141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Elaine P. Walters-Gordon, who is with Ward Chapel AME Church in Peoria. Pastor Walters-Gordon is the guest of Representative Gordon-Booth. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance. Pastor."
- Pastor Walter-Gordon: "Thank you. Let us pray. Gracious and loving God, creator of us all, we thank You for the gift of this day and the opportunity it presents us to make a positive difference in the lives of those we have been called to serve. We thank You for all who serve in any capacity, each staff person, each assistant, each Page, and particularly, each Member of the Illinois House of Representatives. We pray for colleagues who are still on the highway and those loved ones left at home. We give thanks for relationships across the aisle and pray for relationships in need of repair. Bless each one, Oh God, as they live out their high calling, then remind us, as Your prophet did, that to obey is better than sacrifice. Make us obedient to Your love and all that we do this day, whether it be gathering facts, negotiating a compromise or casting our vote. Help us to obey Your commands to love our enemies, to serve the weak, to seek peace and to walk humbly with You, Amen and Amen."
- Speaker Lang: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative McSweeney."
- McSweeney et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Lang: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Poe is excused on the Republican side of the aisle."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absences of Representatives Chapa LaVia, Gordon-Booth, and Smith."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. There are 114 Members of the House in attendance; we do have a quorum. The Chair recognizes Mr. Beiser."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Beiser: "Members in the House, I'd like to take this opportunity, as many of us do, to recognize someone in our districts who's meant a lot to our district, plus has meant a lot to our... to each of us in our respective hometown and area. Right behind me in the gallery, if I'd ask Dennis Carpenter and his family to stand up. We passed a Resolution on May 6 honoring Dennis and his... his devotion and his work at the Village of South Roxana. Dennis was the chief for 28 years in that community. He worked for South Roxana for 36 years. In addition to being the chief, he was the zoning person, the economic development and the village administrator, so he wore many hats. And it's my distinct pleasure to introduce him along with his wife, Tina; their grandkids, Faith, Austin, and Cole Carpenter; and their friend, Savannah Squires. And I will just say this in

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

closing. When I got elected, one of the things I had to do, of course, was go around and meet my officials in my different communities. And I did that. And I knew right away with Dennis that this was going to be a person I could work with. But more than that, this has evolved into a very strong friendship and I very much want to say publicly to Dennis and to Tina for sharing Dennis with our community, thank you very, very much. Let's give a round of applause for Dennis Carpenter."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. Thanks for being with us today. Chair recognizes Representative Fine for some very important introductions."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Fine: "I would like to welcome to the floor today my parents from Glenview, Illinois, District 17, Phil and Arleen Cowan."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thanks for joining with us. Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of both the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus and the Illinois Legislative Latino Caucus, I would like to thank all the Members of the General Assembly that joined us yesterday for our annual end of the Session celebration. It was a little different. We enhanced it a little bit. But some things that turned out to be absolutely great, including the Brazilian dancers. So, if you didn't come, you missed a treat last night, let me tell you. But we had a very good time. The food was fantastic. And again, I just want to thank all the Members who were able to join us last night. And I appreciate your support and we look forward to doing this again next year."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Davis. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans would like to request an immediate caucus."
- Speaker Lang: "And do you have an estimate on time, Sir?"
- Bost: "Probably an hour. Tomorrow, about noon, we'd like to see you. Would that be all right? About an hour."
- Speaker Lang: "The Republicans will caucus. The Democrats will do whatever Democrats do. And the House will be in recess to the call of the Chair. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2014: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1106, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 636, Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 2187, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2612, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2644, Floor Amendments 6 and 7 to Senate Bill 2758, Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2793, Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 3259; approved for consideration, referred to Second Reading is House Bill 498 and House Bill 3845; recommends be adopted are the Motions to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5342, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5397, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5812."
- Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to begin with Concurrences on page 16 of the Calendar. The first Bill on that Order is House Bill 1152, Mr. Ford. Please proceed, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It changes the date and the time frame that the Chicago Public Schools have to start the task force and complete. I move for Concurrence."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Ford, you want to vote for your own? Thank you, Sir. On this... Clerk... Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1152. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1154, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk. This is Concurrence, Representative. Mr. Clerk, out of the record. We'll just figure this out. House Bill 2494, Leader Currie on Concurrence. Also out of the record. House Bill 4123, Mr. Moylan. Please proceed, Sir."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.

 I wish to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 5. And

 I wish for a positive vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Bellock, Halbrook, Pihos. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 5 to House Bill 4123. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Bill 4442, Representative Monique Davis. Please proceed on your Concurrence Motion."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate added an Amendment, Amendment #2 and it gives a sunset date. We passed it out of the House without a sunset date and they have given a sunset date. And I would just ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello on the Motion."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman... or thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, we spoke against this Bill last time. We believe that the information is already there. We don't believe that this Bill needs to go any further and we would respectfully ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Excuse me. We explained during that process that a lot of new laws were passed, licenses were being given to new drivers, and the gentleman who is doing the study, it's a study, and the gentleman who is doing it, Dr. Weiss, requested additional time. And in order to have a valid study, you do have to have a certain length of time and a certain number of factors involved in the study. So, I would just ask for an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, it indicates here that the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police are... are against the Bill. Do you know why the law enforcement community would be in opposition to your Bill?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- Davis, M.: "I believe they were opposed originally, but in the last meetings that I had in committees, they were not opposed, if I recollect. I don't remember them being opposed. We haven't heard from them."
- Hays: "I... I show that they're listing as opposed. I... I will certainly follow up with them. Thank you very much."
- Davis, M.: "This... Thank you. This Bill passed out of the Senate with 50 'yes' votes, 0 'no' votes, 0 'present' votes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "So, Representative, back in '03, we originally passed this law to conduct a study. And you're here testifying that this is going to be continuing of the study. Under this new Concurrence, it'll be through 2019. Is that the facts?"

Davis, M.: "That is correct."

- Sullivan: "Okay. So, we're going to have a study on potential issues regarding the traffic stops and now this will take it from 2004, where it started, to 2015. Do you think that at the end of this, in 2019, a 15-year study on traffic stops, do you think that there will be enough evidence to make some recommendations to do something or do you think at that point you might have to go further beyond the 2019?"
- Davis, M.: "Well, I think during this process, recommendations have been made. I do believe the standards board has increased its training in certain areas..."

Sullivan: "Absolutely."

141st Legislative Day

- Davis, M.: "...because of this study. And I would just hope that it would not be necessary past the date that the Senators have put in for a sunset."
- Sullivan: "Well, I think 15 years to study traffic stops is... is plenty of time. And I would just like to get a commitment from you to... to try and hopefully, and I'm not going to hold you to a commitment in 2019 of course, but..."
- Davis, M.: "I'll be here. Don't worry."
- Sullivan: "...at some point, we have to end this study. At some point, we have to say we have collected the... the data. I won't be."
- Davis, M.: "I know. You know, I... research in many areas in order to have a valid study. Sometimes it takes a very long time, even..."
- Sullivan: "Sure."
- Davis, M.: "...perhaps, in medicine, where people say, well, this medicine's working. Why can't we use it? It works. Because there has to be validity to the study that once takes... one takes."
- Sullivan: "Absolutely."
- Davis, M.: "And when you change the parameters sometimes, then you have to maybe continue to gather the data, Representative."
- Sullivan: "I'm just saying as is, with what your... the parameters are today, I think 15 years should be plenty of time. And hopefully we can then relieve some of the burden on local law enforcement..."
- Davis, M.: "I'll send a note."
- Sullivan: "...once we collect the data."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Davis, M.: "I'll send a note."

Sullivan: "Great. Thank you."

Davis, M.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Dunkin: "So, Representative, why the need for this... this piece of legislation, again?"

Davis, M.: "Well, what the study does was made determinations if people were being stopped unnecessarily by the police. And if a stop was made, did they take... or was there necessity for further action or was the person merely humiliated, searched, car searched, no ticket issued and that was determined to be called racial profiling. And originally, the study was to determine if and where racial profiling occurred or if other injustices occurred. Sometimes a police superintendent could find out how and exactly his or her police officials were behaving. And in most cases, Representative, they are doing fine, excellent, exemplary work. But in some areas, this was not the case and in some areas, we were asking that further training be done and that has occurred with the standards board."

Dunkin: "So, why's that the... So, let's do a little history here. So, who in the Senate carried this Bill when it was successful? Do you recall?"

Davis, M.: "Barack Obama carried the Bill in the Senate with the help and support of the… no, it was the Attorney General's Office. It was a Republican Gentleman. Barack and I and this Gentleman worked on this Bill and it was passed. It's one of

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

the premiere pieces of legislation that our President is proud to have been a part of. I think this Bill helps to stop some of the abuses that were occurring, but Dr. Weiss feels that once we have taken in all existing new parameters and all of the new conditions that occur, people moving to different areas. In other words, when we started this study, there were no... hardly any African Americans or other minorities in Naperville. Well, that's not true today. So, hopefully you can support the Bill."

Dunkin: "Absolutely. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, the legislation is current with the times that we live in. The fact of the matter is, race still matters in America as well as the State of Illinois. When you look at some of the demographics of who's living in certain communities, who's working in certain jobs, unfortunately, in some cases, in too many cases, who is stopped by the police, who is given a ticket, who is given a warning. This legislation is pretty straightforward, pretty simple in most of our minds. It simply adds an extra box of what color the person was, just like the box that says if the person was male or female. I really don't see the big issue with this piece of legislation and why, you know, there'll be questions with this. I mean, here you have the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, the University of Chicago Law School, the Muslim Bar Association, the Council on American-Islamic Relations, the civil... American Civil Liberties Union of Illinois, the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund. Ladies and Gentlemen, apparently there still is an issue. But there's nothing wrong with highlighting and being asked specifically

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

as possible with who is actually stopped. It didn't cost the law enforcement agencies a red cent. This is something that is a part of our culture today, it's a part of a simple box check on who was stopped. Nothing more, nothing less. I would encourage an 'aye' vote to support the Lady. I think it is responsible legislation. Great job on continuing to get answers to how our society is functioning today. And I thank you. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis to close."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cross, Mautino, Soto. Mr. Cross. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4442. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Representative Senger."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to basically introduce my Page for the day, Kim Dauber, and her mom, Dee Dauber. Something special about Kim, Kim graduated yesterday from Naperville North. She's going to be attending MIT and she also did many years of youth in government. Her sophomore year, I believe, you were a Legislator? Her junior year, she was the Speaker, and now she works for the Governor. So, let's give her a warm welcome."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome aboard. Mr. Harms."

