a Chicago casino?"

Bradley: "No, Ma'am."

Bellock: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear?"

Bradley: "No, Ma'am. I wouldn't be sponsoring it if it was."

Bellock: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "I... I know there's a number of good things in this Bill, as we've discussed and there's a number of bad things in this Bill, it's kind a lump of I don't know what. You... you said this is... economic development is the common subject in here. I... I don't understand how adding prevailing wage and PLA's to the LUST Fund applies to economic development?"

Bradley: "Well, if you read carefully in the LUST Fund portion, we're going to make sure that the LUST Fund is sufficiently supported and funded. And it's not solely going to be a result of the fee and tax structure,

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

- previously. If necessary, there'll be a diversion of state sales tax to make sure that there's proper money in there. Which I think was in response to maybe a question you may have had or some others may have had in making sure that there's sufficient funds in the LUST Fund to actually do these projects."
- Davidsmeyer: "So... so, where... where are those other funds coming from?"
- Bradley: "The... the diversion of state sales tax with regards to motor fuels."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So, it'll be... it'll take revenues away from the General Revenue Fund?"
- Bradley: "Yeah. It won't take revenue out of sales tax unless...

 if it doesn't need it. But if it's needed, it's a

 backstop."
- Davidsmeyer: "It... have... have we had sufficient funds in... in past years to cover all these LUST Fund projects?"
- Bradley: "The last couple of years we've been okay. There have been situations in the past where it wasn't. There's concern by the Petroleum Marketers as to the cost of PLA associated with having to hire an attorney to do the PLA for them. And when the process of... of... we've had discussions and I hope that that issue can be worked through beyond the general policy concerns over extending PLA's to the LUST Fund."
- Davidsmeyer: "Okay. On... on the previous Bill that this was included with there was something about poultry. Is there anything about poultry in this Bill?"

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bradley: "No. I've had enough of that with the LUST Fund. I think that's coming back to us, so we can debate that maybe later today or tomorrow."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. As I said... to the Bill. As I said, I think there's a number of good things in this Bill. I think it's incredibly unnecessary to lump it with these horrible other ideas. I... I appreciate your efforts on this, but I... I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I would hope that certainly a lot of the measures in this Bill that benefit my area aren't deemed to be horrible. They're tremendous parts of a big economic development package and they're all important. I remember when I came down here in 2007 there was a Gentleman, good friend on the other side of the aisle, that was lobbying me for some development that was... that was going on in their district. And I told that person that I would always be ... it would be a very rare time that I'd ever be against anyone's economic development efforts anywhere in this state. I spoke before a few months ago when we were talking about some of the facility closings that were going on all over the state and how I railed against them. It was important to me as I went all over this state talking to residents to be sure that economic development took place all over the state and especially in central and southern Illinois to the greatest extent possible. I support all of these measures cause I believe that economic development anywhere benefits us all, all over the state, certainly with regard to the Peotone

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Airport. And I've worked on airport issues as a planner for 30 years. This is going to do a lot just, you know, for economic development in that area, but it's going to do a lot for safety of the skies above the south suburbs... well, really above the entire flight path in Chicago, Illinois. This is a good Bill. You know, we never have a Bill that... that's perfect. But this is an extremely good Bill that touches a lot of people. And I would hope that you would join me in voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's legislation. There are two items which are very important to a lot of us downstate and I'd like to just quickly highlight the farmland assessment side. As the way that we properly assess farmland gets farther and farther apart, some of you in this room, whether you knew it or not, were facing 2000 percent increases in the assessment structure and there was just a great disparity between upstate and downstate. So, as that grew further apart, there was a risk of that failing, so it's a very important piece for all of us downstate. This gives us a little bit of breathing room; we can work out the solution for it. So, we have the next three years to get through that without having an adverse impact on your farmland properties in both the north... northern part of Illinois as well as the southern. Another part, that in my region, we've been very fortunate in Grundy County, it has been a great economic engine, there has been great growth. And because of a decision made about

