134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Zoila Marty, who is with First United Methodist Church in Chester. Pastor Marty is the guest of Representative Costello. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor Marty."
- "Good afternoon. Let's all pray. Mighty God, Pastor Marty: creators of heaven and air, this day, we thank You because You are the God of power, mercy, love, and compassion. This day I thank You for giving me the opportunity to ask ... to ask You to bless each person gathered here in this place. Oh Lord, You promise that we can ask You anything in the Father, to Your Father, and You will answer. This is the day that we ask You to give the wisdom to each Member of this Body to make the best decision for the benefits of the poor, the powerless, and the voiceless... this is ... in this state and our nation. You... You're saying You're all that we need to pray in what ... for one another. And I bless You and we bless You and I bless every person in this place, and I ask You to continue giving them the wisdom to be the voice of us. Thank You, Father, Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by a man you should take a close look at, Mr. Franks."
- Franks 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."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

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

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that all Republicans are present and we're ready to do the work of the people, and observe Jack Franks's hair."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 117 Members of the House present. We do have a quorum. Mr. Poe."

Poe: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Poe: "Yeah. I'd like for the Lutheran Grade School kids to stand up, and we got Russell Vining who's been coming over here 20 years with his Lutheran class, and he's going to retire after this year, so let's get him Godspeeds on retirement and thank the kids for being here."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Leader. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Berrios: "I would like the Body to help me welcome my boyfriend who's up in the gallery with his family, Jim Weiss, Mary Murray, and they have the three nieces: Jelana, Bianca, and Skylar, if we could welcome them to Springfield today."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Walsh: "Today we have the Illinois 4-H Legislative Connection here, and I'd like to recognize the University of Illinois extension 4-H Legislative Connection event being held today and tomorrow. Over the course of the next two days, 22 4-H members

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

from the Illinois 4-H Youth Leadership Team and the speaker for the Illinois 4-H program will be visiting the Members of the House and the Senate. These youth are from 14 counties throughout the state, and represent almost 160 thousand 4-H participants from all 102 counties in the State of Illinois. Working with these teams are Dr. George Czapar, Director of the University of Illinois Extension: Dr. Denise Oberle, Assistant Dean and Director of Illinois 4-H; Erica Austin, John Davis, Patricia McGlaughlin, and Deb Stocker of the University of Illinois Extension; Joshua Frank, a 4-H volunteer; and Jeanne Harland, Jerry Hicks, Jerry Townsend, and Pam Weber, members of the Extension Partners. Please help me in welcoming our 4-H folks behind us in the gallery."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us today.

Representative Osmond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Osmond: "The staff has asked me to announce that there is a fundraiser tonight. It's called Walk to Defeat ALS. It's at CherryBerry and it is from 5 to 9 o'clock this evening, for defeating ALS. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you very much. Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed, Sir."

Meier: "I just want to welcome the 4-H kids here, too, today and say that I'm very proud to have my 4-H tie on today, given to me by my 4-H kids this Christmas."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to pick up on Senate Bills-Third Reading on page

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

7 of the Calendar. The first Bill is Senate Bill 2945, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Holloman: "Senate Bill 2945, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2945 allows up to seven additional students who would have severe... severe autism to... fulfill their IEP at a... center in Ohio, which is one of the preeminent facilities in... in the country for treating severe autism. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "To the Bill."

Bellock: "I support this Bill. And this is for children, as
Representative Nekritz said, that have severe autism. And
this is an outstanding school. This will not take any other
money that would follow these children anyways. And so, I
stand in strong support of helping these children. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I see that ISBE and the Illinois Alliance of Special Education Administrators are opponents. Could you please tell us why?"

Nekritz: "Well, Representative, I think they're... they're concerned about two things. One, they testified in committee that this would increase costs. I strongly dispute that. I don't think it will. We... we're the ones that appropriate the line item for these things and... and if we don't appropriate

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

more money, then there's no more... then there isn't any money to be... to be spent. I think they're concerned about the precedent and I am... I would understand that, but I think that the... this right now is going through the Purchased Care Review Board, which has flexibility to do this but does not take account of various... of the variety of circumstances in... in other schools around the country and... so here we are with legislation."

Franks: "Was there ever a fiscal note attached to this? Was there any... I understand this is subject to appropriation, correct?"

Nekritz: "No, it's not. So, no. It's not because we... this... we have to do this within the existing lines. Whatever we appropriated last year, we're not asking for a greater appropriation. Whatever we appropriate for FY15, we're not asking..."

Franks: Okay. So..."

Nekritz: "...for... for a large appropriation."

Franks: "So, you're just redistributing the money you already have..."

Nekritz: "Correct."

Franks: "...so that money can follow the children."

Nekritz: "Correct. And I don't know whether it will, you know, I mean, if these children went to... there are plenty of schools around the country that are more expensive than this school. If they go to one of those more expensive schools, it'll be, you know, it'll be of smaller proration, if they go to a less expensive school... school it'd be a large approp. So, there's no way to predict that based on where students select to go. And that's up to the student and the local district."

Franks: "Thank you very much."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Nekritz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Flowers: "Representative, is this not current law? Is this not what you're supposed to do if the school district does not have what is necessary for the children? They should be able to go outside, and if it is a private school, so be it."

Nekritz: "That's correct. But this school right now... would... is only able to... because of the way the formulas work, they're only able to serve 5 Illinois children, and we would like them to be able to serve 12."

Flowers: "Okay. But I... my point is, it's already existing law."

Nekritz: "That they can... I'm sorry, Representative."

Flowers: "It is existing law that if a school district does not have what is necessary for the education of that child, by Federal Law, the parents have the right to send their child outside the school district, and that school district should pay for it."

Nekritz: "That's my understanding, yes."

Flowers: "Thank you very much,"

Nekritz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question I have on this Bill is, could more students go to this school without this Bill?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Nekritz: "Well, Representative, there's only 5 there from Illinois right now, and the school is not accepting any... anymore Illinois students."
- Pihos: "And is that because of the negotiated rates or for some other reason?"
- Nekritz: "That's because... I wouldn't say it's a negotiated rate.

  That's the rate that the Purchase... the Purchase Care Review
  Board requires. Yes."
- Pihos: "Right. And are the Members of the General Assembly aware that there're probably 70 other sites in the State of Illinois that could also accept these students?"
- Nekritz: "Representative, that's up to... that would be up to the school district and the student to determine where they want to go. Some of those sites are more expensive than this location."
- Pihos: "But this location could negotiate rates if they wanted to add up to 7 more additional students, am I correct?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I don't know that you would call it 'negotiated'.

  I think they've tried that and it's been unsuccessful."
- Pihos: "And is there any particular reason that we're doing this? Are we doing this for any one student in the state, or is this just being done globally because we think it's a good thing?"
- Nekritz: "I think we're doing it because it's... it would be a good thing."
- Pihos: "Well, I would encourage our Members of the House to consider the fact that there are many other good sites here in the State of Illinois that could accept these students, that would accept these students, and we are sending our state

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

dollars out of state for perhaps the wrong reasons when we have sites already available for these students. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz to close."

Nekritz: "Ask for your support."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Cross. Please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Senger."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Senger: "In February of this year, I introduced House Resolution 807 that called for the Department of Insurance to audit the Obamacare Navigator program. The program has been used by at least... has used at least 36 million in taxpayer dollars to hire over 1200 navigators. And those navigators were used to help guide people through the health care enrollment choices. Even with the support of numerous colleagues and the Department of Insurance, the Resolution has been sent to subcommittee without a scheduled hearing. With the recent disclosure of the waste and abuse in a similar program that lacked oversight, the Neighborhood Recovery Program, it is clear that we need to open the books on all government spending so that more tax dollars aren't wasted. That is why I call on you today to vote to allow this Resolution to be called in committee because when we find out about waste and abuse four years ago... from now, it'll be too late. With that

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

I move, pursuant to Rule 58, file a Motion to Discharge from the Health Exchange Marketplace House Resolution 807 carried on a daily Calendar, pursuant to Rule 49, ask for a record vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Lady has moved that House Resolution 807 be discharged from committee. The Chair recognizes Mr. Mautino on the Motion."
- Mautino: "Yes, Speaker, I would object to the Motion. The... This legislation actually or... in the Bill itself has been addressed by the Insurance Committee, and actually was the subject of a lot of negotiation. We had agreement to structure that all navigators would have background checks and everything that's being asked for and required by this action. So, with that, I would object. And I would ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis, the Chairman of the House Insurance Committee."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For this particular Resolution, we did have a subcommittee. And that subcommittee decided to keep this Bill in subcommittee. So, I'm really surprised to see this Bill on the floor. We have a process in place in all of our committees and that process states, with the Chair's permission a Bill can be placed in subcommittee and the Members of that subcommittee can vote to let it out or keep it inside. Because of the nature of the Bill, and because as Representative Mautino stated, the issue has been addressed. It's been addressed through legislation. We felt the Resolution was superlative, and we didn't need it. Therefore, I, too, urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt, do you rise... No, not on this? Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm just speaking to the merits of why I think there should be some public debate on this... on the Representative's Motion. Because several of us had Bills regarding different things... regarding the Affordable Care Act, the In-Person Counselors, of which I asked several people for definitions of how you define an In-Person Counselor versus a navigator. I never got a clear definition of that. The \$36 million that came from the Federal Government towards this, there was just... we felt that there needed to be more transparency and accountability in the money that was coming into this state and how it was going to be spent. Another issue here is that I couldn't get clarification on was, that if people were coming in on the Medicaid rolls and there would be 17 million across the United States, why when people were going in on the exchange were people that did not meet Medicaid eligibility, why they got into private insurance but their children were put into Medicaid. These are people making over a hundred to 125 thousand a year. So, there was a lot of... not clarity on the Bill. And I agree with Representative that there needs to be more definition, more transparency, and more accountability so that we can all understand what really got spent of the 36 million. I serve on the Human Service Approp Committees. I asked over and over again as to where some of the money was going on the Medicaid match and everything. Obviously, some of it was in the Insurance Approp Bills, but we would like to see more transparency and accountability on... especially the In-Person

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Counselors and the navigators. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hey, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish you were paying attention to exactly what is going on here. And for those of you that are in the gallery for the first time, a Member of the other side of the aisle said it was referred to subcommittee, and then it was... then it was not allowed out of subcommittee based on that vote. Well, let me tell you about subcommittees. Subcommittees are created so that we can... so that the Majority Party can have total power over certain Bills by referring them to subcommittee where they load the committee up with two Members from the Majority Party, one from the Minority, and therefore, they make the vote. I will... I will assume that there was no debate. It was just a vote to make sure that it stayed into subcommittee. Let me explain what the Lady is trying to ask for here. She's trying to ask for some clarity on where money was spent and what exactly and who that money was spent on. Whether you agree with the Affordable Care Act or you disagree with the Affordable Care Act, it must be handled correctly by law. All we're asking in this Resolution is simply saying, let's get to the ... get to the bottom of this, find out to make sure and if there's no problem, then there's no problem. But if there is some wrongdoing or if the money has been improperly handled, then we need to know that so that it can be provided to the people who really need to have it provided to them. This sham of sending things to subcommittee and not allowing a fair hearing. All we're asking here of the Members

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

of this Body, and I ask you to join with whoever... whether you're Republican or Democrat, ask... I'm asking you to vote to give the opportunity for a fair hearing on this Resolution. That's all we're asking for. This is the way government is supposed to work. Bring it out, let's talk about it; let's find out what we're supposed to do. If you don't want to do it, then vote 'no', but at least allow the hearing. So, vote 'yes', we're allowing the hearing. I stand in strong support of the Lady's Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Well, here we are. We'll spend more time actually on the process than actually debating the merits of this Resolution. Why don't... Mr. Speaker, why don't we just vote 60 folks here, allow the Resolution to be thoroughly debated, it can rise or fall on its own merits and the arguments of those in support and those opposed and that's it. But that's what happens when you, the Majority Party, put all these hoops that people should jump through because you simply want to kill legislation that you don't like. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. In Insurance Committee, I specifically asked, on behalf of Representative... to the chairwoman, would the next step then be trying to bring this to the House Floor? And at that time, madam chair indicated 'yes'. So, as others have... have testified to here and spoken to, simply we're asking for just a fair 'yes' or 'no' vote on the Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution... Motion. I, too, actually happened say what in Representative Senger asked and asked and asked that this Bill be posted to subcommittee after it was sent there. And each week we heard no, no, no. All the Lady wants is to have her Bill heard in committee so that she can have a fair debate on it. That's all we've asked. And it's disingenuous for this... this chairman of the committee to say that we held a vote, and the Members of the subcommittee voted to keep it in subcommittee and not let it be heard. There was no vote taken. If there was, I'd like to know when that committee was held. Nothing happened. The Chairman doesn't want to let the Bill out, and that's that. So, all we're asking with this is for it to be discharged so that the Representative can have a fair debate on her Bill. If we find out that the Insurance... Department of Insurance is, in fact, doing these things, fine, then we know that. All the Representative is asking for... for is a fair hearing. And we've heard the Speaker say now that we just let the people speak, let the people speak. Well, we represent a lot of people too, what's wrong with letting the Lady have her Bill heard in committee. I rise in support of the Motion."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Davis is the chairman of the Insurance Committee. And I've been in this chamber for 12 years, and Representative Davis was very kind to appoint me to the subcommittee. And Representative Davis, I do not remember ever being called for that subcommittee. We didn't have a vote in that. In fact, when Representative

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Senger asked for it to be discharged, you were gracious enough to say it should be before the whole floor. So, that's why we are here today, and it was your recommendation that we do this. So, I guess, we're just following your procedures, madam chairman. And hopefully people will understand that needs... this needs to have a vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, your light is on. Were you planning to speak a second time, Sir? You've spoken enough. We believe so. We believe so. Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that this Resolution has about 15 or 20 organizations in opposition. We were attempting to give the Sponsor an opportunity to meet with these opponents and reach some kind of conclusion. It is really interesting to me that some people think, in this Body, that certain chairmen don't have the same rights and privileges of every other chairman. It is the process, it is in the rules, that a Bill can be placed in subcommittee. It is also a process that the chairman can decide when it comes out. Now, because there are no negotiations taking place, because the Sponsor of the Resolution chooses not to meet with AARP, the Cancer Society, the Citizen's Action, a number of Illinois primary health care organizations, chooses not to meet with these organizations, but still wants this Bill to be called, and I chose to leave it in committee. And I stand by my right to make that decision."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been some interesting debate. It's actually subsumed what otherwise could have been accomplished, a 'yes'/'no' vote on the merits of the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Resolution, probably by 15 minutes. The process, however, we find is interesting. The spokesperson just said there's opposition, there's no attempt on the part of the Sponsor to meet with the opposition, therefore, I didn't let it out of subcommittee, but we're still here talking about it. The fact of the matter is, many of the Bills, Resolutions, and items we discuss and debate have opposition. That's the American way. The substance of this Resolution deserves a hearing on the merits. And again, you spend so much time talking about the procedure, it's subsumed the substance, which is a shame. Let's go about this the right way. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to try to bring a little clarity to the Lady's Resolution. On line 12, it says: 'WHEREAS, The State of Illinois has given out more than \$36 million in federal taxpayer dollars to dozens of community groups in Illinois to hire temporary workers and navigators.' And then it goes on to say, 'WHEREAS, There are over 1... 1,200 navigators in Illinois, many with no background in insurance and limited training.' And I just want to say, for the record, according to the information that I have read in regards to navigators, you need not have any type of insurance background or to be an insurance agent to be a navigator. So, I just want to... hopefully, that will kind of clear up the concerns that you have. That was not a prerequisite in order to become a navigator, in regards to doing a background check. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, your light is once again on. Is there something wrong with the switch there, Sir?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Reboletti: "No. I have an Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry."