141st Legislative Day

- Harms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 4123, I voted 'no', but my intention was to vote 'yes'. If I could have the record reflect that."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intentions. Mr. Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."
- Moffitt: "I have the pleasure of announcing the arrival of a new Republican and it has nothing to do with either of my bachelor seatmates. This is our former colleague, Rita... Sid and Rita Mathias. I got a nice e-mail from them yesterday. They've recently been in New Jersey with their son, Elliot, and his wife to welcome a new Republican grandson, Avraham Noach Mathias. So, if you get a chance, go on their Facebook. But congratulations to Sid and Rita Mathias. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to page 25 on the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, there appears House Resolution 1157. Mr. Bradley is recognized."
- Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are... this is the updated House revenue estimate, reflective of the budgets that were passed."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. Let's be very clear about what the numbers are that we're talking about here. The COGFA estimate was 34,495,000,000. That's what we all passed, unanimously passed. The updated COGFA number is 34,662,000,000, but there's a problem. There's a missing \$690 million. So, what is that? Forty million comes from the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

extension of the hospital assessment. The real problem is that \$650 million in this Resolution is what they're calling interfund borrowing. Let's make this clear. This is a fancy way of saying sweep. This is a fund sweep. So, the real question is what funds are going to be swept? Is it the American Red Cross fund? Is it the Veterans' Home fund? This is an unbalanced budget. I strongly believe that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation we're voting for in this Session. This sets the number. We agreed as a Revenue Committee that we would actually go by the COGFA numbers. This is not an independent number. This is a number that relies on raiding funds. And if you believe that actually this money will be borrowed, then you also believe that this will be a major tax increase in the future. So, either you are raiding funds, sweeping funds, or raising taxes. I strongly urge a 'no' vote. Again, this is an unbalanced budget, this is a fund sweep, and this is a future tax increase. And this is one of the most important pieces of legislation you're going to vote on. So, I strongly, strongly urge a 'no' vote on this Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me make sure I understand the… the process. The process is that has been set up by the Speaker very smartly is that we determine the… the revenue estimate and then we build our budget on the revenue estimate. I'm wholeheartedly in support of that process. So, wait a minute. Wait a minute. We've already spent the money. In other words, the process is kind of bass ackwards here. We have spent the money, so now

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

we have to come up with the revenue estimate to meet the spending. In other words, we have to make sure that what we do here is constitutionally sound as spelled out in Article VIII Section 2 Paragraph... Section 2 Paragraph (b) of our Constitution that says that our appropriations should not exceed the estimated revenue. Well, if I can, give me just a few moments to make comments before addressing the estimate directly. First of all, thank you to the Majority Party, because we are going to leave this Session of the General Assembly not having passed an extension of the income tax increase. In other words, we're going to keep our promise that we made to the people of the State of Illinois. That's not a bad deal, keeping our promise. Now, I understand that's a disappointment for some in this chamber, but I will tell you that when you go home and if you happen to live in northern Illinois and served by ComEd, if you go home and on Saturday when the electric bills go up by 21 percent, which they are scheduled to do, your constituents are going to say thank you for not extending the income tax increase. When you go home and your constituents go to the grocery store and find that a pound of ground beef is sky high or that lime that they used to purchase that cost 20 cents per lime is now 90 cents per lime, they are going to say to you thank you for not extending the income tax increase and leaving more money in my pocket. Now, some of us or some across the... the rotunda, some of our colleagues across the rotunda would tell you this tell... that... that what we're doing leaves a big gaping hole in the budget. Well, you know what? First of all, I don't buy that. Second of all, we have known for four years that this

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

day was coming. We didn't prepare for it. That was our fault. It's not the fault of the taxpayer. It was our fault. We've seen total general revenues rise by 33 percent in four years. I grant you, as I've said before, a large part of those increases have not gone to programmatic programs but rather to things like Medicaid and pensions and group health and transfers out and old bills and debt service. But we now are where we are and a budget has been put together for FY15. And let's put those numbers in context just for a second. The FY14 budget was built on \$35.446 billion, \$35,446,000,000. Now, fortunately for us, FY revenues were \$1.2 billion higher than that budget, so we had \$1.2 billion that had been used the supplemental... supplemental appropriation yesterday. But let's remember, the budget for the current fiscal year was built on \$35.446 billion. The budget for FY15 is built on \$35.352 billion. That's a difference... If you add... compare FY14 to FY15, that is a difference of only 94 billion... Excuse me... \$94 million. Ninety-four million dollars difference between FY14 and FY15. That is two-tenths of one percent. Two-tenths of one percent. Illinois will not disconnect from the continental landmass and sink into Lake Michigan because of two-tenths of one percent. Illinois will not suffer a financial Armageddon because of two-tenths of one percent. Basic government services will be maintained. I'm not saying that the budget for FY16 won't be difficult, it will. But the ... but every budget for the foreseeable future, because of the situation you're in, is going to be difficult. The best solution for us to get out of our difficulties, guite frankly, is to promote economic policies that create jobs.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Okay. Thank you for ... for letting me say that. Now, let me turn to the estimate directly. And some of you may suffer from my eyes glaze over, from MEGO, from my eyes glaze over as we delve into the numbers, but bear with me a second. This revenue estimate is \$857 million higher than the initial revenue estimate adopted in HJR80, which we passed earlier. And I think there are two issues related to this revenue estimate. First, is it accurate? How was it determined? Second, are there policy issues associated with it? An \$857 million increase. Where did it come from? Well, first of all, came from three areas. First, it came from using COGFA's increased revenue estimate for this year, which increased by \$167 million. That's a positive sign. Second, there was an expectation that the hospital assessment would go away. That's now not going to happen because of 741 that we passed yesterday. So, the hospital assessment will remain in place. That's going to mean an additional \$40 million. So, that's... that's clearly understood. That leaves us with the \$650 million that was referenced earlier. And that's accounted for in an interfund borrowing program. An interfund borrowing program. Is that what we want to do? Do we want to borrow from other funds and have to pay those funds back at a later day? Do we want to do that? Is that good public policy on how we should build our budget? I ask you to think long and hard about that. So, the first question I asked was is... is this revenue estimate accurate? Well, I talked to the folks at COGFA, and if you build the budget... if you build the estimate, excuse me. If you build the estimate on those three factors that we just used, then the numbers indicate that this is an

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

accurate estimate. But then that brings us to the second question about the policy implications of the estimate. This \$650 million in interfund borrowing means that \$650 million has to be paid back in future budgets. It's an additional strain on future budgets. Last year, we added \$1.8 billion, \$1.8 billion to our future general fund's liability by the expansion of Medicaid because when the Federal Government stops covering 100 percent of Medicaid, we're going to be forced to pick up \$1.8 billion. If we keep adding liabilities, whether it's 1.8 billion or 650 million, if we keep adding liabilities to future budgets, we're not going to get out of our hole. So, our side of the aisle has a real concern about policy implications of the revenue estimate. understand the numbers. We understand how they were arrived at. But what about the downstream consequences of building our budget on a revenue estimate that relies on the clever legerdemain instead of hard dollars coming in the front door? So, as you vote on this revenue estimate, I ask you to think long and hard about that second issue of the policy implications that are... that is contained... that are contained in this revenue estimate. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We tried... we tried to pass a budget that reflected revenues based on a potential tax extension. That failed. We tried to pass a budget that was a doomsday budget. That failed. We have landed somewhere inbetween based upon comments that we heard on this floor. We listened and we have landed somewhere in-between based upon comments that we heard on this floor. We are trying to cobble

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

together a budget to get through the next fiscal year. And the next Governor, whoever that may be, has got a real fiscal cliff to deal with. A real fiscal cliff to deal with. But this budget, this budget, gets us through the next year without the devastating cuts that people were against and without the tax extension that people were against. Let's be realistic. Let's govern. Let's pass a responsible budget, the most responsible budget we can pass in this climate, given the fact that everybody's against everything. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution... those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Drury. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. Page 21 of Calendar, House Joint Resolution 100. Mr. Bradley is recognized."

Bradley: "This is the same Resolution. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes';

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

Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving to Senate Bills-Third Reading, page 8 of the Calendar. The first Bill on this Order is Senate Bill 121, Mr. Dunkin. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 121, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr... Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill simply... Senate Bill 121 simply states that the African-American Family Commission is to advise and collaborate with the Governor's Office, the General Assembly and various state agencies to improve and expand, extend policies, services, programs, and educational, social and economic opportunities for African Americans. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. And I want to thank him for his work, his close work with our committee to make sure this got done. It's a very important organization and they've done a wonderful job. But I'd ask everyone for an 'aye' vote. And again, I appreciate Mr. Dunkin's leadership on this issue."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, my analysis says that this is... requires a funding allocation of no less than half a million dollars for the commission annually. Is your Bill subject to appropriation?"

Dunkin: "It is subject to appropriation."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, what is the reason for the change? I...

I see that initially, it was appointments only by the Governor and now that it gives all the leaders an opportunity to make

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

appointments. What was the reason for the change, Representative?"

Dunkin: "Can you state the last portion of your question?"

Reboletti: "What... what was the reason for the change? I... I think the Governor initially made all of the appointments. Now, the Leaders are going to make appointments. Is that... am I correct in the understanding of the Bill?"

Dunkin: "Yeah. To my understanding, the... the Governor still makes the appointment."

Reboletti: "And what happens if, when this Bill is subject to appropriation and there's not an appropriation, what happens then to the commission?"

Dunkin: "Well, that means that we'll have a commission with no funding."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, which Amendment are we working with?

You had three of them."

Dunkin: "Right. We... we tabled the one that required a minimum of \$500 thousand. We also tabled the... the... actually, we tabled both of those Amendments. So, it's subject to appropriation like any other commission, any other agency. So, we took that out of the Bill."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know that there's a supposedly an annual report that's issued. And I have yet to receive one.

I've asked for one. Can you recount a little bit about the value of what the African-American Family Commission does?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Dunkin: "Absolutely, Representative. And it shouldn't be a problem for you to receive that... that report. That's... that's not a problem at all. So basically, the African-American Family Commission, you know, is to advise and collaborate with the Governor, with us in the General Assembly and the various state agencies to improve and expand, you know, extend... excuse me. To improve various policies, services, programs, and educational and social and economic opportunities African-American families across the State of Illinois. The Bill also describes the membership of this commission in terms of its limits and various aspects of the African-American family. And so, the Black Caucus created this years ago, actually, about 19 years ago, to address some of the issues that we know, you know, with chronic unemployment, you know, small population but an excessive amount of individuals who are incarcerated. Dealing with some of those dynamics that are unique to the African-American community in our State of Illinois."