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

40 years ago on the amity tax structure, they have become at a... they've come to a competitive disadvantage for the areas around them, not only locally but on a state level. This language will allow them to continue their economic development district and be competitive. They have a number of very large-, small- and medium-size projects that are interested and this will greatly help them. So I commend the Sponsor and support the legislation. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rosenthal."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

"First of all, I'd like to rise in support of the Rosenthal: Bill... overall Bill. And especially the Tuscola fertilizer plant, which we will be producing value out of products that are utilized in our resources. And I think that that's one of the things that we definitely need in Illinois. The other thing I'd like to address is the LUST Fund. And you know, for those that don't know it's for the underground leaking storage tanks. And these projects currently are between private contractors; it's an agreement between the owner of the tanks and the Office of the State Fire Marshal's approved contractor. And the remediation work may or may not be reimbursed from the LUST Fund and that... the distribution of the fund qualification for that remediation is evaluated by the Illinois EPA at the end of the remediation. The other thing is that the moneys for the reimbursement program are paid for by the tank owner distributors and there are no tax dollars in that fund. The

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

wage rates for the LUST projects are set by... currently set by the Pollution Control Board not by the prevailing wage scale schedule from the Illinois Department of Labor. So, with this PLA what are the... what are the rates going to be? Are they going to be determined by the PLA? Are they going to be determined by prevailing wage or are they going to be determined by the Pollution Control Board?"

- Bradley: "Well, again, we had a meeting earlier with Petroleum Marketers and we'll try to... try to get a quick determination in terms of making sure that those prevailing wage rates are updated so that there's proper reimbursement on this fund."
- Rosenthal: "Does that mean that the Pollution Control Board is going to be overridden or are they still going to be..."
- Bradley: "I... I think the way that it's going to be... try to be worked and I don't want to make a complete commitment because I don't believe that I have the expertise on this that you do, Representative Rosenthal..."

Rosenthal: "Okay."

- Bradley: "But the Pollution Control Board needs to update their numbers. And so, that's the route that's going to be looked at to try to do expeditiously."
- Rosenthal: "Okay. The... the other question, do you know who's going to bear the cost of the PLA and whether that cost is going to be reimbursable?"
- Bradley: "Again, that's an issue that's come up and an issue that I believe would be reimbursable. There's a question about attorneys' fees and that's something, again, that we hopefully can work through in an expeditious manner."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Rosenthal: "Well, currently, right now..."

Bradley: "I think that can be..."

Rosenthal: "Well..."

Bradley: "I think that can be handled by Rules and by a process that doesn't require legislation or we're going to try to... to work through that."

Rosenthal: "Okay. Well, currently, when there's a release of petroleum products right now, there's a rapid response in controlling the damage and that's very important. So what's going to happen in emergencies? Are you going to have to wait for PLA to be in place or can they respond to it without that?"

Bradley: "Well, my understanding is that the Environmental Protection Agency will use the same process that the Capital Development Board uses for project labor agreements that it oversees."

Rosenthal: "Okay. Thank you very much. And I... I encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thanks."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I've been here for about one year and a lot of my colleagues have told me to watch what goes on, learn what's happening here and listen. For the last year, I've been listening to jobs. We need jobs. We need economic development. We put a Bill here today that is going to address those concerns. We're going to create jobs in Illinois. The south suburban airport alone, construction jobs 11,400. After its construction in its first year, 4500 jobs. After 15 years, 14,000 jobs. This is to go along with the Illiana Expressway that's

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

coming into that area also. That's a billion dollars of investment in the airport, a billion dollars of investment in the Illiana Expressway, huge, huge job creation. This Bill... this Bill throughout the whole State of Illinois, not only for farmers, for southern Illinois, for Chicago, for the southlands this is the economic development that I've been hearing we need to do. I strongly... strongly urge everyone of my colleagues to please vote 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Scherer."