Reboletti: "The Chairman of the committee stated that there was a subcommittee. There was a subcommittee that was held, and there was a vote that was taken. So, I'm asking the Clerk for some clarification if this was actually posted in a subcommittee and if a vote actually took place."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, in answer to your inquiry. The LIS system does not show subcommittee votes. The Clerk would have to do research to get the answer to your question. The Chairperson..."

Reboletti: "I... If I..."

Speaker Lang: "...the Chairperson of the committee stated on the record what she believes the case to be. If you wish to challenge that, you certainly may. But we cannot provide you an answer at this moment, Sir."

Reboletti: "Then I... Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chairman then."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Mr. Speaker, I did misspeak. We did not meet. It was put in subcommittee and there has not been a call for a meeting. I did misspeak on that. And I do apologize."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, did that respond to your answer... your question, Sir?"

Reboletti: "I appreciate the clarification. Henceforth, the august debate here about the Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I wish people would confine their remarks on a procedural Motion,

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

which is what is before us, to procedures, and some of the speakers have done just that. Others want to discuss what's in the Resolution. That I would urge, the Members and the chair, is not appropriate for a discussion of the Motion to Discharge committee. What is important for each and every Member of this House is the committee structure. We are all Members of House Committees. We take our work seriously. And when we decide 'aye' or 'nay' on a measure before us, we hope our colleagues will respect the care and the work that went into those decisions. We have committees because committees are the ones that know the subject areas, can deal with issues that Members from other committees bring before them. Each and every one of us should stand up for our committees. We've heard from a distinguished Member of the committee, Representative Mautino. We've heard from the chair of the subcommittee... I'm sorry, the chair of the committee, Representative Davis and they assure us that the committee took this issue seriously. As a Member of the Revenue Committee, I would just let you know that we almost always send all of our Bills to subcommittee. By no means is it a graveyard. In fact, every once in a while a Bill escapes the subcommittee structure. I believe today we considered a measure by the House Minority Leader, Representative Durkin and for reasons unclear to me, Representative Bradley, the chair of the committee, didn't send it directly to sub. We, instead, reported it to the floor. But subcommittees are not a bad idea at all. It's a way for us to develop expertise in a particular area under the general work of the committees upon which we serve. I would say each of us... each of us who

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

chairs a committee or is a Minority Spokesperson, each of us who serves on a committee should stand up for Representative Davis, for Representative Mautino, and for the work of the House Insurance Committee. We should reject the Motion to Discharge that committee, not only because we don't need to consider this Resolution, which already is law, but also because we support the idea that our committees have value, they are part of the work that we do, and if we can say no to this committee, then why in the world do you get up for an 8:30 chance to debate a Bill in any of the committees of the Illinois House of Representatives. I think it behooves us all to stand with Representative Davis, to stand with her committee and reject the Motion to Discharge."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Senger to close on her Motion."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'll walk through the steps of how we got here today. Number one, we had this Bill in February in the Insurance Committee, and during that process, there were two individuals in the room that wanted to have a subject matter hearing. And basically, the process we went through was the objectors were read, and the Bill was put in subcommittee. I put a letter of discharge together, to ask the letter to be heard for a hearing in subcommittee. And I asked in... in Insurance last week to have this Bill, again, heard in subcommittee. What is going on here, and I didn't talk to the individuals that oppose, but working through the Republican staff, those who objected to this, objected to that because of the way this Resolution was worded. So, what you have just said is that you do not like the word 'audit', you do not like the word 'transparency', and you do not want

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

to see some disclosure on how this program was run. There's two components here, In-Person Counselors and navigators. Twenty-eight million went to the In-Person Counselor program that is... looked... looked and audited metric by the state. The eight million has no oversight. And you have done nothing here today but hide behind some regulations to say we don't care about transparency, we don't care about how the federal dollar gets spent. All we care about is basically doing the way we want to do it. I ask for a discharge."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves that House Resolution 807 be discharged from the Insurance Committee. This Motion requires 60 affirmative votes. 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? Ford, Mayfield. Mr. Ford. Please take the record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes', and 69 voting 'no'. And the Lady's Motion fails. Senate Bill 2954, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2954, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."

McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is an initiative of the Chicago Bar Association. It is also supported by the National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys. It's making an Amendment to the Probate Act, allowing for, in certain limited circumstances, the guardian of a ward to petition for dissolution of marriage, to file a petition for legal separation, or for declaration of invalidity of

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

marriage. I'm happy to answer any questions and appreciate the support of the Body."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 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 Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question for you. Have you ever heard anybody in this chamber talk about wanting smaller government? That they want smaller government? Well, tomorrow night, the Retrofit Caucus is going to have a walk, and we can find out who's just talking the talk and how many can walk the walk, okay. 9:30. Yes, 9:30, tomorrow evening, meet out on the east side of the Capitol, down there by the Lincoln statue, and we'll have a group walk. And we will see who's serious about smaller government. 9:30 tomorrow evening, sponsored by the American Heart Association and American Cancer Society. Hope you'll join us. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Personal... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, please."

Brady: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please give a nice Springfield welcome to my Page today, Josh, who is here with

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

his dad, John, in the gallery from my legislative district. He attends George Evans School. Please say hello to Josh and his dad, John Nepomuceno. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Josh. Glad you're here with us. Representative Manley."

Manley: "Hello, Speaker. Thank you. I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "You may proceed."

Manley: "With me, to my left, is a wonderful young lady. In my district, I have this dynamic powerful group of women that we call the... Working Women's Advisory Committee. And I was introduced to Phaelon Voss through one of those members. She's a graduate of U of I in 2012, in Political Science. She is dazzled by what goes on, on the floor so far. Currently, she's working for a cardiologist, and hoping, maybe, to be a Representative someday. She's like, 'no way'. Can we welcome her to Springfield, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Glad you're enjoying the House Floor.

Don't take too much back to school with you. Representative

Evans."

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Evans: "Just as a reminder, Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Gordon-Booth is having a celebration today for her baby at the Lincoln Towers... at the Lincoln Hotel, Adams Street. Of course we know, 701 East Adams, today from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. Flyers were distributed to everybody. So, if you can, please come by and celebrate our colleague's first child. Thank you." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, a pers... a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Moffitt: "I would ask the Body if you'd give a nice welcome. I have three Pages here today from Galesburg, Illinois, Lydia, Caleb, and Benjamin Plattner. Welcome to the chamber."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here with us. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed."

Williams: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to be having an impromptu briefing tomorrow in my office, at 11:30, prior to Session for the Green Caucus, just to informally go over the last remaining issues as we approach adjournment. So, if you could make it tomorrow, great. 11:30 in my office in the Stratton Building. Representative Fortner will be there as well, just to go over the last remaining issues. And if you're unable to attend, see me, we'll provide you materials. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I have, to my left, my Page for the day,
Hayden Barber, who will be celebrating his 12th birthday
tomorrow. Please welcome him to Springfield and wish him a
happy early birthday."

Speaker Lang: "Happy birthday. Thanks for being here. Mr. Meier."

Meier: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Meier: "I've had a group of parents here today from Murray Parents Association, and we're just celebrating 50 years of the State of Illinois doing what's best for our... our residents there. And we want to say thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Glad you're with us. Moving down the Calendar, Senate Bill 2958, Leader Feigenholtz. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2958, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."
- Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Senate Bill 2958 is an agreed upon Bill that extends a pilot program known as the MAC program. It clarifies who is going to provide administrative support. Once that was resolved, everyone got on board. The... this is an initiative of the Nurse's Association, Illinois Health Care Association, HCCI, and long-term care providers. I'd be glad to answer any questions."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Yingling. 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. House Bill 2972, Mr. Crespo. Out of the record. House Bill 2978, Mr. Cabello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2978, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is cleanup language to a Bill that is for police officer memorial plate. It does not... Again, it's not a new license plate. Unfortunately, there are people that could get this license plate. We're trying to limit it to just officers, their family members that have lost. And it's a good bipartisan Bill. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Leitch, Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2980, Mr. Stewart. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2980, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

  Speaker Lang: "Mr. Stewart."
- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2980 is an initiative of the Township Officials of Illinois. It amends the Township Code. It provides that a copy of the full unaudited statement of the financial affairs of the township may be provided to the electors at the annual township meeting in lieu of the township clerk reading the statement aloud. I know of no opposition. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2984, Representative McAsey. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2984. A Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of the Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative McAsey."
- McAsey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the initiative of the Illinois State Bar Association. It makes various Amendments to the Illinois State Trust and Trustees Act. Changes and clarifications that are based upon practitioners with regard to total return trust, conversions, virtual representation, beneficiaries without capacity. I know of no opposition and would be happy to answer any specific questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House... Excuse me. Senate Bill 2989, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2989, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 2989 is an initiative of the school psychologists. And it simply changes the definition of 'school psychologists' to include a psychologist who holds a valid Nationally Certified

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

School Psychologist certificate. Illinois continues to experience a shortage of school psychologists, which puts children in underserved areas at a disadvantage. According to Supply and Demand ISBE's Educator Report, psychologists top the list of the most underproduced education professionals in the state. This board... the National School Psychology Certification Board oversees a very rigorous process which is... utilizes the competencies ISBE requires of the... of their university programs. Thirty-one states accept this credential. This is simply an additional route to add to the available pool of school psychologists. And I'm happy to answer questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm reading the analysis, Representative. And do you have to be a psychologist to be a certified school psychologist?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. That's what I couldn't tell."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Franks: "So, this isn't really changing..."

Cassidy: "It's just a different board certification."

Franks: "Okay. That's what I was trying to find. So, they'll still be board certified, and they'll still be psychologists, and have gone through all the proper training."

Cassidy: "Yes."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Franks: "This is just so we can get more psychologists into our schools."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Franks: "Thank you."
Cassidy: "Thanks."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tabares. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2992, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2995, Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2995, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 2995 amends the Criminal Code of Criminal Procedure by explicitly allowing individuals who pled guilty to petition proposed conviction, DNA testing. Under the current law, a defendant may petition the trial court to allow fingerprint, ballistic, or forensic DNA testing evidence that was secured in relation to the trial which resulted in his or her conviction. This evidence must've been previously subject to the testing. The petitioner must show that the identity was an issue at trial. And the evidence to be tested has to be subject of a chain of custody, such that it has not been tampered with, substituted or altered, and the courts must allow testing if... if it determines that the testing has

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

potential to produce new noncumulative evidence that is materially relevant. Senate Bill 2995 adds that the defendant may petition the trial court to perform such testing on evidence that was secured in relation to a guilty plea, which is result in his or her conviction, and provides that the petitioner must show that the identity was an issue at the guilty plea. And if the conviction was the result of a guilty plea, the court must allow testing upon the determination that the test results would raise a reasonable probability that the defendant would have been acquitted had he proceeded to trial. And the testing employs a generally accepted scientific method. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, could you explain in what situation that this might occur? You're stating that an individual would plead guilty, the court would admonish the defendant as to the rights that he was relinquishing, and his sentence would be entered. And you're stating that at some point in time, thereafter, the defendant could file a motion to state that there is DNA evidence that would show that he is actually innocent of the crime?"

Turner: "Sir, Representative Reboletti, the current statute in the interpretation by the Illinois Supreme Court has barred individuals who pled guilty to a crime to seek post-conviction release through DNA, ballistic, or fingerprint testing, even if the test results may prove their innocence. Nationwide, there have been 316 post-conviction exonerations by DNA

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

evidence, and 30 of those exonerees had previously pled guilty. Research has shown that some individuals often falsely confess, plead guilty, and otherwise provide admission of guilt for crimes that they did not commit. And this would allow them to go back and do the... where the identity was an issue at the guilty plea, and do the DNA testing."

Reboletti: "Is it your... is it your concern that the postconviction relief that is available to motions that can be filed both in state and federal court to challenge the guilty plea, I guess, or the lack of evidence. That's insufficient now when the defendant enters a plea of guilty?"

Turner: "Say it again. I'm sorry, I didn't..."