Pritchard: "And I realize there's some very significant disparities and gaps when you're looking at education or incarceration or some of the other issues. My question is... is really, though, to what kind of results are we seeing? As you said, this has been in existence for 19 years. Have we made any progress in any of these areas that we're concerned about?"

Dunkin: "You know, I would like to... to not have an African-American Family Commission. I would like to see the numbers where... where 28 percent of the... of the population and over 25, you know, Illinois complete a high school... excuse me.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Twenty-eight percent of black folk complete high school, very small percentage. We have 36 percent had some college or an associate's degree. Less than 12 percent of us obtain a bachelor's degree. So, these are some of the systemic problems that are part of us. And some of our state agencies, like the private industry or local agencies, county governments, can play a role in facilitating to close that gap of some of the... the vast..."

Pritchard: "Well..."

Dunkin: "...dichotomies of so many of us not finishing high school, so many of us, you know, going from the cradle to the... to the penitentiary. So, I would love to... to work with you and the agencies. And this agency, this commission here, is a part of facilitating resources to connect with some of these various population demographics that are real in our respective state."

Pritchard: "Well, and I agree. And whether we're talking about the African-American or the Latino Family Commission, I think both of these areas are critical. But I want to see some progress. I want to see us doing some things that make a difference. So, certainly I would be willing to work with you, but I think we need to be challenging these commissions to be more productive and to report some real progress. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Bill. And... and just to answer some of the questions of the last speaker, I agree. There has not been progress made in the 19 years that

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

this office have been existence. All you have to do is look at the policies in which we've passed right here in the State of Illinois that has... that caused it not to go forward. When you... when you look at the report that the State Board of Education has put out, it says that we live in two Illinois, one for the have and one for the have-nots. See, that is the reason why we have the Latino Family Commission and the African-American Family Commission and all these other commissions, because we're... every time we try to move two steps forward, we're pushed three steps backwards. Look at the legislation that we passed yesterday about getting rid of something that's unconstitutional, being arrested being a part of your record. That was a step backwards for any child, any adult that was trying to move forward. Look at our schools. We've closed 40 some-odd schools in the City of Chicago. There is no continuity of education. That is the reason why we need this. Look at the hospital and the lack of access to health care. That is the reason why we've not moved forward. So, until such time that we remove these barriers that has been interfering with us moving forward, we will always have these types of commissions, these types of setasides, because we're forever trying to scratch our way out of the hell that we have been placed in. When you look at the policies that was passed back from the '50s that said that if a woman... an African-American woman was on public aid, which she'd have to be because she couldn't find a job, she had to give up her husband. She could not go to work. She could not go to school. She could not have a job. That is what broke up the family. That's the reason why we need this family

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

commission, this black family commission. That's the reason why we have not moved forward, again, because of the policies that has impeded us from moving forward. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin to close."

- Dunkin: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate your indulgence. I'd like to thank the Sponsors, Representative Jack Franks, Representative Ford, Representative Flowers, Representative Monique Davis and you all's indulgence. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Bost, Brady, Moffitt, Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 122, Mr. Turner. Leader Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 122, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 352, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 452, Mr. Turner. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. Third Reading of this Senate Bill." Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 452 requires all investment advisors, consultants or private market funds seeking to contract with a retirement

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

system, pension fund or investment board establish, under the Pension Code, to disclose certain diversity-related information about their staff and contracts. A few change... a few things that we've included in the Bill under the Amendment: on or before February 1, 2015, a retirement system, pension fund or investment board must adopt a policy that sets forth goals for increasing utilization of minority investment managers. And it must also provide... establish by the board a specific search criteria that... that establishes a consultant for the search and that the investment manager must receive an invitation and present his or her firm for final consideration of a contract. I'd be happy to answer any questions around this legislation."

- 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? Please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1004, Representative Monique Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1004, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, out of the record. Senate Bill 1051,
 David Harris. Mr. Harris. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1051, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and just a brief moment, if I may. This is a Bill that makes minor Amendments to the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Probate Act, which codifies some currently existing practices. Specifically, it requires that the report accompanying a petition for adjudication of disability and for the appointment of a guardian shall contain the name, address and business telephone number of all persons who perform the evaluations. This information is already required in court forms but not on the actual report. This would put it on the actual report. And then the other change that it makes specifies that the… the selection of a guardian has to be in the best interest and well-being of the disabled person for whom the guardian is being appointed. And I'd ask concur... I would ask a favorable vote on this Bill."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Evans. Mr. Evans. 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 1778, Representative Moeller. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1778, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller."

Moeller: "Thank you, Speaker. Senate Bill 1778 creates the Resale Dealers Act. It provides for record-keeping requirements for businesses that purchase items from the public. These include commonly known stores as Cash 4 Gold and jewelry stores who buy items, jewelry and precious metals from the govern... from the public. The... the Bill is the product of the Precious Metals Purchaser Task Force. I was the chair of this task

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

force, we met for a number of months to come up with the regulation. The task force was actually created last year through legislation sponsored by Representative Tryon and Representative Bellock. And I would be happy to take any questions regarding this legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sure, but couldn't you just talk to her? She's right next to you."

Franks: "It's a little awkward that way. I figure I prefer to have it on the record, if I may. I appreciate the Sponsor carrying this Bill. I had worked on previous legislation similar to this, as had Representative Tryon. But the purposes of legislative intent, I want to be crystal clear. This would not deal with things that are rented rather than... than owned by... by someone, correct?"

Moeller: "Correct. The language in the statute or the Bill is clear that this is... only deals with property that is owned by the public, not leased or rented."

Franks: "What I was thinking of was, you know, someone might have a cable box or something from a cable company and I don't want this Bill to pertain to the cable industry because they own the property and not the… the person who is renting it."

Moeller: "Correct."

Franks: "So..."

Moeller: "Yes. This would not pertain to those types of items."

Franks: "Okay. Well, I... I appreciate the Sponsor's request. And I would have liked to have talked to her privately, but I thought this was more prudent to have it on the record this

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

way, just to make it entirely sure. We're not going to sing as a duet. But I think it's an important public policy and I'd encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

Moeller: "Thank you."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Moeller: "Yes."

Tryon: "I rise in support of Representative Moeller's Bill. I was approached about four years ago by one of my city council... councilwomen. Councilwoman Moeller came to me and... with a problem that, I think, affects most of our communities throughout Illinois, where we see cash for gold places buying back materials that leave the area and may get melted down, may get resold. And really, when you think about it, it's no different than the same operation at a pawn shop. And this has been ... been worked on for probably about four years. And I would like to just thank the Sponsor. She chaired the task force. She worked tirelessly with some of our state agencies to come up with the content of this... this legislation. And I think that this will make a big impact and provide for accountability for the people that purchase and deal with these issues as well as make it easier for law enforcement to recover any potentially stolen goods. So, I'd like to thank you for all of your hard work, Representative Moeller."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Moeller, you may close if you wish."

Moeller: "I think Representative Tryon summarized it very well.

I do ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- 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? Reboletti. 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 2015, Mr. Costello. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2015, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

- Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Senate Bill 2015 clarifies that all interstate highway speed limits are 70 mile an hour, including the jurisdiction of the Illinois Toll Highway Authority. I would like to remind the Body that the counties of Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, Madison, McHenry, St. Clair, and Will still have the ability to opt out. Also, if IDOT or the Illinois Toll Highway Authority would do a safety study deeming this speed limit to be dangerous, they could lower the speed limit. I thank you and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Dunkin. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2694, Mr. Drury. Please... Out of the record. Senate Bill 2730, Representative Nekritz. Please read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2730, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."
- Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2730 deals with the situation where there's been a foreclosure action but there is a subordinate lien holder that was not named in the complaint as part of the foreclosure process. And this sets up a... a easier process and a... and a cleaner process for taking care of that subordinate... in dealing with that subordinate interest in cleaning titles so that properties can be moved off the foreclosure process and... and sold."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, 113 voting 'yes' and 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2758, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill. Leader Currie, we can't do the Amendment for about 10 or 15 minutes. We'll get back to you on this Bill. Senate Bill 2846, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2991, Mr. Martwick. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2991, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 2992, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3113, Mr. Moffitt. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3113, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is legislation that... for a consolidated school district. It's one that Representative Pat Verschoore did represent until 2012. It would allow the... require the clerk representing Mercer County School District, which is the new consolidated one between Westburn and Aledo that only extend the taxes on the Aledo portion, which had approved the referendum. But what they're going to do is refinance and get a lower interest rate, and so they're saving money by the lower interest rate but they only going to apply to the district that originally had approved it. So, it's... it's a win-win. It saves money and limits it to only those that, by our referendum have adopted it. So, it's one of those rare things we get to do. I'd appreciate your support. Be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I stand... to the Bill. I stand in strong support of this Bill. It's a win-win situation for the school districts that merged here approximately four years ago, I believe. But I... I commend Representative Moffitt for bringing this to the floor. And I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Ives, Kosel, Reboletti, Senger, Unes. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3259, Mr. Hays. Please

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

read the Bill. Mr. Hays, we'll have to get back to your Bill because your Amendment needs a few more minutes before we can call it, Sir. Senate Bill 3275, Mr. Reboletti. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3275, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the Body. This addresses some additional synthetic hallucinogens, which you see on your analysis. I won't read them but would ask that they be listed to the Illinois Controlled Substances Act."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Senger. 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. You're up again, Mr. Reboletti. Senate Bill 3364. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2854, Mr. Rita. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2854, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We got Senate Bill 2854, which extends the time a Cook County taxpayer may file a claim for refund of overpayment of property taxes. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Rita, my analysis says that this obviously provides... is for Cook County only. But it says taxpayers have 20 years to claim a property tax refund. But it limits the refund amounts for taxes paid prior to 2009 to 2.5 million per year. Where did that cap come from and what does it seek to achieve?"

Rita: "It... so that they wouldn't put an... it come from Cook County.

And this only applies to Cook County. It's so that there'd be a cap so that how much money would have to flow out."

Sandack: "But... but what if claims..."

Rita: "In case it was over... over... it came from Cook County, that cap, to... to working closely with them."

Sandack: "I understand that, but what if claims exceed that amount? What would... what would the county do then?"

Rita: "My understanding, it would just carry off into the next year and continue to... to issue them refunds that... that went in."

Sandack: "Okay."