Scherer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill affects my district. Many people will have an opportunity for a job. Just to let you know, Decatur has almost 14 percent unemployment and it is desperately needed. I appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Christian Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I want to speak specifically to the portion of this Bill that pertains directly to my district which is the MPA Project. This is potentially a very exciting development, one that could be a gateway to the near south side that could create up to 10,000 temporary jobs in construction and around 3700 permanent jobs in hospitality and other industries. Now, there's more that needs to be done to ensure that those numbers hold up, certainly more to be done to ensure that those benefits accrue south of the Stevenson Expressway. It is my expectation and I know the expectation of the local aldermen that this project will meet and exceed 25, 5 MWBE requirements, not just in terms of construction but also in

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

terms of professional services, bond deals, architects, engineers, et cetera, that there'll be consideration of capacity building opportunities for smaller and midsize businesses including possible joint ventures and sourcing of local vendors for supplies and services. And what is more exciting, potentially, is... is an commitment from the city to explain throughout this process anchor project becomes the beginning this development in the Bronze Ville area, which has such a rich history in arts and in... so much potential in capacity. There remains significant local community concern about the project, which I know the city's been working on. There was a meeting a couple of days ago with the prairie district. The city and MPA have committed to see those debates out to their end and will continue to work with myself, the aldermen and other stakeholders. All we are doing with this Bill by extending the TIF District, as well as expanding MPA's authority, is to allow the debate to continue at the local level. This could potentially be a very good thing for my district, the City of Chicago and the state. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sosnowski: "Just a quick question. I just want to focus in on just one issue particularly in regards to the Peotone Airport. If my memory recalls, we've spent tens of millions of dollars purchasing land through the Illinois Department of Transportation. What part of this legislation changes

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

that or... or modifies what they've been doing already to purchase property?"

Bradley: "I... not surprisingly I haven't been around that issue to the extent to address that say to the degree of my Representative Riley or someone like that could address that issue. But my understanding is, is this gives IDOT the ability to build upon whatever has already taken place there and take a different approach through a public-private partnership similar to what happened with the Illiana Expressway. And so, this Bill would give them the ability to do a public-private partnership, which I believe is new to this proposal and to build upon the efforts that have already been done in that area in previous Legislatures."

"Thank you. To the Bill. Do a little bit of a Sosnowski: commercial here, but there's a purpose behind this. You know, for those legislators who represent the northern part of Illinois, north of I-80 and, you know, even in towards the Elgin area, you know we've talked about this airport and I think this goes back to the late '80s, the Peotone Airport proposal. You know, we've got an International Airport out in Rockford which handles increasing cargo flights and cargo dollars are being brought in, passenger service continues to grow. Yet we have these ongoing conversations and I think just recently as many... several months ago, the Illinois Department of Transportation was looking at investing another 71 million dollars in this airport. And I keep asking why? As we see the 787 Dreamliners develop, you know, the move for airports...

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

airlines... airlines particularly are looking to have more volume of passengers on their flights and they're looking to have less airplanes landing. Now in addition to that, O'Hare is starting their expansion. You know, hundreds of millions of dollars to expand O'Hare Airport so that they can handle more airplanes. Yet, we're going to continue to sink tens of hundreds of millions of dollars into Peotone Airport hoping someday that something will come out of that and the airlines aren't asking for it, in fact, you know, what I've seen in their 20-, 30-, 40-year plans is they don't think there is any additional need for an airport. So the question I keep coming back to is why are we, knowing that airlines and the development of these Dreamliners and the, you know, the highly efficient large planes that carry a lot of passengers, why are we spending money to purchase land on something that I don't think we're ever going to need, especially with the change in technology. So, again, there's... there's some parts of this Bill that are good. I ... I just... rather this passes or not I certainly hope we can, as a General Assembly, go back and look at this... this Peotone process knowing again that you know we expanding O'Hare. We're moving forward on that plan as we speak with more runway space. Let's not spend these dollars there. I mean, there's all types of projects in the suburbs, in Chicago, downstate that we can invest these dollars into. Still creating jobs but doing the infrastructure that we actually need. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "I'd like to follow up on some of Mr. Sosnowski's comments. John, have... have any airlines committed to Peotone?"