Reboletti: "I... I guess what I'm saying is, Leader, is that... is there enough... do we not have enough, in the ways of our post-conviction relief, that a defendant could file motions to overturn the guilty plea at certain times down the road? So, you have 30 days to remove your guilty plea, withdraw your guilty plea already, and then there's other issues down the road. So, you're saying that you can't collaterally challenge the..."

Turner: "This is just an added tool, Representative."

Reboletti: "How many... how many individuals would this have applied to in the State of Illinois if this were available?"

Turner: "I don't have an exact number, Representative, but I can
 get back to you with something."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Turner: "Thank you."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ealewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, on page 3 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 3814. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3814, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. This Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Speaker Madigan, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan on the Amendment."

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would move for the adoption of the Amendment, and then debate the issue on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed "no". The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3814, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this matter is concerned with the minimum wage. The Amendment would call for a statewide advisory question to be placed on the November General Election ballot asking Illinois voters if the state's minimum wage, for those over the age of 18, should be

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

increased to \$10 an hour by January of 2015. Speaking to a number of Members on this issue, it became clear to me that there were differences of opinion as how to address it. Therefore, I believe the issue deserves a discussion, so I filed this Amendment. Under current law, the minimum wage in Illinois for employees 18 and over is \$8.25 an hour. That means that today a full-time employee in Illinois working 40 hours a week at minimum wage earns only \$16,500 a year. It's clear that we need to do more to help reduce economic inequality. More than 100 thousand people in Illinois work full-time at minimum wage jobs, and still live below the poverty line. The vast majority of minimum wage workers are adults, and most of them work full-time, often to support a family. There's just no way to support a family on a minimum wage of \$8.25 an hour. So, we need to do more to help with struggling families on a path to a living wage. The minimum wage has not kept pace with inflation, making it even harder for working families to make ends meet. If the federal minimum wage in 1968, when the peak value of the minimum wage was reached, it kept pace with inflation it would now be \$10.69 an hour in 2013 dollars. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Would Speaker Madigan yield for some questions, please."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Sandack: "Speaker, in committee there was a lot of discussion about the propriety of this nonbinding question. Maybe I didn't hear it. What's the purpose of putting this on a

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

referendum for nonbinding purposes? What is it you hope to achieve, Sir?"

Madigan: "As I said on my remarks, as we worked with this issue, and as we talked with Members in the House, it became apparent that there were some significant differences of opinion regarding the issue. I happen to think we ought to raise the minimum wage. I think we ought to raise the minimum wage consistent with the language in this Bill. I do think it merits a full public discussion by all Illinoisans. After we get the results of that discussion, and vote in November of this year, why then we can return to the Legislature with that evidence in hand. We can show people in the Legislature that despite the differences, we ought to move ahead with raising the Illinois minimum wage."

Sandack: "Well, following that logic and rationale, Sir, doesn't it seem to make some semblance of sense given the stark opinion on the propriety of the temporary income tax. There are some Members of this Body that wish to raise it, and there's some that don't. Doesn't it seem to you that that's a compelling issue, maybe more compelling than this question, to put to the voters in nonvoting referenda form?"

Madigan: "Well, Representative, on this side of the aisle, we're working our way through the question of extending the income tax increase. We'd welcome your support, if you wish to join us."

Sandack: "I do not."

Madigan: "If we come to the point where we wish to vote away public advisory question, why we'll offer the second sponsorship position to you."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Sandack: "Well, I think that's gracious and I'm very appreciative of that fine offer, but to the merits or the point of a nonbinding referendum, certainly there are many questions we could put before the people to seek their input, and I think there's at... maybe as many as four questions coming on this current ballot. We have Marsy's Law. We have the Voting Rights position... petition. We have potentially term limits and fair map. These are lot of questions for the people of the State of Illinois. Is it, in your opinion, good form and good policy to continue to... essentially pile on with additional referenda questions?"

Madigan: "Well, Representative, I'm only speaking to the content of the Amendment before us at this time. I don't plan to go beyond that."

Sandack: "And I appreciate that. It just seems to me that what...
but we're talking about is asking the folks of Illinois to
opine when they're already going to the polls. But let me ask
you something to the substance of your nonbinding referendum.
Illinois's already, I believe, the fourth or fifth highest
state in the country with its minimum wage. Isn't that
correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "And I believe, you can correct me if I'm wrong, it's the highest in the Midwest."

Madigan: "That's correct."

Sandack: "Sir, are you concerned that we're... and with all due respect to trying to raise people's standards and quality of living, which I do not think you'll get an argument from anyone in this Body, is this going to help or hurt employers

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

with respect to hiring new people and trying to improve the job climate in our state?"

- Madigan: "We don't feel that this would act as a detriment to what Illinois employers are attempting to do. We understand. And we've heard from employers that this will raise costs, for both public and private employers. But we think that, at the end of the day, this will be the best for Illinois because we will prevent people at the bottom of the economic stratum to lift themselves up and enjoy more of life here in the State of Illinois."
- Sandack: "And to that end, with that goal, which I certainly concur with, is there any statistics, is there any information you can offer to show that raising this minimum wage will actually bring that good policy resolution about?"
- Madigan: "Representative, I would simply quote a recent study conducted by the Center for Economic and Policy Research which concluded, the vast majority of studies on this issue found raising the minimum wage has no discernable effect on employment rates. Raising the minimum wage lifts families out of poverty and reduces the number of persons eligible for government benefits such as TANF, SNAP, and Medicaid."
- Sandack: "Thank you for that citation. I'm looking at a couple other citations that are concerned about the State of Illinois's high unemployment rate. As you're well aware, I think we're at 7.9 percent, which is an improvement but still dramatically higher than some of our neighboring states in the Midwest, and well beyond the national average. I'm looking at something from the National Restaurant Association which has many jobs in and around the minimum wage area, and it

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

said, while national unemployment has dropped to 6.3, unemployment in Illinois continues to be higher than the nation as a whole standing at 7.9 percent. So, if this doesn't have a market improvement on employment, I hear you that it may not hurt it. Are we really moving the ball forward in a larger sense? I worry that we may be actually discouraging small employers from taking risks and hiring new employees. Does that concern you at all?"

Madigan: "Well, again, Representative, we all think that this moves in the wrong direction. We think it moves in the right direction; we think that it helps people in the society that do need some help. Not everybody in the Illinois society has been fortunate enough to do extremely well. There are some that are just getting by, and then there are others that are really up against it. So, our view would be that for those who are really up against it, this would be a good help and it ought to happen."

Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker Madigan. I appreciate the answers to the questions. To the nonbinding referendum Bill, I don't think there's anyone in this chamber, and I think I can speak for my side, that wants to do anything to hurt working class people. We want to raise people's standard of living. We want to offer prosperity opportunities for everyone. I question the method in this instance, whether it does appreciable good or rather, unfortunately, has an unintended consequence of stifling further small business initiative and opportunities for those who wish to engage in business and wish to employ people, including people at the lower end of the pay schedule. Indeed, every person in this place has, at one time, been a

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

minimum wage worker. When you were in high school, when you were in college, out of college, invariably you had a job making the minimum wage. It was not the endgame, but rather, hopefully, where you were going forward after that. While I appreciate the Bill, I respectfully suggest a 'no' vote is warranted. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Turner: Gentlemen, we need a statewide conversation about raising wages. I know that the issue is very important in my community and communities across the state. And I believe this referendum is what it will take to increase the minimum wage in Illinois. Low wage workers are falling behind. Had minimum wage kept pace with inflation, it would be around 10.65 right now. The result is that more and more workers are unable to make ends meet and falling into poverty. Indeed, there are 110 thousand people working full-time year-round in Illinois but still living in poverty. No one should be working and living in poverty. Look at the realities. You cannot support yourself, much less a family, on 8.25 an hour and yet, that's what many workers are forced to do. The vast majority of low wage workers are adults, and many are parents trying to support children. Nearly 400 thousand people experiencing poverty in Illinois live in a family with a full-time worker. This Session I've heard a lot about... a lot of people claim that the minimum wage is not good for our economy, but look around the country and you will see that that just isn't true. A high minimum wage does not stifle economic growth. Bloomberg News reported earlier this year about Washington State, which

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

has the highest minimum wage in the country. When Washington residents voted in 1998 to raise the state's minimum wage, many linked it to a job killer. The prediction hasn't borne out. Job growth continued at an average of .8 percent annual pace, .3 percentage points above the national rate. Payrolls at Washington's restaurants and bars, which are portrayed as particularly vulnerable to high wage costs, expanded by 21 percent. Poverty in Washington State has trailed the U.S. level for the last seven years. Increasing the minimum wage puts money in the hands of people who will spend it, generating economic activity in our communities. The research is settled. Increasing the minimum wage does not cause job loss. On other conflicting reports, different scales, it all depends on who you ask, but again, the vast majority of research shows that raising the minimum wage will have little to no effect on the employment loss. It's been nearly four years since the last minimum wage increase. It's time for a discussion around this issue, and time for minimum wage workers to get a raise. We see this measure as an important step toward returning the minimum wage to its historic levels. I'd like to thank Speaker Madigan on his leadership around this issue and this referendum. And this is overwhelmingly supported across the state of Illinois. And we hope that we can get an 'aye' vote today. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. Any of us could cite... could cite statistics of one sort or another regarding the minimum wage. One of the studies that was put out most recently, when there

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

was a talk about an increase in the federal minimum wage, was done by the Congressional Budget Office, a highly respected organization which the members of Congress listen to and rely on. And what did the Congressional Budget Office say about the minimum wage? Brief summary. Summary: increasing the minimum wage would have two principle effects on low wage workers. Most of them would receive higher pay, which would increase their family income. Some families would see their income rise above the federal poverty threshold. But jobs for low wage workers would probably be eliminated. The income of most workers who become jobless would fall substantially, and the share of low wage workers who were employed would fall slightly. That's the Congressional Budget Office talking about an increase in the minimum wage. And we can argue back and forth about whether or not it's a good idea or not a good idea. The minimum wage, I think, is meant to be a temporary wage not a long time permanent lifetime level of salary. An entry level wage that people can earn to get started. But let's go away from the issue of the minimum wage. Let's look at putting this on the ballot. That's the issue here. Folks, do we really want to become California? The California Legislature can't make a decision... a tough decision without saying, oop, we got to put it on the ballot. We have to have a... we have to have a popular referendum on any number of issues. And then you see hundreds of millions of dollars spent on one side or the other side of the issue, arguing yes or no, trying to convince the voters which way to vote on a referendum. Guess what, these kinds of issues are for us to decide. We don't have the referendum process like they do in

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

California or Colorado here in Illinois. We, the Legislature, are supposed to decide on these tough public policy issues. We shouldn't fob off our responsibility on to an advisory referendum. We should take that decision right here. Why the minimum wage? Why not an income tax increase, or the extension of the income tax? Why not a referendum on workers' compensation reform? Why not a referendum on any number of tough policy issues which we have to deal with day in and day out. We don't need a referendum, an advisory referendum on the ballot. It is not the way to go. It sets up a terrible precedent for what we want to do with tough policy... public policy issues in the State of Illinois. And I'm standing and urging a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Just a couple of very brief points. The first is, in theory, a lot of the arguments against this sound great. The idea that a minimum wage is necessarily a permanent wage that's made by youth. But the reality is that according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, over 50 percent of people who are in the minimum wage are over the age of 25. Some larger percentage of those people are, in fact, trying to raise families, and half of them are women. So, what we are talking about is a chance to uplift literally hundreds of thousands of people potentially out of poverty. Second thing is that the Wall Street Journal did a study on this very issue polling economists, 65 percent of whom said the lack of consumer demand is holding back our economy. Who we're talking about here is an economic growth question, and I would hope that my colleagues on both sides

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

of the aisle would be able to support that. Finally, I find it somewhat interesting that folks are asking for a referendum on taxes, and I look forward to the support of this Body for... the fair tax referendum the next time it comes up, given that taxes are now something that should go before the voters. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we've had a very good and wholesome debate.

I would request an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bost, Cross, Senger. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 3287, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3287, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3287, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was debated thoroughly in committee. It would change... reverse a court ruling in the northern part of Illinois, which change the applicability of

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

the Workers' Comp Act with regards to third party and thirdparty lawsuits. And so, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. I'm happy to debate it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "John, I apologize, we can almost not hear you at all.

Can you just give a brief description again of your Bill?

Again, we couldn't hear it."

Bradley: "This has to do with the applicability of third-party lawsuits in the context of workers' comp, and the definition of 'employer', and the immunity afforded an employer under the Workers' Comp Act, as you know."

Sandack: "I remember the dialogue and discussion. And isn't it accurate to say that this is really trying to overturn an Appellate Court decision and codify a law that... contrary to that Appellate Court decision?"

Bradley: "I think the proper characterization... I don't disagree with what you said. I think that proper characterization is, is that the Appellate Court decision was inconsistent or a contradiction to settled law in the workers' comp field for many years. And this would change that decision and make the law of the State of Illinois consistent throughout and consistent with what's happened in the past."

Sandack: "And I won't argue with that clarification, of course.

The one thing that's missing is the State Supreme Court did not take the case."

Bradley: "That's correct."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Sandack: "And so, while an Appellate Court decision, which you may disagree with or I may disagree with, and perhaps is unsettled, that's a function of the state judiciary system as it exists. The Supreme Court can take a case subsequent to try and clarify if such a case appears."

Bradley: "I'm not sure procedurally. It's been a while since I actively practiced in Appellate work. And so, I'm not sure procedurally whether or not the Supreme Court at this time could take it. But as a coequal branch of government, we certainly have the right to weigh in on it as well."

Sandack: "To the Bill. I think the Sponsor is correct. We do, as a coequal sponsor... or a coequal branch of government can codify differently than what an Appellate Court judge or judges says... say. However, I think that's a mistake and it's bad use of policy. If, the Illinois Supreme Court wanted to overturn this particular case, Mockbee v. Humphrey Manlift Company, it would've done so. It chose not to. I think us inserting ourselves at this juncture is a mistake. It's legislatively improper, given the circumstances. If, indeed, the law of the land is unsettled, our judicial system is very well capable of clarifying when such clarification is needed. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, you've worked a lot on workers' compensation, so I know you know a good deal about it, but I'm curious about the cost of this to businesses in the State

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

of Illinois moving forward should your Bill pass today. Will it go up or down?"