Rita: "That's how my understanding on it."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A matter of personal privilege. On May 6 of 2012, there was a very devastating derailment of a Burlington Northern Santa Fe train near Toluca in Marshall County in my district. I must tell you that Evans and Bennington townships had damage to roads and drainage areas that were really extraordinary and of great concern to that county and those communities. A year ago, the engineering was accomplished and exchanged between the railroad and the Marshall County engineering officials. To this day, we cannot get any response from that railroad. I don't know whether it's incompetence; I don't know whether it's arrogance; I don't know whether that railroad is just blowing off the constituents that we have in Marshall County. But I know that my residents and constituents are very, very upset and concerned because those township roads, clearly the townships do not have the money to make those millions of dollars in repairs. They are getting sick and tired and fed up with that railroad refusing to negotiate and complete the negotiations, complete the offer, and be able to repair those township roads. So, I would just ask the Body to, as we adjourn over the summer, join me in thinking of some new regulation and restrictions that we can put on these railroads to get their attention because I know Marshall County is not the only county to have... to have put up with the arrogance and incompetence and attitude that my county's experiencing in Marshall County. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mayfield."

141st Legislative Day

- Mayfield: "Yes. Just would like to remind everyone that the Black Caucus has sponsored a bus to Peoria to Representative Jehan Gordon's home this evening. We'll be leaving at 5 p.m. on the south end of the Stratton Building. And again, if you have not signed up, please sign up with Representative Esther Golar so we'll have an accurate head count. There will be sandwiches provided on the bus. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. On page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 352, Leader Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 636, Representative Feigenholtz. Representative Feigenholtz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 641, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 641, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. The accrediting agency that dealt with elevator safety has changed its name. It's now a different national organization. All this Bill does is reference in our statute the new national accrediting organization. I'd be grateful for your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Halbrook, Ives. Halbrook. 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 2758, Leader Currie. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Please place this Bill on the Order of

141st Legislative Day

- Second Reading at the request of the Sponsor and please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2758, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 3, 4 and 5 have already been adopted to the Bill. Floor Amendments 6 and 7 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, Members of the House.

 Amendment 6 is technical corrections offered by the

 Treasurer's Office to make sure that the... the language of the

 Bill is in the right place and that there is a... a fund for

 the operations of the new Secure Choice Program."
- 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: "Floor Amendment #7 is offered by Representative Currie and has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "This also is technical. It's further clarification that the whole Bill applies to employers who have 25 or more... more than 25 employees during the course... the full course of any calendar year."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed' 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments, but notes have been requested on this Bill and not filed at this time."
- Speaker Lang: "Please hold this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 2846, Mr. Mautino. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 3259, Mr. Hays. Please read the Bill. Mr. Hays wishes the Bill to be placed on the Order of Second Reading. Please do so, Mr. Clerk, and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3259, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hays, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I... could we adopt the Amendment and discuss the Bill on Third?"
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3259, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3259 addresses a situation as everyone in this chamber remembers. The weekend before Thanksgiving last November devastating tornadoes once again ravaged our communities, the communities of Gifford and Washington and other areas. This Bill seeks to give property tax relief to those business owners who are seeking to rebuild in those communities. You'll recall in the 96th General

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Assembly, Representative Phelps and others from southern Illinois brought to this Assembly property tax relief for residential property owners whose homes had been destroyed. They could keep the property assessment at the level of pretornado. This seeks to do something similar. The ... the rate for a small business would be the rate that they were paying prior to the tornado and then it would ramp up over a period of time so that those businesses would have incentive to rebuild. The hardware store and lumberyard in the small community of Gifford, Illinois, was destroyed. Certainly, the business owner was not contemplating rebuilding; the business had been there for many decades. Rebuilding at today's cost would cause ... cause the property tax to go up almost quadruple. This would allow him to have stability. It would allow the community to continue to have that business on the tax rolls. This is something that's supported by the Champaign County Board Chair, by the Champaign County Tax Assessor, by the local school district, village, et cetera. This is really the difference between these businesses rebuilding and staying in our rural communities and not rebuilding. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote and certainly look forward to questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Phelps: "Representative Hays, don't you believe that without this
Bill a lot of small businesses would not be encouraged to
rebuild?"

Hays: "That's absolutely the case, Representative. And the example that I gave, the… the tax bill, because this was a lumberyard

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that was built back in the '30s. The... the tax assessment, in their case, will go from 8 thousand to nearly 30 thousand dollars in one fell swoop. This gives the business the ability to stay on the tax rolls, pay the taxes they've always been paying, but then with a cap, ramp up over a period of time. It gives stability to the business owner. It does not provide a chilling effect that erodes their business plan and would have them, frankly, not rebuilding. But it also gives the community that continuity of the tax base they've already had."

Phelps: "To the Bill. I want to commend the Sponsor, Representative Hays. I did a similar Bill when Harrisburg had the tornado for residential and didn't have time to do commercial then. So, I want commend my friend. I'm honored to work with him, Representative Hays, for doing this because he's going to make sure that our small businesses are taken care of. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "To the Bill. I just want to compliment the Sponsor of this legislation who has advocated diligently on this issue, who has withstood the perils of the Revenue & Finance Committee. And who has, in the spirit of cooperation and the greater good of the state, agreed to some reasonable limitations on this that will help his affected area but will not break the state's bank. And so, to you and to Senator Frerichs, I just want to say thank you for your gentlemanship in terms of carry of this Bill and I wholeheartedly support it as amended."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Mautino: "Thank you. I also want to commend the Gentleman for bringing this forward. I represent the Village of Utica which a decade ago a level five tornado came through and it took out many of the... the residential areas but also a good portion of the downtown district and commercial district in a very small town. We suffered eight... the loss of lives of eight people. So, there was a human toll as well as a commercial toll. This would have helped us tremendously, although this does not go back retroactively and I wouldn't ask that it did. I think for those communities that go through future disasters, this can be a great help. So with that, I rise in support."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Davis, W.: "Just for clarity purposes, Representative, is this a statewide... does this cover the entire State of Illinois?"

Hays: "Yes, Sir. It does."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So... and most of the individuals that are stood up represent downstate communities that can be diseased by tornadoes even though they will happen up north, maybe a lot less frequently than in downstate, so I wanted to be clear on that. And then the second thing, when we talk about natural disasters, does that include flooding?"

Hays: "The... this Bill would be narrowly defined for tornadoes. And to... if I could expound on your first question, it absolutely is statewide. And one of the things that we did at the request of... of the chair of the Revenue Committee is to make sure that this fit in properly, particularly with Cook

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

County and the City of Chicago. If you... if you look at the language closely, we... we did... we did seek to make sure that this would work properly with the classification of how industrial and business property, commercial property is classified in Chicago. So, we did make that change for that specific reason."

Davis, W.: "Okay. But flooding would be a natural disaster that if..."

Hays: "Right. The... I'm sorry."

Davis, W.: "...that could be a part of this as well?"

Hays: "The... this Bill, as amended, the... the peril that would be covered would be a tornado disaster, not flooding, is the answer to your question."

Davis, W.: "So... so, this... so, if we have flooding, which is a natural disaster in some cases..."

Hays: "Right."

Davis, W.: "...and something more likely to occur in Cook County that could impact homes and businesses, even though this is about business, that is not included in this?"

Hays: "That... that is not included in this Bill."

Davis, W.: "And any particular... because... because the way it reads is natural disasters, at least the analysis. But you are categorizing what a natural disaster is and excluding, potentially, a natural disaster that could occur in Cook County."

Hays: "The... the amended language references a tornado disaster. So, it would be to your point, the... this Bill, as we are discussing it now, would be limited to a tornado disaster."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Davis, W.: "Okay. I mean, you see a problem with that? I mean, I'm... I'm just... I'm just asking a question. Again, I can appreciate what you and other downstate Members go through..."

Hays: "Sure."

Davis, W.: "...but certainly it seems like... and I won't say it was intentional, but a natural disaster that could occur in Cook County, it seems like you just kind of left that out."

Hays: "The... the original version of the Bill actually had natural disaster defined more broadly. I was asked to narrow the scope, so I accommodated that request. But I certainly, certainly understand and respect where you're coming from. Absolutely."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Number one, I would like to commend Representative Hays on this piece of legislation. I think it makes it more comprehensive from what Representative Phelps did in the... the last Session. I would also like to say to Representative Davis's comments, I think that's a terrific point. If you look at some of the floods that... that we all endured and some of the floods in downstate in the '90s, they were terrible. So, maybe that's some follow-up legislation that we could work on together in the next Session. That's a terrific point. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Meier."

Meier: "I, too, rise to thank Representative Hays for all he's done on this Bill. This tornado went through my home county, was visible from my farm and it did massive damage with two

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

deaths and several businesses. We have farms there that will cost almost a million dollars to rebuild that having nothing left on them, nothing useable. Their cattle were moved to four different farms and they're still not all back home yet. So, a Bill like this will help to get these farms back to being working businesses and paying taxes to the State of Illinois. It's a great Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to answer the question previously that was asked by another Member as to why this doesn't apply to floods and just tornadoes, and there is... that's a valid issue because floods are a natural disaster; however, the effect of a tornado can be seen... the effect of a tornado is it can literally demolish an entire town and wipe out whole blocks and neighborhoods just in a matter of moments. You don't... while a flood is certainly devastating, it is usually not as completely devastating that entire neighborhoods are torn apart and... and just disappear. So, that was the logic, I think, behind limiting it to just tornadoes. And I stand in strong support of the Gentleman's Bill and hopefully you will as well."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Representative Hays, I just have a couple of questions. First of all, I want to start out by saying that I think this is a great initiative. Anything that the Legislature can do to help rebuild a community is fantastic and I do support it, but I did have one small question. This Bill would limit the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

modified assessed value... equalized assessed value to a four percent increase per year. Is that correct?"

Hays: "That's right."

Martwick: "For 15 years?"

Hays: "What... what the Bill would do, Representative, is the... the assessed valuation from the year of the tornado. So in this case, the assessed valuation of the business last year would be the base amount."

Martwick: "Yes."

"And then going forward, assuming that new construction would bring the value higher than it was pretornado, then the assessment would start to ramp up with a cap of four percent per year for a period of 15 years. And the purpose of that, if the business is sold, all bets are off, so to speak, because that, you know, that's predictable. They would know what their liability is from a property tax perspective. So, what we're trying to do is give that business predictability. In being... in being, you know, with concern for the school district and the community, et cetera, want to recognize that the value does go up and the business would recognize that their liability will go up, but they would be able to plan for it. It would be over a period of time and obviously, they wouldn't be hit with this enormous increase in one fell swoop with a situation where they probably weren't planning on rebuilding to begin with. The other thing that's important to note, it does limit the rebuilding to 110 percent of the square footage. So, there's a lot of things built-in so one could not game the system, if you will, that it's a legitimate

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

tornado as declared by the Governor or by the President and with all of the other characteristics that I described."