Bradley: "I'm not aware of any."

Franks: "Do we know if we have actually asked for it?"

Bradley: "I don't know the answer to that, Representative."

Franks: "Do we have any economic numbers for the return on the investment? If we're going to be spending billions of dollars there? Do we have any idea what we expect to return?"

Bradley: "Representative, I don't have that answer, and as a caveat to that, let me just say this, 'cause you know that I don't... I'm not from that area of the state this is a statewide economic development package. The thing that binds this thing together is economic development for the entire state. It's about creating jobs and economic development. I am relying on the Legislators from the particular areas of the state to make determinations with regards to these different area-specific projects, doing that in the case of the south suburban airport. So while they're not the Sponsors..."

Franks: "Well, I..."

Bradley: "...I would suggest a conversation with them about what they think are the merits of those reports"

Franks: "Well no, I understand that and I appreciate that, but
I also want to make sure this is being vetted because I
think the taxpayers are going to be on the hook for some of

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

these things. And I... certainly I like the mayor's idea for the McCormick Place, the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, but my question is, if for some reason these bonds aren't paid because for whatever reason, the... the team isn't very good and nobody shows up or they overbilled the hotel, if these bonds aren't paid will the state be on the hook to pay these bonds?"

Bradley: "Well, Representative, we're not changing the bonding authority. We're changing what the bonding authority could be spent on or the use of that. So, as you know... as you know, the primary source are through the collection of taxes which were previously authorized by the General Assembly but which are local in nature."

Franks: "Of course."

Bradley: "And so, there is a backstop on down the road, on down the line, if the other sources of revenue fall apart."

Franks: "So... so, I think the state would be not the primary obligor, but we'd be..."

Bradley: "It's... we're down the road and I don't know if you would characterize it where down the road, but we're down the road in terms of there are other sources of revenue that were the result of legislative action and Governor's signature but which are collected on a local basis."

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate... I appreciate what the Gentleman's doing. And I think everyone here is for economic development. The question is, how do we get there? This happens every year. We have a Bill like this that comes at the end that isn't necessarily vetted. We haven't had a chance to look at the numbers. I think it's a problem with

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

the process. But I think fundamentally, if we're looking to help grow jobs and to help grow businesses in the state, there's a few other things we ought to be doing. The first thing we ought to do is stop the overregulation of our businesses. The second thing we ought to be doing is to pay our bills and to pay our vendors on time and to pass balanced budgets that pay back our bills instead expanding to new programs. The most important thing that we could do is to pass comprehensive pension reform because that is what scares most employers and people who want to come to the state. And we also need to come up with a plan so we can have our tax increase expire. So, until we do those things, we're just... this is sort of window dressing where we're picking winners and losers. We need to have a more comprehensive plan that affects every taxpayer in the State of Illinois, not just some of the chosen few. I'm concerned on the scope of this... this Bill; I think there's a lot of good things in here, but I also think there are things that would not and could not and should not pass on their own. And that's why they've been put into this Bill to try to cover that up. I've got a problem with that; I've got a problem with the process. I've got a problem that we haven't passed the pension reform that should have been the most important issue; it is the most important issue and should have been dealt with to the exclusion of everything else but it seems to be put on the back burner. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no' and encourage you to do the same."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to the lateness of the hour, I will certainly be brief. I want to thank the Gentleman for bringing this Bill forward. And one of the previous speakers from the other side of the aisle asked why is the third airport necessary. Well, if he would like to read the reports from the FAA that says that it is necessary because there is a need for additional capacity in the Chicago Metropolitan area, despite the expansion of O'Hare, despite all the other small regional airports, this airport will be built in a way that it will be able to accommodate the additional capacity that's needed well into the future. So, again, if he would like to be briefed on the entire project where we can lay this out for him be more than happy to do so. That's why we need to have that third airport. Oh, by the way, thousands of jobs will be created and economic development will take place in a region that has sorely not received the... the type of state support to make these kinds of things happen. So we are on the precipice, if I can use that word, of making this a reality. So I do encourage all of you to support this Bill. And then secondly, I represent the south suburbs. Another fantastic piece of this Bill will be the Brownfields Redevelopment and Intermodal... Intermodal Promotion Act that will use a net... a couple of natural assets that we have in the south suburbs. In my district, I have four class 1 rail yards including Canadian National and Union Pacific. They will be able to use what's generated by this Act to help grow and develop two fantastic intermodal rail yards. Canadian National could have very easily packed up and