Bradley: "Well, we're talking about third-party liability for nonemployers, right?"

Kay: "Well, but that's... that's a service..."

Bradley: "Which has been the law... which has been the..."

Kay: "...that's a service being paid for, right?"

Bradley: "And so, I don't set the insurance rates with regards to that, and there have been predictions, I know, made. And I don't think that this Bill would necessarily necessitate huge increases in cost or huge increases in insurance rates. I don't think they're justified by the passage or not passage of this Bill either way."

Kay: "Yeah. Well, I might disagree. Any other state have
legislation like this?"

Bradley: "I couldn't answer that."

Kay: "Okay. Does it bother you that the business community views this as... as just one more jab at them to make it more difficult to survive in Illinois?"

Bradley: "Well, going back to your previous comment, I think that most states recognize employer immunity with regards to comp, but do not give immunity for nonemployers who create third-party torts in the context of comp."

Kay: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. This is just one more step down a path that we here... we have been and continue to take in Illinois, to say, go to Indiana, go to Iowa, go to Missouri, go to Kentucky, go to Wisconsin, because all these states, well, they don't mess with this craziness, this nonsense. We've got enough lawyer Bills, friendly to the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

lawyer community and the attorneys in the State of Illinois, to the extent that most people are just darn scared of them and they don't want to be here because they want to try and run a business and not worry about being in court. And now, not knowing the cost or not caring about the cost of what this may accrue to the local businesses, we move forward. We plod forward. We say, Mr. Businessman, either you'll pay for it, or we expect the company that works for us to pay for it, along with all the other bad habits that apply to the business community. This is just another way... this is just another way to get around the Work Comp Act so that we can have another work comp issue. And I say, for Illinois enough is enough. We should be long ways away from this, moving in the opposite direction, and if there is more proof positive needed, look back to what happened in 2011 when workers' compensation... a Bill was passed. I said that, and I say it now, it wasn't worth the paper written on. It hasn't saved a nickel. Well, it saved \$100 thousand out of a \$4.4 billion problem. So, it saves a few pennies. But folks, we're traveling down the wrong path, and now we've sent up a smoke signal saying 'out'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we should ask that the last business out of state... out of the State of Illinois turn off the light. And I was hopeful that some of the editorial boards might've opined on this piece of legislation because it should be all hands on deck. Our workers' compensation laws are woefully outdated. And it makes our state uncompetitive when compared

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

to our neighbors. When we had a witness testify in the Judiciary, a distinguished member of the bar, I asked some questions about the process of what happened in this litigation. What we found out was that this has been the law of the state for decades and that when this was litigated and appealed, the First District Appellate Court, which is all of Cook County, sided with 40 years of case law and of the statute. And then, our Illinois Supreme Court, which could have chosen to take this up for further appeal, chose not to. So, where does that leave us? Now, we have become the court of last resort. And when I asked questions of that witness, I was told the following: that if I didn't vote for this piece of legislation, that I would choose property over people without any concern for widows and orphans. Wow. I worked very hard to get to this place and be a member of the Bar and I find it interesting to be told that all I care about are things, and don't care about anybody that may be injured on the job, considering my father was injured on the job and lost two fingers in an industrial accident. So, of course, I don't have any concern for those individuals, which again, is nonsense. This is about a failure of an appeal. That's all it is. But it should be a bigger discussion of the state of the economy of where we are trying to change how we do things here. What business would locate here when they can simply go about 35 miles away from Elmhurst and Addison, and can move to Indiana where the... it's one-fourth the cost for workers' compensation insurance. The whole purpose of this legislation for decades has to have been to allow small business people, to allow safety advisors and experts to come to their

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

businesses to make sure people don't get hurt in the first place. But if you lose an appeal, too bad. The lawyer lost. The lawyer's been wronged, and woe is he. Don't we want to make sure that people go to safe workplaces every day and that our loved ones come home with all of their fingers and toes, don't hurt their back? That's what this is about. We want a safe workplace in the State of Illinois, and this does the complete opposite."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Walsh: "Representative Bradley, there was some questions brought forth from some of my local unions that have apprenticeships.

Does this affect their availability..."

Bradley: "No."

Walsh: "...their liability and some of their training as far their apprenticeship and joining apprenticeship programs?"

Bradley: "No."

Walsh: "I didn't hear you."

Bradley: "No."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I... if I might... if I might, I'd just like to tell a brief story. Thirty... and it's a true story. Thirty-four years ago... or 31 years ago this last April, a man went... went to work, left his home, kissed his wife good-bye in the morning, went to work and was tragically... tragically killed when a trench caved in on him. The... the ambulance came to the scene

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

and he was unfortunately was deceased. The coroner's office had to go to the wife who was left that morning to her job, and tell her of the tragic accident. That woman was my mother. That woman was my mother. I was in school, it was before cell phones, before you would get ahold of people, and they had to drive up to tell me that my father had been tragically killed in an industrial accident. Now, I don't talk about that that often, but I want to talk about it today because I want to tell you, there is a face and there is a family behind injured workers. I'm not here to say that it's ... you're voting against injured workers if you vote 'no'. I understand. I understand. But to simply say it's just about business, to simply say that a Bill like this doesn't affect people and doesn't affect the families of people who are injured is just wrong. Fortyone other states allow third-party liability. That question was asked before. This is not a Bill that will increase the costs of workers' compensation insurance. This is a Bill that simply says that the person who caused the injury will be responsible for paying the injured worker. Once that happens... once the third party pays, guess what, the employer who did not 'cause the injury gets reimbursed. So, for the life of me, I don't understand why small employers wouldn't be for this because they're actually going to get reimbursed because they didn't commit the negligent act that caused the injury. Now, I just ask that if there's an 'aye' vote because I want to tell you, I want to tell you, you never want to be in that position where you come home and you have to look your mother in the eye because there was an industrial accident and see the pain on her face. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Representative Bradley, couple of quick questions for you. Much has been made today about this... fact that we are attempting to legislate a decision that was not liked at the Appellate Court. Isn't it true that the Appellate Court in its decision, suggested that if there was a fix necessary in this law that the proper place to do it was right here in the Legislature?"

Bradley: "Yeah, I believe there was some... some language to that effect."

Martwick: "And of course, as was mentioned, that is the whole purpose of our separation of powers is that we have these equal responsibilities, and so, therefore, this is a responsibility that it does properly fall squarely on our shoulders."

Bradley: "We certainly have a right to do this."

Martwick: "And to follow... just up with a couple of questions from the line from the last speaker. Who... who pays for workers' compensation? It's the employer, right?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Martwick: "And so, these third-party companies, who offer something as critical as workplace safety, training, and advice, something that workers would rely on so that they're operating in a safe manner, if they are negligent in their duties and someone's harmed, what's their liability currently?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Bradley: "I wouldn't believe that they would have liability currently, but there's a court case out there that says that they did it in one regular case."
- Martwick: "Right. So... so, until we change this law currently, someone who would act negligently and cause the injury to another person has no civil liability whatsoever, and they don't pay anything into workers' compensation, do they?"
- Bradley: "Correct. It would be a potential co... recovery for the workers' compensation carrier."
- Martwick: "Yes. Yes. But I'm speaking under the current law that we're seeking to change. You've got companies that are able to act without any fear of being liable for bad actions. Can you think of any other industry where a company who acts negligently and causes harm to another person is without any cost or any liability whatsoever, 'cause I can't. Can you think of anything?"

Bradley: "Are you asking me or is that rhetorical?"

Martwick: "Well, I guess it was rhetorical. I'll just speak to the Bill here. Ladies and Gentlemen, as the previous speaker said before me, this is not an antibusiness Bill. This is a Bill that says to the employers, who are already on the hook for paying into unemployment insurance, that they shouldn't have to foot the bill when someone that they entrusted to come in and train their employees so they would have a safe workplace acts in a negligent manner. There is no business anywhere where you can act with complete impunity without any costs and without any fear of being held liable. That's why we have a... a system of civil justice in our society, so that people can seek redress. So that people are held liable.

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

That's what makes them do a good job. I'm a lawyer. I have to carry insurance for the things that I do. Most of you who have businesses must carry some sort of insurance to cover any sort of problems that you might have. But this is one sector of our society that we have decided should be immune. That's nonsense. That's nonsense. This is a good Bill because what it does is it stands up for businesses. It says, you will not be on the hook for the... for the... the wrongdoings of a third party. And it makes the third-party trainers liable for their actions. It makes them more responsible because it makes them aware of the fact that if they are not careful, if they are not cautious and they're not diligent in doing a good job, they, like everyone else in our society, will be held liable for their actions. This is a good Bill. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Jay, I want to thank you for your story. And I'm sorry for your loss, and that could have been any of us. And I was listening to Mr. Martwick just talk after Mr. Hoffman and it hit me that there's just no reason for anyone who is negligent not to at least be held accountable. If it happened to any of us, and it has, the least that we should expect is that the family or the injured person should be adequately com... compensated for the negligent act. And the arguments that I've heard on the other side seem to be that if a safety provider does not do his or her job that there shouldn't be consequences. And we know better. Everyone, everyone, everyone must be held accountable. So, anyone who's hurt by the negligence of

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

another should at least have an avenue to redress their complaint, so it can at least be heard. And that's all this Bill would allow. I think it's a question of fundamental fairness. And I hope that it will increase safety as well. It may or may not. I hope it would be. I think that's probably the goal of this legislation. But even if it doesn't increase safety to make people adhere to the proper standards, at least it wouldn't shield people from bad acts. And I think that's all we're asking is for accountability and for people to do the right thing. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I just wanted to go back, Representative Bradley, to a conversation you had with Representative Walsh. Am I intend... to understand that unions will not be affected by this Bill at all?"

Bradley: "The apprentice programs, correct."

Ives: "Only apprentice programs. So, the unions are responsible for training and a lot of that training deals with safe acts.

Deals with trenches actually being shored up rather than falling in. I..."

Bradley: "This Bill does not apply to apprenticeship programs. It provides safety training."

Ives: "At all?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Ives: "Okay. All right. All right. To the Bill. So, essentially, you've got... One of the most important things that unions do for us is actually to provide a very skilled and trained

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

workforce and a lot of that skills and training... training comes in... with respect to safety. Safety is one of the most important things on the jobsite. I hear about the accidents all the time and what goes on from my husband who builds large electrical construction projects throughout the United States and in Canada. So, I am ... one of the most important things to him is the safety on the jobsite, and he depends on the unions for a lot of that training. And I think that they should also be subjected, their apprenticeship programs, to the same type of litigation should the training program that they put in place not be in effect. But truthfully, what you're going to do here is you're going to ... the reason you see all the opponents is you're going to add to the cost of every single contract from now on. You're going to have to indemnify any private sector safety consultant that you have and that is going to add to the costs. So, this is basically going to add to everybody's costs and at the same time it doesn't hit everybody who plays into the safety instruction role. Thank you very much. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. You've probably noticed that a lot of public safety agencies such as the... and their representatives, such as Illinois Fire Chiefs have expressed their concern. Obviously, those groups want to protect their people, their employees, but I think the unintended consequence that this could bring about is what we need to take a look at and that... like fire districts in the Illinois Associations of Fire Protection Districts is opposed. This could drive up their cost of training to the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

point that they would not get some of the training they've had in the past which, with reduced training, could, in actual fact, make a less safe workplace. I know it's not the intent, but I'm afraid that what this would do, the unintended consequence, because of driving up costs for public safety agencies actually will reduce training available. And they have been, in the past, used cross-training, used other sources and they won't... be less likely to do that if this becomes law. Therefore, I think the right vote is a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. There's a lot of arguments about how it's going to drive up costs, but let's put this in perspective. There's a negotiation. A business wants to hire a safety service provider. The safety service provider says, hey, Acme Company, I have to charge you more because chances are I'm going to be negligent when I do my job. And because I'm going to be negligent when I do my job you have to pay me more to do my job. And that's the negotiation. These arguments just don't carry water. It's not going to drive up costs. Safety providers, safety consultants are going to do their job. They're going to do them well just like they always did. It's going to be a competitive market, and life is going to go on. I don't ... I'm not someone who is on every one of these Bills, but this one I stand behind... I stand strongly behind because the safety providers that we're talking about don't pay into the system. They're getting a free ride. And so why are we giving them a free ride? If they want to pay into the system, let's talk about that, but they

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

don't. The employer pays into the system. They get workman comp. The third-party doesn't pay into the system, they don't. That's all this Bill is doing. It's not going to drive up costs. The talking points are good, but they're not true. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative Bradley, normally when we go change... making changes to the Work Comp Act, we go through an agreed Bill process. How come this Bill did not go through that process?"

Bradley: "I don't think it's a change. I think it's a reestablishment of what was already there. Plus, this is really... this is really about third-party immunity. And it's really about... I mean the workers' comp carrier is going to be able to get recovery from the third party who actually committed the tort."

Reis: "But Representative, there are so many business groups that are involved with that agreed Bill process. They're opponents to your Bill. And I passed a simple Bill onetime talking about people, migrant workers, not having to pay workman's comp because they're not able to collect, and the Governor vetoed my Bill, and we had to come back and go through the agreed Bill process. It was just a little tweak, codifying Federal Law. So, I guess, I wonder why this didn't go through the agreed Bill process so that maybe we could get some of the opponents on as opponents and something we've done every year since you and I've been in this General Assembly."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Bradley: "I have been involved in issues that went through the agreed Bill process, and I've been involved in issues that didn't. And oftentimes, when the agreed Bill process is invoked, it's invoked because somebody doesn't want something to happen. And when it's not applicable, it's when they want something to happen. And so, I understand your opposition to this Bill. And I understand you referencing the Agreed Bill process, but that is not a constant with regards to issues that come before this Body."