Martwick: "Right. And again, I think it's well thought out. I have some experience in property tax matters. The only... the only suggestion I have is I would... I would just encourage you to think in the future if, God forbid, and we... we should all hope that this should happen that there is a great economic recovery in our state and we have rising property values that... that outweigh this four percent. So, if you have, you know, if they're held to four percent but we have an economic recovery that's causing property values to rise by six, seven, eight percent for their neighbors, maybe you build in some adjustment for that just to make sure that the schools aren't harmed, while still protecting them, limiting them to no greater increase from their base year than other people. Something you could do in a trailer Bill, just a suggestion. But this is a great idea, it's a great initiative and I'm proud to support it."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know that we did this for Harrisburg and some other communities and I know that it's necessary for your community. This is not something that the assessor in your area could do on their own. Is that correct?"

Hays: "That is correct. And in fact, Representative... I appreciate the question. The... the tax assessor in Champaign County actually came to me, as did the county board chair and the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

county board members from that area of Champaign County and requested that we do this. And the tax assessor actually was... was very instrumental and outspoken and appreciative that... that we did this. But yes, we would need to do this by statute here."

- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that. And thank you, Representative. And to the Bill. For your hard work on this, I know you and I have had numerous conversations on it. And to the Gentleman from Cook County, I know that my district has had flooding issues over the years as well. And usually we have township assessors and those assessors are usually able to grant some relief for short periods of time when assessing the property based on the… the level of damage to the property. So, I know some assessors are able to do that on their own with their discretion, but obviously, this is not that circumstance. So, I would urge its support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Zalewski. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Mr. Hays."
- Hays: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I failed to recognize the tireless work of our staff member, Frank Straus, on this Bill. Frank, thank you for your tenacity."
- Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 1681, Mr. Hoffman. Please read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1681, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1681 simply provides a method for combining fire protection districts as well as fire departments. There was significant opposition to the Bill initially. However, the opposition has been removed through an Amendment that was placed in committee. I'd like to... to thank the Members of the committee for work... who worked on this. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Jay, I noticed a lot of groups that are now neutral. I didn't see DuPage Mayors and Managers. I know IML's on that.

Do you know if DuPage Mayors and Managers slipped in? I think originally they were in opposition. Do you know if they went neutral?"

Hoffman: "I believe all the organizations that were against it are now neutral. And county... County Board Chairman Cronin is also in favor of the Bill."

Sandack: "Thank you. Thanks for your work on this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry, Sir."

Reboletti: "It's my understanding that this Bill preempts Home Rule. Is that correct?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "We will have the parliamentarian look into that, Sir."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. The Bill does not preempt Home Rule with the Amendment. But I want to thank Representative Hoffman. I want to thank the Associated Firefighters, especially Pat Devaney. We worked on this Amendment for two weeks. When the Bill came over from the Senate, there was 190 listed opponents to the Bill. And we worked through those and we negotiated and came up with a very good result. So, thank you, Jay. And I encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Hoffman, I just wanted to ask a couple more questions here on... because currently, the city I represent, along with a couple other cities already have a consolidation process in place or they have a... a fire alliance that they're already working on. And in no way would your Bill alter that relationship that they currently have. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Ives: "Okay. And also, it would take... the corporate authorities, if on their own wanted to do some sort of consolidation, they could do that with or without this referendum process. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I have one question of the Sponsor, I know, while you're..."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Reboletti: "Representative Hoffman, I have a question. So, some of my communities have fire protection districts and some are municipal. How would that work if they want to join together or is that only applicable to fire protection districts?"

Hoffman: "It's... no. It's my understanding that under current law, it provides that two or more fire protection districts can consolidate upon voter petition and referendum. This provides a mechanism... or doesn't change that, but this provides a mechanism for fire departments as well. So, fire... fire departments currently can join together, but this provides a petition mechanism for consolidation of fire departments."

Reboletti: "Does that also include the paper fire districts, where they only contract out services, they don't actually have physical infrastructure of any sort? Would they be able to join in then?"

Hoffman: "I think it was... it would be a mechanism for providing services in a joint manner where they would be under one uniform command. So, I believe that that... that would... could also fall under this by voter petition."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Jay, I'm just wondering, and this... does this deal with just fire districts, but does it... if municipalities wanted

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

to do the same, is it... is the language clear that that could be the case?"

Hoffman: "That municipality? Yes."

Bost: "Okay."

Hoffman: "That's..."

Bost: "And in the language, and this is a concern that I have because there's only two like this, and so many times when we draft the language when we're dealing with stuff like this, we forget that... that there are two. There are... does this include township fire departments and does it specifically say that? Because there's only two in the state, one in Carbondale and another one in Jackson County. So, there's... they're only in my district. And... and if not, I mean, you can come back later and put them in, but... but I'm just wanting to see if..."

Hoffman: "I don't have the… I could tell from my analysis what the… under the definitions. A fire protection jurisdiction means a fire protection district, municipal department or county or township fire service."

Bost: "Or township."

Hoffman: "So, it does include..."

Bost: "That... that's... Got it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, in answer to your inquiry, Mr. DeLuca was correct. With the Amendment, there is no preemption of Home Rule. This Bill will require 60 votes. Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "I, once again, would like to thank Mr. DeLuca for all his work and the Members of the committee. Again, I know of

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

no opposition now to the Bill. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris. 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. Members, we are moving to the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading. Those of you that have Bills that are ready to go on that Order may wish to listen. We'll start with page 12 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 727, Representative Cassidy. Out of the record. Senate Bill 852, Mr. McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2187, Mr. Bradley. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2187, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I would like to proceed with Floor... the last Floor Amendment, #5."

Speaker Lang: "Do you wish to withdraw Amendment 2, 3 and 4?"

Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Amendments 2, 3 and 4 are withdrawn at the request of the Sponsor. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #5 is offered by Representative Bradley, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- Bradley: "This Amendment would be reflective of an agreement reached. And I would ask it be adopted and then moved to Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2612, Representative Currie. Leader Currie. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2612, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment 2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, Members of the House. What the Amendment provides is that should the auditing function in the Department of Revenue and any kind of... of private letter ruling letters not require more than 2.5 million, the overage would go into the state General Revenue Fund."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2644, Mr. Burke. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2644, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time a previous day.

 Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

offered by Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4, which includes three additional locations relative to liquor exemptions in the City of Chicago. That would be Serpent and Apple, Pete's Fresh Market, Roosevelt Collection and surrounding development. All of these locations have complied with the requirements of sign-offs on whether they be churches, schools, or whatever entity that would be restricted with respect to their hundred feet rule. And I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2793, Mr. Davis. Representative Will Davis. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3530, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3530, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. This Bill was read a second time a previous day. Amendment #3 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Mautino, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

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

3530 is the agreed unemployment insurance Bill. It has three
Sections and that one is the jobs... job-sharing portion. Two

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

are the Press Association's bundle handler's Amendment, which passed out of the House and now has come back through the agreed Bill process and there are a number of changes. This is a result of meetings between the Department of Employment Security, business, and labor. This Amendment also takes out the objections of the... and concerns of the Community Bankers and the posting requirements that raised some concerns for AT&T. I ask for the Amendment to be added to the Bill. And this is now a product of the agreed Bill process."

- 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. On the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 4329, Mr. Franks. Please proceed, Sir."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which remove the requirement that persons over 75 years of age must also be enrolled in the Benefit Access Program. They thought it would get more people involved. There's... this is an agreed Bill and I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Golar, Halbrook, Jackson, Pritchard. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4329. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

declared passed. House Bill 5397, Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. Basically, what the change that was made in the Senate is just mostly clarification changes. This Bill did successfully pass both Houses. And I'm asking for an 'ave' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "This particular Bill barely passed the House the first time around. I know that it creates another task force. Could you explain it a little bit more detail?"

Mayfield: "Actually, what this Bill does, it does not create... so much create a task force as it deals with the physical fitness assessment for students. And I believe that we changed the start to the beginning of the school year so that we can definitely get better information out of this. This right here actually came as a recommendation out of a task force, that this was something that we needed to do so that we could help our students on the road to better physical health and education. One of the things..."

Pihos: "And I know that we... Oh. Thank you. I know that we've had a lot of Bills on obesity."

Mayfield: "Yes."

Pihos: "And we know obesity starts in the home as well as in the schools. We know that we have a new national lunch program that we should let go forward. Do we have any idea how much this will cost the state?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Mayfield: "Actually, it is my understanding that it won't cost them anything because the physical fitness assessment tools are free."

Pihos: "That's true. They're free and anybody can go online and do it. But the cost for them to move this forward will come out of their contractual service line. So, there will be a cost to the state. We've given them a... an awful lot of task force to manage this year. I don't know if this is necessary right now, since the fitness gram is free online and anybody can do it. So, I would ask the Body to take that into consideration in a tight fiscal year where we put a lot of mandates on the State Board of Education to manage in... in and through task force. Thank you."

Mayfield: "Right. And Representative... however, this is only done twice a year, at the beginning at the year and then at the end of the year. We're not asking that a lot of time or effort be put into this. It is actually done during the course of a scheduled gym class. So, they're already in the class. There's nothing extra that's being done here that is going to request... I'm sorry... that's going to cost any additional funding. So, it's definitely not going to cost us more money. We're not administering it all year long. It's twice a year, the beginning of the year, the end of the year, and then those physical education teachers use that information to better align their instructions for those students. We're just trying to make our students more healthy. And I think this is something very good. As you mentioned, we do have the baked foods. We've taken out all the snacks. We've taken out everything. But it is a two-prong approach. It's diet and

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

exercise. I think we've got the diet part down to a science, to where we have removed everything possible that a child could possibly want to eat from the schools. But we need them to exercise as well and they need to understand the importance of exercising. This really will help our students."

Pihos: "And I... I understand that. But again, it's a collection of biometric data. We can see obesity. It's... it's physically apparent. And I just think the investment of our time instead of always studying data should be actually putting forth the good public policy and practices that will make a difference."

Mayfield: "Right. I appreciate your..."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This Bill is nothing more than an unfunded mandate that can... any good physical fitness education teacher can already do for the children in their district. It's something that we should not be adding on to their requirements. It's something that these physical fitness teachers, as I stated before, have extensive knowledge about exercise and what's beneficial in terms of controlling weight and adding to the fitness level of these students. They... they have to get this type of knowledge in their college preparation classes and they actually do this many schools. They already do physical assessments. There's no need to mandate this. Good schools do this already. And I think it's just a slippery slope into the next thing that we're going to mandate. Maybe it's personal trainers, as I remarked before. It may also be a slippery slope to banning the candy jar in front of Representative Brauer's desk and you know, that would be something that I

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

would be just detrimental to the entire atmosphere here. So, vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, I want to make sure I was clear. In an answer to an earlier question, I thought I heard you say that this Bill does not have a task force in it. Is that accurate or inaccurate?"