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

moved to Tennessee, but they decided to stay in the south suburbs because they saw the potential and they saw what we as a Body are capable of doing in order to grow and promote business here in the State of Illinois. All I've heard from most of the other side of the aisle is that we need to create jobs in the State of Illinois. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill creates jobs in the State of Illinois and you should all be voting 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cloonen."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Cloonen: "Thank you. Yes, this is a very important Bill and the third airport is in my district and we know it brings jobs. I enjoyed the day we came to the floor and saw the word, jobs, jobs, jobs printed all over the microphones. And we know, as I said, that we're a State Representative of our district, but the one thing I have learned since being here and the one thing that has been engrained in me is that we are the Representative of the entire state. And this Bill is good for the entire state. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "I was... to the Bill. I was going to ask Representative Franks if he could just stand beside me and repeat his talking points since he pretty much stole mine, but looks like he's headed over to the other side of the aisle. So, what you find out here is that really Mr. Davis just said that, you know, you only hear one thing from this side of the aisle, well, we just heard all the good talking points from Representative Franks on the other side of the aisle.

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

But I'll be brief here for the rest of it. I'll tell you what, this would never happen at the local level. You would not hand a local board a 373-page Bill and expect them to vote on it in three hours when it has this level of detail and impacts this much taxing and other economic development projects. You'd be having public hearings on it, you could never get this to happen. And the biggest problem with this is, while Mr. Mautino made very good comments about the farmland assessment, unfortunately, with the quick-take provision on the Peotone Airport, these farmers are going to wake up and find out it doesn't matter 'cause their farmland was just taken. So, I urge a 'no' vote here. I think this is too much and there's a lot of bad projects mixed in with the good. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative Bradley, is there only one opponent at this point?"

Bradley: "One what?"

Davis, M.: "I mean, is there only one person... one group in opposition to your Bill?"

Bradley: "I don't know the answer to that, but so far it sounds like that."

Davis, M.: "I mean, we were... I think someone had asked about some petroleum group? Pardon?"

Bradley: "You're talking about the Representative from McHenry County?"

Davis, M.: "Is that one person? To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Bradley: "I think so."