Reis: "I didn't mean every issue, just work comp issues. So, I have one more question and then I'll... I'll speak..."

Bradley: "I don't think the last Comp Bill went through the agreed process... Bill process either."

Reis: "It started out anyway."

Bradley: "It didn't."

Reis: "Okay. One other question. We... we repealed the Scaffolding Act... the Structural Work Act in '95 or '96. There are some indications that this is trying to circumvent that and reinstate the Scaffolding Act. Would you agree with those?"

Bradley: "I'm not aware of that. And if that is a motive, it's not my motive."

Reis: "Okay."

Bradley: "Okay."

Reis: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're ranked 48th in business. We raise minimum wage, we try to go back on our commitments on taxes. This is just another thing that businesses look at and you know, you say there's not going to be an increase in cost. There's increase exposure. Increased exposure means more payouts, more lawyers, higher premiums.

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

There's just no way around it. The trial lawyers want this for a reason. And you know, there's some reference here that the courts have weighed in on this. The courts did weigh on this, and they found that the legislative intent was already clear on the General Assembly's desire to immunize these organizations from liability as a means to increase worker... workplace safety and follow precedent in case law to uphold the trial's court ruling for summary judgments. So, call it what it is. I think this should really be called the Trial Lawyer Compassionate Compensation Act. We're going to drive up costs. They're going to make more money. And we'll be maybe 49th or 50th in a couple years. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Dunkin: "Representative, I'm just... as a nonlawyer, and trying to understand this, and certainly listening very, very intently with several of my colleagues. In particular, with Jay Hoffman, and that unfortunate situation that... that he articulated. So my question is, why would any... any company that is not an employer be entitled to worker compensation protection if they're not the employer?"

Bradley: "They shouldn't."

Dunkin: "How is limiting liability for a nonemployees fair to the injured worker harmed by their conduct?"

Bradley: "It isn't."

Dunkin: "Doesn't... doesn't this give companies absolute immunity if they are not liable under the Workers' Compensation Act and also not liable for third-party liability claims?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Bradley: "Can you repeat the question?"

Dunkin: "Doesn't this give these companies absolute immunity if they are not liable under the Workers' Compensation Act and also not liable for third-party liability claims?"

Bradley: "If we don't pass this, that would be correct."

Dunkin: "This Bill does not establish liability or simply says that the ... these companies can be ... Excuse me. To the Bill. Thank you for answering those questions, my good Sponsor. To the Bill. You know, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill, it doesn't establish liability. It simply says that these companies can be sued for their negligence caused by injury or harm. So, how's it unfair? This is maintaining the civil justice system as it existed... has existed for 40 years. You know, none of us want to be in a situation that was articulated earlier today by one of our colleagues. I think some of us are very familiar with, people that we know and love or have met who have been severely injured or harmed in the workplace by third-party companies that doesn't fall under the Workers' Compensation Law. So, you know, it's not an expansion of the system. It simply protects... further protects those individuals who may run across a very unfortunate situation in the workplace. I would encourage a strong 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "I yield my time to Representative Sandack."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There's been much said and some very dramatic and compelling stories told that are emotional and understandable. Let's be clear what the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

current law is. Current law prevents an employee from suing their employer when they're hurt at work. They use and avail themselves to the Workers' Compensation Statute. They have a remedy. The statute that now the Sponsor wishes to amend, lines of potential recovery. It's would create two unnecessary. The law is clear. There is no compelling reason to change it, and the Appellate Court has said so, and the Supreme Court has not sought to supposedly clarify any supposed inconsistencies in the law. Last, there was a speaker who kind of said, this isn't going to cost any more money. I don't back every Bill. Vote 'yes'. I don't think I've ever seen a Bill on the floor that's had more opponents than this one. Earlier today, we were having a procedural fight. We were having a procedural fight, and the excuse for it not coming to the floor was there's too many opponents. Take a look at the list of opponents on this Bill. Yeah, they're wrong, Representative. They're wrong. They know... you know their business better than they do. You know that it won't raise costs better than they won't. Guess what, folks, don't substitute your sideline judgment for expense in favor of businesses' frontline experience. We are killing business in this state. This is a slow death by a thousand cuts, but this may be cut 999. Stop it."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's just about a century ago that employers and employees made a grand bargain that is our workers' compensation system where employers... employees gave up the right to sue for negligence, and employers got the uncertainty of when someone was injured on

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

the job what that... what they would be paying out for that. That's a grand bargain between employers and employees that's existed all that time. I, for the life of me, can't figure out why someone who's not a party to that grand bargain is entitled to immunity. These are people that are not paying into the workers' compensation system for... for these injured workers. They are performing a service and if they are negligent, I think that they should be held liable. And I think that the ... the Sponsor has brought forth a good Bill, in that regard. We've had other Bills that have come before the Judiciary Committee, where we've had the same argument that we've had on this Bill, where one side is saying this has been a law for 40 years and... and we're... simply keeping the law the way it was. And the other side says, wait a minute. The law's been the other way for 40 years, and we have to change it on the basis of a court case. I don't know what the right answer is on that 40-year history on this Bill. But I will tell you that I think for the policy of the State of Illinois that it's important to hold people accountable if they are, in fact, negligent and someone gets injured through that negligence. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill get the required votes, I ask for a verification, please."

Speaker Lang: "That request will be acknowledged. Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "If this Bill doesn't pass, the employer... the employer can sue the third party, but the employee cannot. The employer can sue the third party, but the employee cannot. The third

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

party does not have immunity from the employer. The third party has immunity from the employee. Let me say that again. The employer can recover their comp costs from the third party, but the employee cannot recover from that third party. The employer can recover property damage from that third party, but the employee cannot recover injury from that third party. The employer can recover from that third party, but the employee cannot recover from that third party, but the employee cannot recover. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no.' The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And Mr. Sullivan has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative vote."

Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative.

Acevedo; Representative Representative Andrade; Representative Arroyo; Representative Beiser; Representative Berrios; Representative Bradley; Representative Daniel Burke; Representative Kelly Burke; Representative Cassidy; Representative Cloonen; Representative Conroy; Representative Costello; Representative Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Representative Monique Davis; Representative William Davis; Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Dunkin; Representative Evans; Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Representative Franks; Representative Representative Golar; Representative Gordon-Booth; Representative Greg Harris; Representative Hoffman;

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Representative Jakobsson; Jefferson; Representative Jones; Representative Kifowit; Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative Representative Christian Mitchell; Representative Moylan; Representative Representative Mussman; Representative Phelps; Representative Riley; Representative Representative Scherer; Representative Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Representative Representative Soto; Representative Thapedi; Representative Verschoore; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski; and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Well, I just commend your staff for rounding up a lot of people because they're all here now. I withdraw my verification."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this Bill, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Riley."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Riley: "It's always good when you have constituents from your area come down to Springfield, especially one that's a very able Legislator. Up in the gallery is the President of Prairie

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

State College IEA local, and she's also the vice chair of the IEA Higher Education Council, Vivian Zimmerman. Vivian. Give her a round of applause, please."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for joining us. Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a lot of very difficult issues that we're dealing with and a budget that we have yet to get resolution. Perhaps the only answer to our situation is through divine intervention. Tomorrow, we may want to ask for that intervention because the Governor is holding his 52nd Annual Prayer Breakfast out at the Crowne Center at 7:30. And the featured speaker this year is going to be Jennifer O'Neill, an acclaimed author and film star who has an innovative animal therapy program, but perhaps, we'll also get guidance there as well. And also in the next day or so, you're going to be visited by two people from Chicago with notebooks that look something like this. One of them is Dr. Herstein Wright, who is a former English professor at the City Colleges of Chicago, and Ron Bellamy, a principal of the Chicago Public Schools, who are trying to encourage the Legislature to pass legislation to restore prayer in our schools on a voluntary basis. I think these various issues are converging and something that we ought to give serious pause to. And I hope you'll join me at the Governor's breakfast tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to page 6 of the Calendar, some Bills left on the Order of House Bills-Third Reading. The first one is House Bill

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- 3832, Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3832, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3832 is calling for... Excuse me one minute, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution... House Bill 3832 is calling for commission on the elimination of property. And I would be more than happy to answer any questions you may have in regards to House Bill 3832."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. There being no debate, those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Acevedo, 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. House Bill 3963, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3963, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

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

This is a measure from the Department of Professional Regulation. What it basically does is changes the way they allow for testing for professional licensing. It does it by rule rather than by statute the way some of these tests have

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

been changing over the years. So, would it allow is that by rule could change the way they do various testing."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Reboletti, Wheeler. Take your time, Sir. 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. House Bill 5732, Representative Chapa LaVia. Out of the record. Chair recognizes Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

D'Amico: "I just wanted to announce that we're going to have softball practice about a half an hour following Session today at Amos and Washington. I know there was a little confusion that they thought it was at Washington Park, but it is at Amos and Washington, right on the corner. The same place we've always practiced."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Page 7 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3014, Representative Osmond. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3014, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Osmond."

Osmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3014 amends the insurance requirements under the Condominium Property Act. This is agreed language between the insurance industry and the Condo Association. I know of no opposition. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm going to miss debating with you, Representative Osmond. Wish you'd stick around."

Osmond: "I have two more Bills after this..."

Franks: "Oh you do?"

Osmond: "...if you want to wait."

Franks: "I'm already up. We'll talk a little bit. Has there been..."

Osmond: "This has nothing to do with hair."

Franks: "Nothing with... I think we should leave Mr. Sandack and Mr. Lang out of all debates. I think that's improper. What the heck. All right. Has there been any fiscal analysis done on this Bill? I'm wondering because you're requiring certain mounts... a certain amount of insurance. Is it going to increase the cost for the homeowner?"

Osmond: "No. Actually, I think in the way that this is worded it's actually going to save because as far as I understand it, if they didn't have the proper insurance coverage this would come back on to the condominium owners to make up the difference. So, this is expanding it and making sure that they're covered for the right reasons."

Franks: "Okay. I was just wondering if there'd been any analysis on there, but it sounds like it makes perfect sense."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Franks: "And I can't wait for your next two Bills."

Osmond: "Thank you."

Franks: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Chair recognizes Leader Currie."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Currie: "Thanks. Please let the record show Representative Gabel is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Leader. 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? Costello. 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. Senate Bill 3023, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3023, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3023 follows up on legislation I passed two years ago, strengthening mechanic liens protection. This is an agreed Bill between the Illinois Bankers Association and contractors and unions. It allows a mechanics lien to be subordinated only if more than 50 percent of the loan has been disbursed to fund improvement to that property. Again, it's an agreed Bill. I know of no opposition. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Leitch, Moylan. 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. Senate Bill 3027, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3027, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Today, county treasurers can declare an administrative sale in error over residential real property if certain conditions are met. It's the county treasurer I'm talking about. This will apply those same standards to a sale and error for a mobile home. I know of no opposition. And I'd appreciate your 'yes' 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? Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting yes, 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3029, Mr. Beiser. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3029, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill amends the Consumer Deposit Account Act by removing two provisions that are outdated. One, it removes the requirement that financial institution must print the date that a checking account was opened on all checks. And it removes the requirement that checks issued for new checking accounts start with the number 101. Ask for your '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? Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Durkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Durkin: "I would like to recognize, to my left, from La Grange,
Illinois, Riley Uremovic, who is our Page for the day. And
we'd just like to extend her a warm Springfield welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Happy you're here. Senate Bill 3038, Mr. Andrade. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3049, Representative Cassidy. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3049, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3049 recognizes the new arrival or really the re-arrival of three apex predator species in the State of Illinois that are currently not considered under our Wildlife Management Code. The Bill will add cougars, black bears, and wolves to our Wildlife Code. All three of these species are currently unprotected. This will help cougars, black bears, and wolves reestablish their population in our state while still giving landowners the ability to protect their land, their livestock, and their property. It was negotiated with the Farm Bureau to ensure that those protections were in place, that nuisance animals and predators bringing danger to... to people and livestock and pets and property could be addressed. And I very much look forward to your questions."

Speaker Lang: "And you're going to get some. Mr. Phelps."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Phelps: "To the Bill. Some say that this is a great Bill. The answer is, I think, just look at the five Sponsors on the board."
- Speaker Lang: "That was enlightening. Mr. Costello."
- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to thank the Chief Sponsor for all her work she did to take away a lot of the opposition to this Bill. Originally, I was against the Bill. She worked with the Farm Bureau. And Kelly, thank you for your work to get the Bill to this point. I encourage an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Spon...
  Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "No. Sponsor yields."
- Arroyo: "Representative, can you take this Bill out of the roll, and... so we can put an Amendment on this to also add the lion? Why don't you have a lion on there?"
- Cassidy: "I'm going take a pass on that opportunity."
- Arroyo: "Well, that... that's up to my... a vote. I mean, I want to vote on this Bill, but I can't vote on it unless you have the lion on there."
- Cassidy: "When we start to have some issues with lions running wild north of I-80, I'd be delighted to discuss a trailer Bill."
- Arroyo: "So, are they... are there coug... are there cougars in my district?"
- Cassidy: "I am... I am aware of one spotted in Roscoe Village, so it's not inconceivable that there's been a lion in your district."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Arroyo: "Do you have a name? Does that cou... does that cougar have a name in Roscoe Village?"

Cassidy: "I was not introduced."

Arroyo: "What made you do this? Is this is for a certain area in the State of Illinois, Kelly, or is this..."

Cassidy: "Actually..."

Arroyo: "Is this west of I-9... I-88?"

Cassidy: "No. Actually, these creatures have been spotted all over the state. The wolves in particular are coming in from just over the Wisconsin border, and the wolves are... it's... it's very important that we address that issue since south of I-80 they are a federally protected species, but north of I-80 they are not. And without this, farmers would not have the ability to protect their livestock from the wolves coming in from... from Wisconsin."

Arroyo: "Representative, have there been any cougars spotted on Rush Street? You know where Rush Street is downtown Chicago? Could you identify what part of downtown Chicago or what part are there cougars spotted?"