Mayfield: "Representative, it refers to the task force that's already in place. It does not create a new task force."

Sandack: "I'm reading the statute. It says on or before October 1, 2014, which is a date yet to come, the State Superintendent of Education shall appoint a 15-member stakeholder and expert task force, including members, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. So, I'm going to suggest that your Bill does have a task force in the body of it."

Mayfield: "The Senate Amendment changes what they're recommending. And they're just going to be making suggestions, but they do not have to take them into consideration. But my understanding from this, and hold on, I just want to verify that I'm telling you correctly. The recommendation changed in the Senate Amendment. So..."

Sandack: "I don't know what that means."

Mayfield: "Right. The original Bill..."

Sandack: "The body of the text..."

Mayfield: "...created a task force. But in the Senate Amendment, it was modified to what it would and would not do."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sandack: "To... to the Bill."

Mayfield: "Right. It just provides more options. That's all."

Sandack: "Okay. To the... to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to echo what other speakers have said with respect to the substance of this Bill. But obviously, with all due respect to the Sponsor, the text of the Bill suggests a task force which springs from a prior task force. Kind of a riddle, you know, ensconced in an enigma wrapped around or shrouded with irony. We do a lot of this. We needn't do this now. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... excuse me. Representative Mayfield to close."

Mayfield: "Thank you. I appreciate the questions and the comments on the other side. However, again, this is something that we've talked about several, several times. It's a two-pronged approach. We're talking diet and exercise. Several Bills fly out of here that cut every type of treat possible out of the school system. We're baking the food, there's fresh salads, there's no ice cream, there's no cookies, there's no donuts, there's no trans fat. We've got the diet piece. We don't have the exercise. This is a free program that is available to the schools. We're asking that they utilize it twice a year, once in the beginning of the year, once in the end of the year. That data is then provided to the students. It's available to the parents so that they can help them to help their students to make better and wiser decisions. It's very easy to say just walk past the candy, but how often do we... how often do the Members of this chamber do that? If you look around, we ourselves need... that's why we have an exercise task force,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

because we understand the importance of the two-prong approach. It's diet and exercise. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Concurrence Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Berrios, Burke, Feigenholtz. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 vote... 65 voting 'yes', 50 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5397. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Mr. Cabello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Cabello: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been at the Governor's Mansion a couple of times in the last month and last night I was there again for an event. We were not allowed to go to the third floor of the Mansion due to the roof falling in. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are standing in a beautiful building that cannot... it's standing the test of time because there are folks that are making sure that we take care of it. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Governor's Mansion is a house of the people. It is supported by the tax dollars that people work so hard to pay for. Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe that there is dollars there waiting to help fix the Governor's Mansion. I think it's time that maybe we all together try to find a way of releasing those dollars because if we don't fix the Governor's Mansion soon, it's just going to get worse and the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

expenses are just going to rise. So, maybe we can all work as a bipartisan effort to... to work for that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Brauer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Brauer: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a serious issue that we're looking at for a wonderful, historic building that was built in 1854. So, if any of you have extra buckets or pans and can spare them to take them up to the third floor because it is beyond belief what is happening up there. The Lincoln and Yates bedrooms have been moved, the furniture in those bedrooms, because they can't even be stored inside, the roof is leaking so bad. There's \$3.7 million in the Capital Development Board that have been sitting there for four years to have those repairs done. Three point seven million's been sitting there for four years. Somebody put a hold on it. We need to get that freed up and take care of our buildings. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Senate Bill 2612, Leader Currie, on the Order of Third Reading. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2612, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. The Bill does two things. First, it enables the Department of Revenue to hold on to a small percentage of money they collect through audits so as to hire new auditors. Auditors bring in about eight dollars for every one dollar they cost and we are well behind other states in our ability to field a full force of auditors. That means

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that we are losing money because we're not going after it appropriately. So, this measure would say that a small percentage of the money that's brought in will be used to hire and train and retain auditors, and to the extent that the money that comes in is above two and a half million dollars, it will go back into the General Revenue Fund. There's another Section of the Bill that represents an agreement between the State Chamber of Commerce, the Retail Merchants, the Department of Revenue, the Federation of Illinois and the RTA about sales tax sourcing so as to make sure that some of the obvious things, for example, if you buy something from a vending machine, the sales tax will be sourced to the place where the vending machine is. Similarly, if you walk into a Walgreens and you buy something over the counter, it's the place where Walgreens is that will define the place where the sales tax is sourced. When it comes to coal and other minerals, it'll be the place the... where the... the minerals come out of the ground that is the place where they are sourced. And to the extent that it's a slightly more complex transaction, it will be sourced to the ... to the place where the sales happens as long as the merchandise is the usual place where it is kept. So, these I would describe as low-hanging fruit. These are not the really tough questions that some will struggle with. As you know, under the Hartney case, sales taxes must be sourced to the place where the bulk of the business happened. So, this will clarify things for retailers, for customers, and for the tax collector. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions. Both

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

pieces of the Bill are really important to the Department of Revenue and to the taxpayers of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis. Mr. Harris, excuse me."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, just so I... to clarify a couple of points. First of all, because of the funding mechanism in this Bill, there is not a drain on the General Revenue Fund. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Exactly right."

Harris, D.: "So, the funds which are deposited into the Tax Compliance and Administration Fund, which are going to be used to fund the auditors, those are dollars which are now coming in and going to that fund already?"

Currie: "That's exactly right."

Harris, D.: "And we're putting a limit on that so that anything above two and a half million dollars will then come to the General Revenue Fund?"

Currie: "Right."

Harris, D.: "Okay. As far as the... as far as the sourcing issue is concerned... well, let me go back to the, if I may, let me go back to the auditors for a second. There is a concern, and I think a justified concern, that auditors are sent out for the... for the sole purpose of simply trying to collect money. I understand that we need to make sure that our laws are enforced and there are folks who do not follow the law and try to get around it, but that auditors are sent out simply with the objective, go get as much money as you possibly can.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Is there any sense or is there any... going to be any requirement issued by the department for there be some sort of a quota on the part of the auditors to bring in a certain amount of money?"

Currie: "Absolutely not."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand that many feel that auditors are nothing more than an irritant, a nuisance when it try... when trying to conduct business and I am certainly sympathetic to that. At the same time, the laws are some ... sometimes complex, oftentimes complex and sometimes filers do not adhere to the either intentionally or unintentionally and it's worthwhile to have an audit. If we don't have auditors, we can't do the audit. Auditors really do bring in revenue. There is, here, a promise on the part of the department that there's not going to be any sort of a quota. They are going to have a lot of retirements of auditors in the department in the not too distant future. We need to build a crew to come in to fill those vacant spots. I think this is a reasonable approach that is being taken. There is not a drain on general revenue. So, I stand in support of the Lady's Bill and hopefully you will likewise vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tracy: "Deputy... Leader Currie, do we have a specific number of auditors that are retiring this year?"

Currie: "I don't... I don't know if the department has specific numerical plans, but it's my understanding that compared to

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

other states, we have on a per capita basis many fewer auditors than is... is typical. So, I... and I think the point that the previous speaker made about the number of retirements that we anticipate are coming in the next few years say that it is really important that we are... are able to... to keep up with the auditing demand."

Tracy: "But at this time we don't..."

Currie: "I'm sorry. They would like to have an additional 75 auditors."

Tracy: "But at this time we don't have a specific number that are in the queue to retire?"

Currie: "No, we don't."

Tracy: "Do we know how many auditors we presently have?"

Currie: "I'm trying to find that number. I know that we don't have as many as most states would have on a per capita basis and I know that the department is looking at retirements now and in the future."

Tracy: "Do you have a figure as..."

Currie: "We... yeah. I'm sorry. We... staff tells me that we have about 400, but we need additional ones. And they were talking about with the... this revenue source, they might be able to go as high as 75 new ones, keeping the force at 450 or above that."

Tracy: "Do you have a dollar figure that is attributed to the number of audit... or to the auditors of... in... as... in terms of money collected for the state?"

Currie: "Well, right now... right now, the Audit Bureau costs us about 66 million a year but brings in more than 500 million.

And as I say, the average... average take is about eight dollars

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

to one dollar, so every one dollar in our cost is likely to generate eight dollars in collected taxes."

Tracy: "Are auditors members of a collective bargaining unit?"

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Tracy: "Are the Illinois Department of Revenue auditors members of a collective bargaining unit?"

Currie: "They are members of a collective bargaining unit. My understanding is that 40 percent of the current auditors are eligible to retire."

Tracy: "Do you have the range of salary for that section or category of employment?"

Currie: "Well, the ones that we have right now, 90 percent of them, in fact, are supervisors. But let me get for you the actual salary range. Supervisors, I would think, might be paid a little more than the others. Seventy-five thousand is the average salary."

Tracy: "Thank you. I think that's all my specific questions. To the Bill. I just... I think at this time, the way I hear from constituents all the time, they feel like we have quite a few auditors in the Department of Revenue who go to small businesses, very often for weeks at a time, and tie up many of these small businesses' hours. And in the end, the findings are often no more than a couple of hundred dollars but the cost to the business of having these auditors go to their business and tie up hours and hours and weeks and weeks of their time. And... and often... and often they feel like it's a hostile or a harassment attack on their... their ability to run their businesses. It doesn't seem like at this particular point in time, it sends a very good message to our business

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

community that we're hiring more auditors to harass them when they're hardly holding on to being able to run their own business at a tough time in the state to run a business in Illinois. So, I cannot support this for the reason that I don't think it's a good time to be adding auditors. And I think that we need to look at other ways to be spending our time right now. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Franks: "Leader, I'm looking at the… the analysis, the sales tax sourcing. I want to be clear. There's no additional sales tax..."

Currie: "No. Not one penny. It's only a question of local sales tax collections and where the sales are sourced."

Franks: "So, if I go online and order a, you know, my... my basketball court and it's not at the local store but it's going to be delivered and I... I get it online and then they deliver it to the, you know, local Walmart in Harvard and I go pick it up in Harvard at the Walmart, the sales tax will be generated in Harvard, not from where the warehouse might be in Mississippi or something."

Currie: "Exactly right."

Franks: "Okay. So, it's a way to... to be more accurate in how the sales taxes are done but there is no tax increase?"