Davis, M.: "For... for a very long time and for many years we keep hearing that this is going to bring jobs and that Bill is going to bring jobs and I am still waiting in Chicago for this to happen. We really do see lots of people with jobs, but we see very few people of color with these jobs we're talking about bringing to Chicago. But because you're going to do a stadium for DePaul University, we're going to do an expansion of McCormick Place, because I think the mayor of the City of Chicago has a number of ideas to perhaps give jobs to all the people in the City of Chicago. Surely, if we build a third airport and we're building all the way out to Peotone, you'll have to skip over African-American people to get to some of the jobs. So, hopefully, this time, we really will benefit and get some of these jobs. I do believe that expanding the TIFs for many areas will help them out and it'll be a benefit to their communities. When we become truly business oriented, when we become really the kind of people who understand what it takes to bring dollars to the State of Illinois, then we will be voting of these kinds of issues. Because I believe that Peotone Airport will bring jobs that the area itself, it's almost a transportation Mecca with Olive Harvey College at 103rd, it should bring a lot of trucking... delivery jobs and it should be a lot of building jobs and hopefully will be a lot of service jobs in the hotel and the DePaul University Stadium. I rise in support of this legislation and I hope it passes on the first vote. Thank you."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Turner: "Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Again, this is a Bill about jobs and I just wanted to make one point. There was... Representative Mautino and I were working on a piece of language that included a incentive to bring a... to keep a major employer in the State of Illinois in the state. And that has to do with Office Max and its merger with Office Depot. So we're still continuing to work on it and I would appreciate your support to get this thing done. We still have a day to do it. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is one of those opportunities for us to do the right thing as it relates to economic development. Of course, the Bill is not perfect, neither Bill or no Bill is. This Bill's what we talk about when we run for office. It's about economic development. It speaks exactly to some of those large-scale projects that we have to... have to sometimes give some legislative legs to so it can come into fruition in relatively short order. When you go through this Bill, there is something in here for everybody, all across the state as it relates to putting people to work. And sometimes we have to make tough decisions, but this legislation doesn't necessarily need that. It's opportunity for us to start breaking ground, for us to start engaging businesses that deals anywhere from new construction to tourism attraction to rejustifying the areas in the City of Chicago in part of my district, all the way downstate. This is something that we can all feel

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

good about, that our constituents will give us another healthy level of respect for doing the right thing and helping to move the economic pendulum in the direction that we need it to go in. So, I would encourage all of us to look at some of these... these wonderful measures that really just boist... boost our economy in various regions of the state and vote 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "In the words of the great professional wrestler, Rick Flair, I don't have to do it, they're doing it for me. No one got that. Anyway. So, this is about economic development. It's about economic development. It's about economic development. It's about the whole state; it's about a comprehensive program. It's about helping every area of the state. It's about economic development. It's about jobs. It's about jobs.

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 20 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 81 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 20, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move to suspend the posting notice requirements so that Senate Joint Resolution 32 may be heard in Elementary & Secondary Education tomorrow."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves, seeing no objection, the Motion prevails. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 413,

offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 414, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 415, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 416, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 417, offered by Representative Cross. House Resolution 421, offered by Representative Currie. House Resolution 422, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution 423, offered by Representative Tracy. House Resolution 424, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolution 425, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 426, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 427, offered by Representative Scherer. House Resolution 428, offered by Representative Sente. House Resolution 429, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 430, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 431, offered by Representative Berrios. House Resolution 432, offered by Representative Pihos. House Resolution 433, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 434, offered by Representative Jackson. House Resolution 435, offered by Representative Turner. And House Resolution 437, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Clerk Hollman: "Committee schedule. The following committees will be meeting tomorrow morning. At 8:30 in the morning is the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee in Room C-1 and the Transportation; Vehicles & Safety Committee in D-1."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

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

Speaker Turner: "State your point, Sir."

Arroyo: "I'm looking for Tasty. I can't find Tasty. I... I'm looking in my drawer and I can't find him. Does anybody know where Tasty is? I... I think that Tasty blew the coop... left the coop. I don't know if he's on the Republican side for any reason or he's looking for another home. But can you... could you return Tasty, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sacia."

Sacia: "Tasty is here, but he's been renamed BOHICA."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege."

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

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I was prepared to file some Resolutions yesterday towards the end of the Blackhawks game after a very terrible call, but the Blackhawks did prevail in a tremendous form. And I would also like to congratulate the Chicago Cubs by winning on an average of a touchdown in every game sweeping the White Sox. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Mr. Speaker, I object."

67th Legislative Day

5/30/2013

Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House adjourn to Friday, May 31 at the hour of 9:30 a.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."

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 30, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to for the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1329. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3636, offered by Representative Berrios, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3637, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."