Cassidy: "The cougar that was killed by the Chicago's... the Chicago Police Department was in Roscoe Village, but I would not have been surprised if came through the Gold Coast."

Arroyo: "So, you say that they could be..."

Cassidy: "They could be anywhere."

Arroyo: "...cougars on Rush Street, downtown Chicago..."

Cassidy: "Cougars have a tremendous range. The cougars that have been spotted in Illinois are believed..."

Arroyo: "I like that."

Cassidy: "...to have come from South Dakota."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Arroyo: "I like that. Cougars have a tremendous range."

Cassidy: "They do. They're amazing creatures."

Arroyo: "That... those are similar, but it... it's similar to a lion though. The lions are... none of them been spotted in Illinois... down in downtown Illinois."

Cassidy: "When lions get spotted, I will... I will sponsor the trailer Bill, I promise you that."

Arroyo: "So, is... is a cougar an endangered... you're trying to make it an endangered species where you can't hunt it? You want to be able to put it to sleep?"

Cassidy: "The reason for the addition of these three predators is to allow the Department of Natural Resources to manage their populations properly and to provide for remedies for people who experience nuisance encounters with those creatures."

Arroyo: "So, if we spot a lion somewhere in the City of Chicago, then we could put the lion in there, to your Bill."

Cassidy: "You just let me know."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Is that about it, Sir? That's it. All right. Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Cavaletto: "Now, again, how many American black bears are there?"

Cassidy: "Could you repeat your question?"

Cavaletto: "How many American black bears do we have?"

Cassidy: "I... I am unaware of the total population, but what we have learned from DNR is that the black bears have been crossing the river into Illinois from Missouri. And they would like to be able to protect them as they come in."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Cavaletto: "Well, if we let them pay a tax then they'd be protected, if we tax them when they come across the border. We could do that."
- Cassidy: "We could perhaps put up a bear toll booth or something, sure."
- Cavaletto: "But do we... do we really want to... do we really want to kill a black bear?"
- Cassidy: "This actually allows the... the department to provide for their protection. I don't want to kill a bear and I know you don't either, but if a bear is threatening you or your family you would be free to do so."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to inquire Mr. Arroyo. One year he wants to save the lions, but this year he wants them to be killed. That's all I want to know because I'm confused at your support of lions, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "You're out of order, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "But now you've used Mr. Arroyo's name in debate.

Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Reboletti, we don't... we don't want to eat a lion. I never talked about eating a lion. I want to be able to put them on the same list, but... We don't want to talk about eating lions. We don't want to do that. We're talking about cougars. I wanted to be able to add them. And I want to see... you know what, thank you. I am going to vote for the cougar Bill 'cause I think cougars are very

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- important, especially when they come to my district. Thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Mitchell. 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. Senate Bill 3055, Mr. Fortner. Out of... You ready, Sir? Please read the Bill. Before you proceed, Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Schmitz is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that. Mr. Fortner on his Bill. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3055, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."
- Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3055 makes some adjustments to the definition of 'closed loop well' systems and for the definition of 'modification' and brings the statute in line with changes that were approved by JCAR late last year. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Mayfield. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3071, Representative Kelly Burke. Please read the Bill."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3071, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3071 brings local libraries and library districts in line with other forms of government in granting two narrow exemptions to competitive bidding. This is exemptions that counties, municipalities, park districts, the Water Reclamation District, and sanitary districts already enjoy. It's an initiation of the Illinois... initiative of the Illinois Library Association. And I know of no opposition."
- 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? Reboletti. Please take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3074, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3074, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury. Mr. Turner in the Chair."
- Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill... Senate Bill 3074 is a victim rights Bill. It simply says that when there is an order of restitution to be paid to a victim that's interrupted by a term of imprisonment that probation could be extended in order to allow the victim to be made whole. It passed out of committee with no opposition. And I don't know of any formal opposition to the Bill. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

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

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, with respect to the extension of the creative probation or conditional discharge, how long can that period be extended?"

Drury: "I believe it's in the discretion of the court."

Reboletti: "It... would that be and... what factors would the court use then to determine how long the extension should be?"

Drury: "I think the court would have to use its discretion, use the existing Code. My sense would be that the judge would look at what the per... interrupted period was, and use that as the main factor that if it was interrupted for five months, the judge may want to do that. But it would be up to the judge."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Drury to close."

Drury: "I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3074 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lang, Mayfield. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3074, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3076, Representative Feigenholtz. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3076, a Bill for an Act concerning health care. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Feigenholtz: "Thank you. Senate Bill 3076 does two things. It changes the name of the current Department of Public Health uniform Do-Not-Resuscitate Advance Directive Form to the DNR POLST life-sustaining treatment form. It's simply a reflection under the real current form that's being used for a patient to have more choices, aside from DNR. The Bill also increases the number of health professionals who can sign the POLST form right now. This Bill will allow APNs and physician's assistants and medical residents to also sign the form. Also, what's notable, this is voluntary. This is a voluntary form. Nothing in current law or under this Bill requires anyone to execute this form. I'm glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Feigenholtz, who... when do people receive this form and... and who receives this form to sign?"

Feigenholtz: "This is typically a form that a profession... health professional would be offering or is requested by a patient who is making life decisions."

Ives: "So, it's my understanding that anybody over the age of 18 going in for a out... even an outpatient surgery would receive this form. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "That is correct."

Ives: "So even if I'm simply going in for a small operation, I'm going to receive a Do-Not-Resuscitate Advance Directive?"

Feigenholtz: "It's currently what happen... right now. And this is a... this Bill, Representative Ives, just permits health care

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

professionals who are actually in the room with patients spending more time with them. It just expands it to them. It adds them as health professionals."

Ives: "So I understand that. However, prior to this, only a doctor could meet with the patient and go through this form. Is that correct? 'Cause this is actually... the form is basically, rather than saying it's... life... it basically removes lifesustaining treatment. Would you say that that's true? It's a form that allows you to remove life-sustaining treatment."

Feigenholtz: "Correct. Yes."

Ives: "Okay. And I really think that the intent of the form should be that you are also protecting life-sustaining treatment."

Feigenholtz: "I agree with you. And... and the modifications on... on the DNR... and now the DNR POLST have evolved over time with a lot of input from people who work in these... in hospice around the country, around the state. There's a sense of uniformity from one state to the next. And this is an advanced directive that gets more and more sophisticated as it applies to real life situations in real time."

Ives: "Now, I know that you've had discussions with some of the... some of the interest groups on this area, and I think that they've talked to you about how they would prefer that the form was organized at least. And since this is a voluntary form, if you go... and I think... Is this the form that we're actually talking about? This is really the form that would be in place. Correct? This is a correct example of the form. Is that right?"

Feigenholtz: "It is. Yes."

Ives: "Okay. So, on the back side..."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Feigenholtz: "I can't really see what you have, Representative Ives, but it actually looks like the same one I have."

Ives: "Okay. So on the back it does say, on the back side, that this advanced directive is always voluntary for persons with advanced or serious illness. I'm just wondering if we could maybe work on this a little bit more before voting on this very important measure. I think the form should be configured differently. Knowing that it's a voluntary form should be on the front side. And then, also, if you're looking at the first box, the first box basically, you're checking whether or not you want to attempt resuscitation or not. But I mean, we all know that you could have an allergic reaction and simply have no pulse and not breathing from a drug interaction, but you would certainly want to be resuscitated. Under this form, you could not be resuscitated from something as simple as a drug interaction. Is that correct?"

Feigenholtz: "You know what, I do not believe that the scenario that you're describing is the intent of this Bill."

Ives: "That's what's confusing to me 'cause this is a very serious form that an individual would sign and to not understand the full and real intent of every box. And then, I guess my biggest problem here is that both in... in C... in parts B and in part C, there are fill in the blank places where you can put down whoever is going through this form with this patient, writes down additional orders or under part C, additional instructions. And I... I'm just... I have a problem if it's not a doctor who's actually sitting down with the patient, who has complete and full knowledge of what those additional orders or instructions should be. I would only want a doctor

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

to do this. You know, and I have college kids, I have a 20-year-old. I don't want him sitting down with anybody other than a doctor who fully understands what could be written in there. And that's really my concern."

Feigenholtz: "Representative..."

Ives: "It's an open-ended form."

Feigenholtz: "Okay. So... so, there had been discussion, Representative Ives, in committee about the form and the issue of possibly putting voluntary on the front, and I think that I'm more than glad to work with you and some of the other parties that were concerned about that in a... in a subsequent Bill. The other thing that you should know is, the Department of Public Health makes this form. It's not in the Bill. It's not... and that this Bill is a Bill that's been worked on for quite some time. It has the support of the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois Hospital Association, and all Allied Health Professionals who are working with patients in these very sensitive circumstances."

Ives: "That's fine. But... is... I mean, I've also heard that the Med Society thinks that there's... you know, that some of this form should be changed up or that they are not as committed to some of the parts of the form."

Feigenholtz: "Well, you know, I mean, as I said, I am more than happy to work with you and other parties. I have had similar discussions with probably the same people you have about this. And I am more than glad to convene a meeting about this to continue to improve this form to allay some of your concerns. I think that..."

Ives: "Well... Okay."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Feigenholtz: "...the form is designed, Representative Ives, to do exactly that, is to take suggestions, such as the one that you're bringing up right now into consideration as we move forward."

Ives: "Well, would it... would it be possible to pull this Bill and work on the form? Because my concern it's going to go forward like this, and we'll never get a trailer Bill done or any of these... the information put on here so that there's full... full knowledge when you're signing this form, exactly what you're signing to."

Feigenholtz: "You know what, actually, we don't even have to do this legislatively, Representative Ives. We can... the department has the power to do this, to make this change that you're discussing. And so, we won't even have to do it legislatively. We can convene and talk to them and possibly try and redesign it so that voluntary is a little bit more pronounced..."

Ives: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...on the front page per your request."

Ives: "So..."

Feigenholtz: "I'm glad to do that with you."

Ives: That's great. I would appreciate that consideration. I just...

I still have concerns over the Bill because it's... it's openended at this point. And you're going to allow professionals, other than doctors, to sign off on a very, very serious form and to add language or directives that they may not know everything about. That's my biggest concern as well. That's what this Bill does. If we could work on the form, that's good. I still think that the doctor should be signing with

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

the patient on something as serious as a do-not-resuscitate. So, thank you for your comments."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

McAuliffe: "Representative, I just want to refresh your memory. In committee, we talked, or I asked you if this Bill would pass on the House Floor, if you'd be willing to have a hearing with the Illinois Department of Public Health, so they could have a hearing and the opponents can talk about this form. Do you remember that?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I do."

McAuliffe: "Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill. This Bill is giving... it's... what it's intending to do is not just have to have a doctor be able to sign off on it. Many of you have... maybe have experienced loved ones that have wanted something like this done. And this just gives a nurse that is licensed the ability to do that. I'd like to thank the Representative for her agreement that, as far as the form is concerned, that this is something that we can look at if the Bill gets passed. Have an open hearing with all... all the parties interested in, so we can have a public hearing during the summer or sometime in the fall. And I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you. Representative Feigenholtz, does the Department of Public Health have the authority to create their

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

own form. Is that what you said? That they didn't need legislative authority."

Feigenholtz: "The... the form is not in statute, Representative Bellock. It is done by the department, they have the authority. So, if we want to, as Representative... the prior speaker indicated, have an opportunity to sit down with them, with some recommendations, we are able to do that. And I am more than glad to work with my colleagues on that."

Bellock: "But my other question is the… you need legislation to change the authority to sign off on the do-not-resuscitate by a doctor versus other people that are listed in the Bill. Correct?"

Feigenholtz: "Yeah... correct."

Bellock: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "The legislation... the form is not in the legislation, but the language expands the number of health care professionals who can sign the POLST form, APNs and medical residents and physicians assistants. And Representative Bellock, when my mother was dying, most of the time the people that were around her were nurses or other professionals, not doctors. And sometimes this is an issue of timing, when families are coming to the realization that some decisions have to be made. Physicians are not always available when family members arrive to have this conversation with a loved one. These are typically family decisions, and sometimes waiting for a physician isn't always in the... the best course of treatment, which is why I believe that the State Medical Society thought long and hard about the best interest of patients. I'm sure you will agree that these are people we

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

trust with our family members. And again, this is a voluntary form. Which it's just a reflection of what is real with our loved ones at the end of their lives."

Bellock: "All right, thank you. I agree. I have been through this with family members myself, on the do-not-resuscitate issue. I just have a lot of concerns on... some of the clarification in the Bill and working on it afterwards. I would prefer to work on some of the suggestions that Representative Ives brought up before the Bill was passed. I just think it needs more work. So, thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is, as I said earlier, a product of many, many hours of work amongst people who take care of our loved ones. It has been customized for what happens, again, in real time when life-sustaining decisions need to be made. I'd appreciate your support on this measure."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3076 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 Ford, Golar, Ives, Sullivan. Please take the record. On a count of 61 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3076, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cabello, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Cabello: "There has been a lot of discussion about hair today, especially for a new... a Member over on the other side of the aisle. And I've been asked to maybe possibly give him some pointers and I can be more than willing to do that for our friend on the other side of the aisle. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Senate Bill 3096, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang."