Currie: "There's no tax increase and as I say, this is clarity over the most obvious kinds of transactions."

Franks: "Well, it seems to make a lot of sense, 'cause we've had some problems with sales tax sourcing throughout the state

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

and... and there's been some shenanigans being played. And I think this would be much more realistic, depending on where the product is actually being sold and delivered as opposed to where it might be stored."

Currie: "Exactly right."

Franks: "Okay. That makes perfect sense. So, I'm looking at the proponents and it looks like, and I'm... one of the previous speakers had said this sounded like it was an antibusiness deal, but I'm looking here and it says that the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is a proponent. Is that correct?"

Currie: "And so is... so are the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, so is the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois."

Franks: "So, it is a probusiness because it's more accurate. Isn't that true?"

Currie: "That's exactly right. And there's no objection to the auditing part of the Bill by the business community."

Franks: "And I want to get to the auditor questions as well 'cause this is something that I brought up in caucus. And I had suggested that we hire more auditors because of the return that we get on our investment. And you're saying it's about for every dollar we spend, we get about eight dollars back."

Currie: "That's right."

Franks: "Okay. And we're not trying to punish honest business people, we're just trying to keep honest people honest and if there's anybody who's made a mistake, whether it be intentional or inadvertent..."

Currie: "Right."

Franks: "...the state should get what it's entitled to."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- Currie: "Exactly. And of course, a lot of the mistakes are inadvertent. And I think that's the importance of having a quality, competent, well-trained auditing workforce."
- Franks: "And I understand that sometimes that even the auditors themselves make mistakes, but I think that's a pretty small proportion. There's also ways to get around that. There's ways to... to fix that in case they've made a mistake."
- Currie: "And... and some of the money that we will use will be to train them to make sure that they do know what they're doing."
- Franks: "And I... there has been a lot of retirements and I met with DOR on this very issue last year. And they told us that they were woefully understaffed, as a result and this would put them where they need to be and help protect the taxpayers. And this isn't even revenue-neutral; this is a revenue generator, which would not be a tax increase."
- Currie: "That's exactly right. But it is... your point, it is not a tax increase. It is generating revenue because we have a quality-trained staff that is adequately sized and adequately educated to do the job that we deserve having done."
- Franks: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker and the Members. This here is a probusiness Bill. This is a way to generate additional revenues to the State of Illinois without any tax increase. This is spending a little bit of money to make money by making sure that the system actually works. We will be getting a huge return on our investment. This is an investment in protecting our business climate. It's also a way to fix the sales tax sourcing that's been a problem that we've seen with many shenanigans being played by both private and public partners. And this should fix that as well. So, I'd encourage

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

an 'aye' vote because I think it's the right thing to do, it's the fair thing to do and it's a way to bring much needed revenue to the state by treating people fairly and without raising taxes. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. It's great now that we have an economic plan here in the State of Illinois. We'll simply... it's a jobs Bill. We're going to hire more Revenue agents. And they will continue to scour and harass businesses to extract a couple hundred dollars or thousand dollars at the cost of doing other things. But this is a revenue Bill too, because we're going to make so much money and I would hope that we were hiring more agents because there were more businesses here. But we don't have that. We have less businesses and more auditors. That's the economic plan. What a great investment, one dollar equals eight dollars. So, maybe if we hire 50 million auditors, we can get our way out of this mess. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I was just have a little bit of difficulty understanding why this Body has to approve additional hiring for the Department of Revenue. Is that in statute or could you explain that further?"

Currie: "We don't. The problem for the Department of Revenue is that we don't have adequate funds to permit them to hire the people they need. If 40 percent of their auditors are of eligible to retire, we have not funded the department through

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

the appropriations, through the budgeting process, in a way that means that they can replace those individuals. So, this becomes a way of using the resources that come into the audit fund and using those dollars up to five percent to hire and train additional auditors. If the state were not in such fiscal trouble, we would be doing this the ordinary way we fund State Government hiring. But the problem is that we don't have the resources to do that. This is a way of using the resources that the auditors bring in to hire and train additional people to do that job. And we anticipate that there will be additional money coming in beyond the amount that goes to the auditing function in order, actually, to see an increase in state revenues without a tax increase."

Ives: "So, we're not adding to their budget. We're saying that of the moneys collected, they can then hire, as that money comes in, the additional auditor. Or do... are they going to get some additional money up front and then hire them?"

Currie: "It's my understanding is that they will use the money that is brought in. It will go into the audit fund and then they will be able to use dollars in the fund in order to be able to hire and train new auditors to keep the workforce up to... up to standard. As I said earlier, we have many fewer auditors than most states do on a per capita basis and there is something wrong with that picture. I don't think anybody in this chamber thinks it's a good idea to create incentives for people to cheat on their taxes, but when you don't have enforcement, when you don't have auditors who can make sure that people are not cheating, I think there's a message that

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

may not be a good message to people who might otherwise decide they would like to behave dishonestly."

Ives: "Well... Okay. What else can you use that tax compliance fund for? Is that... are the auditors all paid out of this one single fund? Is that what you're saying? Or are they not using it across their whole budget?"

Currie: "Let me just see if I can get a... a complete answer on that one. Oh, yeah. They... it's enforcement, generally. So, investigators, I mean, that's... someone talked about revenue agents. Well, the auditors, I think, really don't quite qualify as agents. The enforcers are the people who would go into, for example, an establishment to see whether or not the cigarettes there have tax stamps. That kind of enforcement..."

Ives: "But all..."

Currie: "...is one of the other things..."

Ives: "...all... all of those salaries..."

Currie: "...that they do."

Ives: "...have to come out of only this fund or can the Revenue Department figure out a way to stretch their money and pay for the auditors as they need to replenish them?"

Currie: "Well, most of them are paid out of GRF. The point is, GRF appropriations are not adequate to keep up with the need."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Leader, do you have any way of telling how many hours a day the typical auditor works in the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "I should think a full-day's work for a full-day's pay."

141st Legislative Day

- Kay: "Well, my understanding is, just based on some experience and... and then listening to some stories from local businesses is that an auditor will drive from Springfield to, let's say the Metro East. Well, that's two hours. They get there, they set up, and they work an hour and then they go to lunch. And they come back from lunch at 2 and they work another hour and then they drive back to Springfield. Is that possible?"
- Currie: "I... I should imagine if they went to lunch at 1, it may be that they do have a full hour for lunch. I will certainly check with the department."
- Kay: "Well, I... I guess my point, and I think you know where I'm going here, is that I'm curious about the efficiency and how we tick and tie their... their hours to their performance, because I don't think they're working full eight-hour days. I understand some travel, but I also understand that you'd need 75 to 100 auditors if, in fact, that's what we're doing. Do you think that's what we're doing, Representative?"
- Currie: "I hope the department will operate efficiently and I hope they will... they will hold their workers to a high standard as I hope every agency in State Government does."
- Kay: "Well, how do we evaluate their performance?"
- Currie: "Well, maybe we should have a, during the appropriations process, maybe we should ask the department, this department and all the others, to come forward and give us some time sheets."
- Kay: "Yeah. Well, I would... and I would agree with you. That's something that we probably should have done before we introduced this Bill, is to find out whether or not the auditors were ever audited. Because I would suggest to you

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that we don't have to have any more people, we just need them to work a full eight-hour day. And I think that's part of our problem here. To the Bill. I'm... I'm just... I guess I'm a little interested or maybe even concerned about the fact that we are somewhat cautious about auditing how funds are spent for various organizations and activities in the state but we have no problem funding auditors when we think that there is revenue to be collected. And I... I am a little bit resentful of the comment I heard a moment ago that would kind of suggest that there are a lot of criminal activity here within the business community in Illinois because I just don't think that's truth, Representative. Now, are there bad people who try and do bad things? Absolutely. But in general, I'm not sure that's the case. I would say this. Anyone who thinks we need additional people, they're mistaken. Anyone who thinks that these people are going to pay for the time that we are going to end up paying them in compensation is mistaken. To think for one minute that they're doing anything to enhance the business community's effort to make some money that's left in their hand in this state are mistaken. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cloonen."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cloonen: "Thank you. I would just like to reiterate what was said before. For the Sponsor, isn't this correct that this clarifies the sales tax sourcing for those cities who choose to use that?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Currie: "This will clarify the sales tax sourcing in some areas, maybe 90 to 95 percent of the business transactions, retail transactions. Yes."

Cloonen: "And by clarifying the sales tax sourcing, this is good business for Illinois."

Currie: "Absolutely right."

Cloonen: "And this brings business to Illinois where they may not come to Illinois in the first place?"

Currie: "Absolutely."

Cloonen: "So, if we did not have this sales tax sourcing agreement, we would not have the businesses wanting to do the sales tax sourcing in Illinois, so we would not have those funds. Is that correct?"

Currie: "I believe so."

Cloonen: "Okay. So, in other words, for those very communities who do the Internet sales tax sourcing, this is good business for them. And we want to encourage the companies to come to the villages and cities in Illinois so we can have this extra revenue come to the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I sit on the General Service Appropriation Committee and every year the director of Revenue points out to this committee that with more auditors they could bring in greater revenue for the State of Illinois. Each and every year they point out to us that, with their limited funds, they can't hire additional revenue... I mean, auditors. And they show us how much each one of these people bring in to the coffers of our state. Now, I

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

hear people talk about they want the... the Governor's Mansion fixed up for Governor Quinn. Governor Quinn really hasn't complained and I don't think he'll complain with his next term. But I do think it's important to recognize that if you want the Governor's Mansion fixed up, you got to vote for the budget. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. We have to bring in the revenue if we're going to spend the revenue. And if we're going to spend the revenue, we have to vote for the budget. I vote 'aye', Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Majority Leader yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Walsh: "Majority Leader Currie, now, first off I want to thank you for including me in some of these meetings. You know, there's, in my district, there's been this issue of kind of a bright line test, clear line test on... on where this stuff is sourced. And a lot of the business decisions that business has to make is, one, where are we sourcing our local property taxes. Now, I understand that this sourcing language in here covers 80, 90 percent of that. That's the low-hanging fruit, the easy sales. The question that comes up is the remainder of it, to where we have a lot of the difficulty in how that's... how that decision, where that sales tax is sourced. Is that being addressed..."

Currie: "That would be..."

Walsh: "...either in this Bill or down the line?"