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, as amended, this Bill does two things. First, in the area of... of filing reports of judgment with the Secretary of State after a traffic accident that leads to personal injury, today there's a provision in the law that says a judge or a clerk has to file the judgment with the Secretary of State. Sometimes that's not happening. And so, the first thing this Bill would say is that the attorneys can file that piece of paper. It's simply a paperwork requirement. The second part of the Bill deals with technical changes due to new technology in the area of radar and lidar devices. There was no opposition to either portion of the Bill. I ask your support."
  - Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3096 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3096, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- passed. Senate Bill 3109, Representative Pihos. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please move that Bill back to the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill for a second time?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3109, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Pihos, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Pihos."
- Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Floor Amendment 1 just makes a technical change. It changes the words U.S. Food and Drug Administration to Federal Regulation."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3109. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3110, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3110, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Cassidy."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 3110 is an initiative of the Cook County State's Attorneys Office to address some difficulties they've encountered of late. Under current practice, physicians and surgeons in hospitals once presented with a subpoena can... can turn over medical records for victims. There have been some issues of late where... where some hospitals have resisted,

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

litigation has occurred and... and there have been trouble... it always ends up being that the records do get released. This will make that clear while still protecting patient privacy and protecting the hospitals and doctors. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3110 pass?' All in favor will vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3110, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3137, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3137, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All this Bill would do would be requiring that members appointed to the Criminal Justice Information Authority be confirmed by the Senate. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, can you explain this... the groups that you're now asking as confirmation in the Senate? What precipitated adding them to Senate confirmation or is there a reason?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Lang: "Bear with me a moment. I don't think my file indicates the reason, but I'm going to guess you have a reason, Sir."

Sullivan: "I'm sorry. I wasn't paying attention."

Lang: "I said that I don't think I have the reason, but I bet you're going to tell us one."

Sullivan: "Well, as a matter of fact I was going to ask, has this had anything to do with the flawed program called the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative? And what are the connections from that program to these groups that you now want to put before..."

Lang: "Well, that program, I believe, was folded into the Criminal Justice Information Authority."

Sullivan: "So, you think that maybe by having confirmation, we'll have better understanding of what went on and better control of the people that are part of that?"

Lang: "Sounds like a great idea, don't you think? You're a Sponsor of this Bill."

Sullivan: "That's why I'm a cosponsor. I just wanted to get that on the record. I appreciate that."

Lang: "Bless your heart, Sir."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this Bill. Of course, our analysis says the reason for the change and the rationale behind the Bill is because of the performance of the audit and what was gleaned by the Auditor General, with respect to the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative. Yes, it did fold into the Illinois Violence

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Prevention Authority planning, but there's no good reason not to highlight the fact that better process, better transparency, and better accountability is our watchword with respect to state grants. So, I stand in strong support and thank the Gentleman for this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, how are the people for the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority... how do they... how do they get there? Who appoints them? And is there a basis of qualification for them?"

Lang: "Yes. Well, we have a certain number of statutory members, you know. I suppose you don't want me to read those into the record, do you, Sir?"

Reboletti: "You could, yes."

Lang: "Sure. The Attorney General, the State Appellate Defender, the State Appellate Prosecutor, the Cook County Public Defender, the State's Attorney of Cook County, the Director of Corrections, the Director of the State Police, the Sheriff of Cook County, the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, the President of the Cook County Board, the Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department, and the Executive Director of the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board. Then there are appointed members which include a Circuit Court clerk out of Cook County, a sheriff out of Cook County, a state's attorney out of Cook County, a public defender out of Cook County, a Chief of Police and six members of the general public."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Reboletti: "Did you mention that the clerk of the Circuit Court is a member of that group?"

Lang: "Yes, I did. Were you listening, Sir?"

Reboletti: "I am. I just wanted to make sure that was clear..."

Lang: "All right. Just checking."

Reboletti: "...Representative. And who's the chairman of the authority?"

Lang: "Peter Ellis."

Reboletti: "And how is that appointment made?"

Lang: "That appointment is also made by the Governor, Sir."

Reboletti: "And how long is the term of that individual?"

Lang: "I don't think we have that information with us, Sir."

Reboletti: "Well, I'm going to join as a cosponsor, Leader, even though I thought that there was not going to be any additional dollars for the NRI, the Recovery Initiative. I think this makes sense. We have additional protection... the people of the State of Illinois and their tax dollars by allowing our colleagues across the way to opine as to the ability of the people the Governor designates to be their chairman."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang to close."

Lang: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3137 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3137, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Representative Arroyo, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the previous Bill, that Kelly Cassidy had, the doctor's Bill, I did not vote. My switch is bad. Can you send a mechanic here? I think that that cougar Bill messed up my board."

Speaker Turner: "I believe you are referring to Senate Bill 3110."

Arroyo: "3110, yes."

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request, Representative."

Arroyo: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Senate Bill 3139, Representative Davidsmeyer.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3139, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill simply allows in a... in an emergency situation when there's a shortage of propane and the Governor announces there's an emergency, that on state and county roads we would be allowed to increase the... the weight limits for trucks to make sure there's enough propane delivered. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Franks: "I'm reading the Bill right now, quickly. I understand we had some propane shortages earlier in the year and there was real price gouging. Correct?"

Davidsmeyer: "It... it was a shortage issue. Yes, Sir."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Franks: "Well, it ma... it caused the prices to spike."

Davidsmeyer: "It very much so did, yes."

Franks: "Yeah, I was... I was concerned about that. I had actually reached out to the Attorney General and I know other folks had as well."

Davidsmeyer: "As did we. Yes, Sir."

Franks: "Yeah, because I was concerned that the consumers were getting ripped off as a result."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "Now, how long would the safety measures on the weight be lifted? Would it only be during the emergency?"

Davidsmeyer: "It would... it would only be during the declaration of emergency based on the Governor's declaration."

Franks: "Has there been anyone who's weighed in on the safety issues here? Wouldn't it be easier, possibly, to get more trucks or something involved? I am a little worried that if you have a truck that has this much weight on it, with such a combustible payload, that it could be a problem. So, I understand what you're trying to do, but I'm wondering if there might be another solution that isn't quite as... flammable."

Davidsmeyer: "I think... I think the goal is to get as... as much of the product to the... to where it's needed. And I think that this is a good solution to get there."

Franks: "Has anyone from the safety community weighed in on this?

Has IEMA, for instance."

Davidsmeyer: "They... they didn't come to the Senate. They didn't come to the House on this Bill either."

Franks: "Okay. So, there's no known opposition to this."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Franks: "And IDOT was okay with it?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. I'm just... want to make sure that we're not having an unintended consequence and creating a bigger problem here.

I know what you're trying to solve. I just don't want to... you know..."

Davidsmeyer: "Yes, Sir. And I appreciate your concerns."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you. I simply rise in support of the Gentleman's legislation. Throughout this winter, those of... those people who use liquid propane for their... to heat their homes, to run their operations, their farms, saw spikes in those prices anywhere from going from \$1.60 up to almost \$5 a gallon. You saw four and five times the monthly bill. And that was partly caused or very much caused by the... not having the ability to get the propane in at the time they were needed. They don't do stockpiles anymore. And the companies with propane gas have cut back on the amount they have. So, with this legislation, it would allow us to bring in, during those emergency times, the amount of propane needed to keep the operations going to help keep the prices from spiking like they did. And the other states around us have had this in place already. So, I thank the Gentleman for bringing it up."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Spon... To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, one of the things that you may not know is

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

that this is a business I was in prior to coming to the Illinois General Assembly. What... what the Gentleman is simply asking for is the opportunity to increase weight. And the question on safety doesn't exist. And the reason it doesn't exist, when we put weight limits in place, it's not for the safety of the public, it's for the safety of the road. At the times that we're talking about moving this, the roads themselves are frozen to a level usually that they can withstand greater weights anyway. We have a bridge law that's set up that allows the weight to be distributed, and that's how these weights are all calculated. And when you're loading a propane tank, what you do is, is there's certain capacity that you can fill to legally anyway. That doesn't change. So, you can fill... it's based on a percentage of how full the tank is on the about... at the ability for the temperature to change from the time you pick the load up until the time you get it to delivery. Those safety regulations are not moved... not being removed. Simply saying, all we're doing is allowing the extra weight, therefore, extra gallonage to get to ... to the storage tank, so they can be delivered to the people. It'll save them money. It saves time. And I think it is a very wise Bill. And I stand in support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for one question?" Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, yeah, just one. When you talked about the declaration of emergency by the Governor, what ends the declaration of an emergency by the Governor?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Davidsmeyer: "It's my belief that the Governor will take off the emergency, remove the emergency."

Davis, W.: "Say it..."

Davidsmeyer: "It's my understanding that the Governor will remove the emergency."

Davis, W.: "So, he removes the emergency?"

Davidsmeyer: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I just wanted to be clear about that because, again, if it's during a specified period of time and we don't know when that time is over with, then you could... I'm making statements. I'm not asking a question. It could cause for these companies to continue to drive on the roads, and we know there are weight limits for specific reasons, which means the roads are going to get damaged, and then somebody from... is going to be complaining about... I think, hey, he said, there's no money for roads. Even though we all need to do is talk to Reis 'cause he controls the Road Fund and he can fix those roads. But I just wanted to be clear about that. Thank you."

Davidsmeyer: "Yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I think we're all aware that we had an unusually cold winter this year. This helps people in rural communities. Many of them depend on this propane for their heat. I think this is a great Bill. I commend the Sponsor. And I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davidsmeyer to close."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All we're trying to do here is make sure that the supply can meet the demand for the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

people who need it to heat their homes. And I move for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3139 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 the count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3139, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3147, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3147, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, 10 years ago, the General Assembly created the Housing Opportunity Area Tax Incentive Program to encourage landlords in affluent neighborhoods to take people who have Section 8 vouchers. The program sunsets this year. This measure would extend the program for another 10 years. I know of no opposition. And I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3147 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the count of 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3147, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3157, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3157, a Bill for an Act concerning public health. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3157 is an initiative of the Department of Public Health. And it changes the... it deletes obsolete language and clarifies existing terms so that we're... we match up with the Federal U.S. Food and Drug Administration's Pasteurized Milk Ordinance. And I would stand for questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know you were working... I don't think I have his attention."

Speaker Turner: "He's listening."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know you were working on another Bill dealing with pasteurization of milk. This has nothing to do with that, correct?"

Mautino: "That is correct. That... it's different legislation and that dealt with raw milk. That is not this Bill. This matches us... our language and the state's to the federal language for the Pasteurized Milk Act."

Pritchard: "Well, as a former dairy producer, I certainly encourage everyone to drink unadulterated milk."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Tracy: "Leader Mautino, I thought you were an expert in beer, but are you also an expert in milk?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Mautino: "Got milk? No, but actually, I wanted to thank Representative Franks because, until this point, I wasn't aware that big boys actually still did hair. It was either that or he was standing too close to the windmills at the Environmental Caucus meeting for the green folks. But other than that..."

Tracy: "Well, thank you."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Tracy: "And I think if you got a little gel, we could do the same thing with your hair too if you're jealous of Franks' new do."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Yeah. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Costello: "Representative, does the Farm Bureau have a position on this Bill?"

Mautino: "They are... they are neutral. They've looked at the language and saw that we are simply just matching our statute to federal language."

Costello: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3157 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 Morrison. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On the count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3157, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

passed. Representative Franks, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Franks: "Point of personal privilege, Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Franks: "I just wanted to point out, first of all, Speaker, that we are moving so much quicker with you up in the well. I appreciate that. But... but I'm standing here... I'll defend myself later, but we have a very special guest on the House Floor. I'm looking here, and I'm excited. We have one of the greatest Chicago Bears of all time, entire career with the Chicago Bears from '76 through '87, made the most punishing hits on the field that many of us had ever seen, redefined the position of safety. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're lucky to have Gary Fencik with us. He's down in the well."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome. Thank you, Representative. Members who would like a picture can come down to the well, for everyone else, we will continue down the Calendar on page 8 with Senate Bill 3176, Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3176, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 3176 is an initiative of the Illinois Department of Public Health. The Bill makes technical changes and some substantive changes to the Illinois Manufactured Housing and Mobile Home Safety Act. The goal of this Bill is to modernize the authorizing legislation and provide administrative authority to enforce the Act.

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Currently, there are no provisions allowing IDPH to handle violations administratively and this Amendment addresses that deficiency. I'll be more than happy to answer questions."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3176 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 Soto. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 112 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3176, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3225, Representative... Representative Unes. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3225, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Unes."

Unes: "Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3225 is an initiative of the Chiefs of Police and supported by Veterans of Foreign... Foreign Wars. And it very simply allows for the Training and Standards Board to conduct or approve a training program in veterans' awareness. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3225 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3225, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3228, Representative Williams. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, can you please bring Senate

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Bill 3228 back to the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3228, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Williams, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you. The Amendment simply provides some language to accommodate the needs of the Anatomical Gift Association.

  And I'd request we move it on and debate it on Third Reading."
- Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3228. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 3231, Representative Sandack. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3231, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3231 amends the Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act to provide that no judge may award maintenance in the event of marriage dissolution without first determining that it's appropriate. It further provides standard guidelines for the amount of maintenance to be paid in most instances. The current state of the law has 12 factors under 504 the Act. This law, however, has become unmanageable. Judges have told us it's

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

led to inconsistent awards. Therefore, this initiative which is brought for... by the Illinois State Bar Association is sought to clarify the law and make it clean. I'm happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "I may have more than one question on this one. So, as I'm reading, when you talk about maintenance, are you talking about alimony?"

Sandack: "Maintenance is what alimony used to be called. Alimony is an obsolete legal word. It's maintenance."

Davis, W.: "It's maintenance now."

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "So, this is clarifying or further determining how much maintenance someone would be owed in the event that they've decided to dissolve their marriage?"

Sandack: "Exactly. Representative, this is the initiative of the Illinois State Bar Association. They had a special group of practitioners, judges, and lawyers who practice in this realm come together and bring a formula... By the way, this change first says is maintenance applicable, and then, it has a formula for when it would be utilized."

Davis, W.: "So, there's a formula to determine how much maintenance I should pay? Does this take into consideration, at all, elements of the relationship, any of the reasons why the marriage may have been dissolved in the first place, or is this strictly about money?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Sandack: "It's years of marriage puts it in a category of how much maintenance is available. There is also need to the parties. There's... there's discretions still afforded to the judge, but it is ultimately about fair, equitable money distribution in the event the court finds maintenance is applicable."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, does this take away the discretion of the judge?"

Sandack: "No."

- Davis, W.: "And if we're codifying something, then how is discretion still applicable in these situations?"
- Sandack: "Discretion is in the statute. It says these are guidelines upon which a court should go through to determine when maintenance is applicable and how much is awarded. But it still gives the court discretion to look at the individual circumstances and make a fair and proper ruling."
- Davis, W.: "So, a judge could reduce the amount if he or she thought that it was appropriate to do so."
- Sandack: "Yes, Representative. A judge could find maintenance is not even applicable at all."
- Davis, W.: "Well, but this is... when it is applicable. So, when it is applicable, can the judge still have the discretion to make changes to what we're attempting to codify?"

Sandack: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "He still can?"

Sandack: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, is this a mandate?"

Sandack: "Is it a mandate?"

Davis, M.: "Is this a mandate?"

Sandack: "To a certain degree, I would say it is a mandate, yes."

Davis, M.: "So, it's mandating that a certain amount of money will be provided to a dispose... disposed spouse. Is that correct?"

Sandack: "Not exactly. It... this is guidelines for the court in a marital dissolution preceding to utilize... to determine, when it's determined maintenance is applicable, how to go about... depending on years of marriage and other circumstances to make an award of maintenance."

Davis, M.: "Representative, what would some of the other circumstances be?"

Sandack: "If the spouse has an independent source of income."

Davis, M.: "Are children involved?"

Sandack: "Children are... are a separate item and that's called support, child support. This is not implicated with maintenance."

Davis, M.: "So, when we talk about maintenance, we're talking about a male or female who has been in a marriage for a number of years and... does the earnings of one party besides the spouse... I mean, the one you want to take care of, does the earnings come into play? I mean, for example, suppose someone is making huge amounts of money. Does that account for anything?"

Sandack: "It does."

Davis, M.: "You want to explain it?"

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Sandack: "Sure. There is a formula. A percentage of that income is utilized in connection with determining maintenance. So... and certainly, a lifestyle that's been afforded during the marriage is part and parcel of the equation as well."

Davis, M.: "You know that would seem fair until or unless you realized, perhaps, the person had another wife that he, too, must take care of. He could have more than one wife. Is that taken into consideration?"

Sandack: "No one in this state can have more than one wife. They may have an ex-spouse and a current spouse..."

Davis, M.: "He might have more than one ex-spouse."

Sandack: "...but this is Illinois and..."

Davis, M.: "This may be his third trip down the aisle, and then he's getting rid of her too."

Sandack: "Well, that would be..."

Davis, M.: "So, now he's got three."

Sandack: "...caveat emptor."

Davis, M.: "So..."

Sandack: "So, be careful, I would suggest."

Davis, M.: "...all I want to know is, are you taking into consideration the circumstances that could exist for that person who is responsible for this spousal support? It could be that he or she has other major obligations, existing obligations. So, are we adding to that with another 20 percent, 40 percent?"

Sandack: "I don't know where the 20 percent comes from, Representative."

Davis, M.: "It's written on the analysis. It says 0 to 5 years multiply by 20, 5 years times 20 equals 1 year, then they've

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- got 5 to 10 years. In other words, they gave us examples of how these years, based upon how long you were married, work."
- Sandack: "Yes. But that is first if a court determines maintenance is applicable. Spouses may have their own independent source of income, and so maintenance may not be awarded. If the court finds maintenance is required or is necessary, then how many years of marriage, what the financial circumstances of the parties are, are accorded, and the court, again, has discretion to deviate as circumstances deem necessary."
- Davis, M.: "So, in other words, if a person was married previously, how would that work? I mean, if a person had a previous marriage which one of these examples would be used. Maybe he was married to someone for 5 years, and maybe to this one for 10 years..."
- Sandack: "Representative, if someone has a prior court order under which they're required to make maintenance payments that would be applicable under these guidelines. They would be part and parcel to financial circumstances of the petitioner..."
- Davis, M.: "Don't you believe..."
- Sandack: "...and respondent."
- Davis, M.: "...don't you believe in the discretion of the judge though?"
- Sandack: "There is discretion of the court built into this statute."
- Davis, M.: "Where does it say that the judge has discretion?"
- Sandack: "In the body of the law, Representative, gives the court the ability to deviate from these. These are suggestive and

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

they're ordered. The idea is to have some uniformity in the law."

Davis, M.: "Because this is a mandate, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dunkin."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Dunkin: "Representative, my colleague, Representative Monique D.

Davis asked some pretty relevant questions as it relates to
a mandate and a judge's discretion. So, currently a judge
makes the complete determination if it's not an agreed
matrimony or maintenance between the two former or current
spouses?"

Sandack: "I'm sorry, Representative. I couldn't understand your question. Can you speak a little louder?"

Dunkin: "So, currently, if a man... if a couple is getting a divorce, the judge rules 100 percent whether an agreement is going to be 30 percent, 40 percent, 0, or 100 percent, correct?"

Sandack: "The court, right now, the judges that are involved in marital dispute resolutions and laws go through a 12-factor step, so it's already codified. Unfortunately, what we've heard from the Illinois State Bar Association and practitioners is that courts have been having a difficult time going through those independent steps and coming up with awards that are consistent under the law. So, there's already mandates out there that... agreed, still have discretionary components in it. This is from the people on the front lines that practice, judges included, that think clarification in how the formula is calculated is required. This is the end result of those discussions amongst practitioners."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

- Dunkin: "Okay. So, now typically how... what's... these percentages...

  does this land on the male spouse or the female spouse? I

  mean, how does... who does... you know, is this like the highest
  breadwinner? How does that work?"
- Sandack: "Yeah. I mean, Representative, I don't have the statistics to say how many percentage of what, but generally, if both people are bread earners and they have earnings, that's taken into consideration. My gut would tell me this is often more about men paying maintenance to women, but I'm suggesting that's probably changing in great deal... detail as society changes."
- Dunkin: "So, how... how would that happen... how would it apply to gay or lesbian couple?"
- Sandack: "Just like it would apply to anyone else."
- Dunkin: "So, whoever makes the most money..."
- Sandack: "The formula's the formula."
- Dunkin: "So, is this... granted, there's a wide discretion as it relates to judges and various couples mitigating circumstances."
- Sandack: "It gives the court the ability to look at the particular circumstances of the matter before them and deviate from these suggestions. Yes."
- Dunkin: "Okay. So, why do we need this right now at this point?

  Is it just because the Illinois State Bar Association says we should have it?"
- Sandack: "No. Because we're seeing inconsistent decisions and the judges in the system saying the current law is not satisfactory and should be cleaned up. So, we're seeing and hearing from the people in the system, suggest that there's

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

problems and these... this solution is in the form of this  $\operatorname{Bill."}$ 

Dunkin: "So, have judges weighed in on this particular issue?"

Sandack: "Yes."

Dunkin: "So, is there a particular organization that would support something along these lines?"

Sandack: "The Illinois State Bar Association which is comprised of practitioners and judges support this Bill."

Dunkin: "Okay. Where's the Cook County Bar Association on this?

Were they even..."

Sandack: "I don't know if they opined specifically on this or not. I don't have that in my analysis. So, I don't know if they've stayed out or if they don't care enough. But the working group was from the Illinois State Bar Association."

Dunkin: "All right. So, is this happening in other states?"

Sandack: "Is what happening in other states?"

Dunkin: "This sort of formula for maintenance guidelines."

Sandack: "I think that's... I think that there's probably difference... differences state to state. I can only speak to what practitioners under Illinois law suggest are better practices and clarifications, which is what's before you in this Bill."

Dunkin: "So, is this a mandate or a suggestion?"

Sandack: "Well, the law... it's an Act. We're... we're changing the Illinois dissolution... Marriage and Dissolution Act. So, that's a mandate, so to speak, but there are discretions..."

Dunkin: "So, it is a mandate."

Sandack: "Yes."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Dunkin: "I see millions in my analysis here. It says... it says

Senate Bill 3231 is an initiative of the Illinois State Bar

Association that provides new guidelines regarding how

maintenance may be calculated for..."

Sandack: "Right."

Dunkin: "...a dissolution of marriage."

Sandack: "Right. It still gives discretion to the judge. Remember, the judge is on the front line. They see cases that deviate and they have that discretion now and they still will if this Bill's passed."

Dunkin: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Martwick."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Martwick: "Representative Sandack, I took a look at the language of the Bill and... and my reading of it says that the... the judge, upon a finding of award of maintenance, shall consider these... these factors that you suggest, right? But it also says that upon considering those factors the judge then has the discretion, and I think that's the word that everyone's looking here, they have the discretion to deviate from those guidelines after they've considered those factors."

Sandack: "Yes."

Martwick: "So, there is no mandate here."

Sandack: "Well, I mean, if the mandate is to go through the process, Representative."

Martwick: "Yes. But the point is that this does not limit..."

Sandack: "But ultimately their... ultimately the judges have discretion to make determinations as they see fit."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Martwick: "Exactly. So, you've got... we... what we're doing is we're setting up a series of guidelines that set by, as you said, experts in the field, and the judge still has the discretion to follow that or do something else."

Sandack: "Well said. That's exactly right."

Martwick: "This is a very good Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thanks. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Mautino: "Representative, I've had some calls from practicing...
attorneys who practice in this field, and they had some great
concerns about the formula and the structure. Now I know, and
understand from them that, for example, in child support there
are guidelines which would have... which are structured and
there's facts and there are economic studies behind what
created those guidelines. Where did these come from?"

Sandack: "These came from members of the Illinois State Bar Association's Fact Finding Committee practitioners. And I think they span the scope of the state, Frank. I mean, they're city practitioners, collar county practitioners, folks in central and southern Illinois. So, these are folks in the front line that regularly practice matrimonial and divorce law."

Mautino: "Now, they came up with these guidelines, but I mean, what... what backs their decision for it? Because pretty much in child support, those guidelines became 'it', the structure. So, we might have a basis here that where there could be an agreement or an agreement for less than what are structured within your different year ranges and the... and the

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

structures in this guide itself. There could never be an agreement less, so you become... you'd get a floor?"

Sandack: "Here, Frank..."

Mautino: "It just seems discretionary."

Sandack: "...Frank, this didn't come out... well, there is discretion based on the circumstances. But this didn't come out of the thin blue sky. The council decided that basically the study of the report of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers on considerations when determining alimony, spousal support, or maintenance. So, they had professional guidelines, and they utilized those professional guidelines and connected, obviously, with their pro... professional experiences as well. And remember this isn't child support, this is maintenance..."

Mautino: "No, no..."

Sandack: "...distinctly different."

Mautino: "...I understand that pretty much child support, once the guidelines were set they became exactly what it... what it would be. Guidelines became the basis. And in... in fact, here, why would anyone agree to less than what, even if the parties could agree, yes, there's discretion, but in all practicality, no one would ever agree to less."

Sandack: "Well, I don't know that. And you don't know that. And I think that there are instances where that occurs depending on property distribution, property rights outside the equation, with respect to go forward maintenance. So, oftentimes, these agreements are usually in the overall... I mean, if there are agreements. Remember, this is the court saying, okay, there's no agreement. I'm going to go through these standards and make a determination, always having

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

discretion. But in a larger property right settlement, other considerations are part and parcel of the distribution and conclusion of the marriage."

Mautino: "I appreciate your... you answering the questions. I do have those concerns only because those in my area who practice in this area of law have those concerns, so they've relayed them to me. So, I appreciate that. I'll be voting 'no', just because I... I have concerns about this becoming that... the standard and concerns have been raised from those that I represent. So, thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "To the Bill. I appreciate... I know we're... I know it's going late. I listened to the debate, and I wasn't sure when we started where we were going to go. You convinced me, Mr. Sandack, to vote for this because there are... I don't believe it's a mandate because it's guidelines allowing the judges in their own discretion how to go forward. I also ... another reason I'm voting for this and I'd encourage others to, is this was vetted by the Illinois State Bar Association. The ISBA is a large... it's the largest volunteer Bar Association in the country. There are over 30 thousand members. They have an assembly. They have separate committees. This was thoroughly vetted through their committees and then through their assembly. This group does not make recommendations lightly. And they've asked for this to be changed. And this ... these recommendations are made by folks who are on the front lines along with the judges. I think that we ought to respect the people who deal with this every day, and listen to their suggestions. Please vote 'aye'."

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack to close."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the active engagement and good questions. To the last speaker and the previous speaker's point, this is a law or a change in the law brought forward by the practitioners and judges who know the law best. The judges and lawyers that are involved in day-to-day activities associated with marital dissolution and property rights. This is their language. They think it clarifies and makes far more manageable the state of the law here. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3231 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 Cross. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3231, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions. No Agreed Resolutions. Allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House will adjourn Session to... Leader Currie moves that the House adjourn Session 'til Wednesday, May 21 at the hour of 12:30 p.m. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6240, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6241, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6242, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

appropriations. House Bill 6243, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6244, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6245, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6246, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6247, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6248, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6249, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6250, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6251, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6252, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6253, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6254, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6255, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6256, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6257, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6258, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6259, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6260, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6261, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6262,

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6263, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6264, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6265, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6266, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6267, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6268, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. House Bill 6269, offered by Speaker Madigan, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 6237, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 6238, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 6239, offered by Representative Andrade, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution 76, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, is referred to the Rules Committee. House Resolution 1118, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell and House Resolution 1119, offered by Representative Tracy is referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Representative Chapa LaVia, Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 587; recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1711, Floor

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3113. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1048, Senate Bill 2952, Senate Bill 3275; recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 5395, House Joint Resolution 96, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2801, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2829, Senate Joint Resolution #42. Representative Deluca, Chairperson from the Committee on Cities & Villages reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3387. Representative Hernandez, Chairperson from Committee on Consumer Protection reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2727. Representative Monique Davis, Chairperson from the Committee on Insurance reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 647. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 3425. Representative Mayfield, Chairperson from the Committee on Public Safety: Police & Fire reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 3414. Representative Riley, Chairperson from the Committee on Mass Transit reports the following committee action taken on May 20, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 3056. There being no

134th Legislative Day

5/20/2014

further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."