Currie: "Yeah. And... and you're right. This... this, you know, I would say this clears the underbrush. These are the kind of obvious places and I think the business community wants very

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

much to have as bright a line as the business community can have. I think we all want clarity. But there certainly are more complex transactions, more difficult cases. The Department of Revenue, I believe, planned to... to disseminate the new rules, sales tax sourcing rules. They hoped to do it yesterday. I don't know if they did or whether they didn't, but those will give a lot more clarity to those more complicated transactions where it isn't as simple as somebody walking into a Walgreens and buying toothpaste over the corner. But this... the business community, I believe, feels that the language in this Bill will give them clarity on the easy ones..."

Walsh: "Right."

Currie: "...clarity on the low-hanging fruit, clear out the underbrush. But it's not going to settle questions that are of more complicated, more complex transactions."

Walsh: "So, on those more complicated transactions, this 13-member task force is being put together to address that and try to come up with a solution whether that's..."

Currie: "Right."

Walsh: "...new language, a whole new retail occupation tax..."

Currie: "Well, in fact, one question is whether we ought to rewrite the sales... the... the retailer occupation tax and the... and the service occupation tax, that... those came in in the 1930s, I think, and some could argue, with some justification, that the whole economy operates differently now than it did then. But to make that determination to go, for example, to a destination model, that would require significant changes

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

in the statute and a lot more conversation among all the stakeholders than we have time to do right now."

Walsh: "And on that point, I'm looking at the analysis and Illinois Municipal League has filed as opposition. Is that one of the reasons why they're opposed? 'Cause on the analysis, they show that. I don't know if that's been addressed or..."

Currie: "I... I... if they... if they're opposed, they didn't tell me."

Walsh: "Well, and..."

Currie: "I would be surprised if they were because they certainly will participate in these discussions, so I..."

Walsh: "And I... I know that. And I think maybe some of that may be that overlying issue with the... with the sourcing issues that are the more complicated factors..."

Currie: "Well, but as I say, those will be addressed in rule..."

Walsh: "...addressed."

Currie: "...and ultimately, I'm hopeful that we will be able to find an overarching solution that means we don't have to rely on... on rules that cannot... cannot give the business community and the municipal communities the clarity that everybody would like to have."

Walsh: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. We've discussed this thoroughly. There's no question that without auditors, we don't collect all that we are due and owed. In addition, this has language that makes it very... a Bill very strongly supported by the Retail Merchants, the State Chamber of Commerce, Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois. I know of no

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- opposition and I think that the only right vote on this Bill is a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 76 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2644, Mr. Burke. Please read the Bill on the Order of Third Reading."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 2644, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

- Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As we are very accustomed, there are exemptions that this Legislature can offer to entities who do not meet certain requirements in terms of distance from schools, churches and other prohibited entities. And I'd be happy to answer any 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? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Andrade, Hatcher. Hatcher. Please take the record. On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2793, Mr. Davis. Does this need to be moved back to Second, Mr. Clerk? Bill's on the Order of Second Reading. Please read the Bill."

141st Legislative Day

- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2793, a Bill for an Act concerning education. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments 2 and 3 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move... there are two Amendments I need to adopt, so let me start by moving to adopt Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2793."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Will Davis."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2793, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."
- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2793 represents a myriad of negotiations with a variety of interest groups, essentially to try to make some strides toward trying to determine if there's an overreliance on discipline in schools by aggregating some data and encouraging schools to report data to the State Board of Education that would allow us to be able to examine that data, determine if there's an

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

overreliance on exclusionary discipline and then certainly encourage schools to work to try to figure out different ways to address discipline problems in school versus simply just suspending or possibly expelling students. House Floor Amendment #2, again, represents a lot of the negotiation. And I will tell you, in case anybody's wondering or you will ask probably, in your analysis, it says that the School Management Alliance is opposed to this. Well, they were a part of the negotiations and the last negotiation that we had, their representative said that she was okay with this and walked out of the room, then came back the following day to say that her organization did have some problems with it. The problems that she appeared to have with it relates to the percentage of... of what we want to use to try to determine kind of the ... the bucket of schools that may need to work on some type of improvement plan. The original intent was to have them in the top 25 percent. That seemed to be a little bit too much and so, after some back and forth, I suggested a 20 percent threshold. And again, that was what we walked out of the room with, with everybody agreeing. But... and... and the reason being is because they felt that a school district that may fall into the bottom part of that percentile may be unfairly stigmatized and that that 20 percent could represent high numbers and then there could be a significant drop-off where you have low numbers in that top 20 percent. And I can appreciate that, but we could have that in the top 5 percent, where you could have in that top 5 percent a certain number of schools that are very high with a significant drop-off, even to the... within the bottom 5 percent, within that bottom ...

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

within the 5 percent. So, you... you kind of say, well, let's pick a number and of course, we can always come back and amend that. And then also, let me be clear, that this represents an aggregation of data. So, we're going to collect data for three years and use that data as a way to try to move forward in working with schools to try to deal with some of ... some of these issues. And so, Floor Amendment #2 represents kind of what we thought we... we had negotiated and Floor Amendment #3 represents a minor technical change that the State Board of Education asked us to institute. Versus using October 1, they would prefer that we use the last day of September kind of as the cutoff in terms of ... in terms of determining the student population that will be a part of the formula used to kind of create, ultimately, this top 20 percent of schools that we are... that we are talking about. So, with that being said, I'll be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pihos: "First of all, I'd like to say that I... I know that the Sponsor's intent is good. I know that we want to collect data on suspensions and expulsions to make sure that they're fair and they're not seeking out any one particular population and if indeed they are, we want to look for remedies to solve that. So, I'm in... I'm in strong support of that. I have several concerns about this Bill. The speaker did try to negotiate it. It's a really difficult Bill to negotiate it and putting the opposition aside, my own personal concerns are this. We're comparing elementary districts, K through 8

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

districts with high school districts, with unit districts, K through 12 districts in the overall scope of things. That's very difficult to do. Obviously, in your high school districts, you're probably going to find a higher incidence of expulsions and suspensions. You don't have the history on any of these expulsions and suspensions, whether they're justified or not justified, in this information. Also, I believe in the collection of data, if the same student is suspended more than once, they probably wouldn't be expelled more than once, but suspended more than once, they're going to be counted multiple times. So, I think those are all very relevant factors. What I would have loved to have seen in this Bill is a first year of just data collection, so we make sure that we're actually collecting the right data. Let that kind of sunset, analyze it and then go to our three-year plan so that we know in those three years the right data is putting forth to evaluating these schools on. My also... my other concern is we have a lot of small school districts. And if those small school districts in any one given year have a lot of suspensions and expulsions, they're going to raise to the top 20 percent, which I don't think is what the speaker is trying to get at. So, I think this is still a little bit premature. I would caution you, I will be voting 'no', but I strongly support what the speak... what the Sponsor would like to do. I think it just needs a little more time for the details to be worked out."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

141st Legislative Day

- Willis: "I just wanted to have a few questions for you for clarification. This absolutely does not take away the authority of the local schools or the school boards for doing the discipline measures, correct?"
- Davis, W.: "No, it does not."
- Willis: "Okay. So, the whole goal of this is to gather information so that we can go forward and have better schools, correct?"

 Davis, W.: "Absolutely."
- Willis: "Okay. This... to the Bill. This is something that, I think, is a long time coming. We have found, even in my own school districts, we have schools that discipline on different levels. And I think it's something that we should see, look at, see what's causing those trends. And it certainly is never wrong to gather information so that we can go and educate our students better. I urge an 'aye' vote on this. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay. Mr. Kay does not wish to speak. Mr. Davis to close."
- Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, let me just say to Representative Pihos, particularly her point about looking at the different types of districts differently. Well, it's our understanding that this type of information that is reported to the Federal Government is not reported... it's all reported the same. It doesn't take into consideration the different categories of districts when that information is reported to the Federal Government. So, we're not doing anything that's different than... than the Federal... Federal Government. Also, let me add, and when she talked about small schools. Well, first, let me... let me point out two things when... as it relates to schools. Schools with less than 10 suspensions or expulsions shall be...

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

shall be excluded in that calculation. Secondly, students ... schools with fewer than 50 either white students that would show a disproportionality or fewer than 50 students of color that would show a disproportionality would be excluded as well. So, we're trying to take into consideration small schools or schools that have very small numbers of either white students or students of color in this calculation as well. So, we are trying to be sensitive, I believe, to some of the things that... that she mentioned. We appreciate her support for what we're attempting to do. And I think if you listen to some of the debate on other issues here in the House, it all begins with data. And you have to step forward and collect the data and then go back and analyze to figure out the best way to do it. If we stood here and just simply tried to pass legislation to make changes to schools without having collected the data, I don't think anybody would vote for it. So, I hope you can appreciate that we're attempting to collect data first and then we'll be able to come back, based on that data and either make no changes, if you will, or make some changes based on the information that will be provided... provided. And that's why I think we should move forward with this legislation. As was pointed out before, doesn't stop school districts from implementing discipline the way they've been implementing it, but certainly if we find that there are some egregious actors out there, we want to try to figure out a way to work with them to provide whatever that may be, whether it's through legislative action or possibly if... they may need additional resource at that school in order to address some of the challenges that they've

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

had. So again, I think we've been sensitive to what the Representative has put forward in terms of some of her concerns and I can understand her not wanting to necessarily vote for it, but we certainly appreciate what... her support for what we're attempting to do. And again, I think this is a... a good... a good piece of legislation, something that we need to move forward with. And again, also, three years. That is the time line in which we're hoping to collect data before any changes are made. And we feel three years will give us good, solid data in order to make very sound decisions in terms of how we move forward. So, I certainly encourage the Body's support and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Pihos, for what reason do you rise?"
Pihos: "Since my name was used in debate, I just want to make two points perfectly clear. While school boards will certainly have the opportunity to put forth discipline as they see fit, I think you'll find that they will be cautious because they don't want to end up in this 20 percent list. And I think we need to take that into consideration. And again, my basic concern, as they're... we are collecting the right data. And so, I'd like to see that happen for a year, reevaluate it, and then go forward with a plan like this. So again, I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in... Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "She talked about the right data. Again, in our negotiation, we came up with a formula to collect the data that everyone walked out of that room in agreement with, including the School Management Alliance. I talked to you about their concerns with regard to percentage and where

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

districts may fall in that percentage. But in terms of the formula used to collect the data, everyone walked out of that room in agreement with. And again, I ask for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Crespo, Davis, Harris, Kosel. Please take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Zalewski is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Zalewski: "As... as many of you may have been paying attention to the great Hawks win last night, you know that the white hot Chicago White Sox are on a tear right now. As a result, it's a good time to announce that the White Sox Caucus next meeting will be July 21 against the Kansas City Royals. Joe Lyons, John McKay, Bruce Heimer, Ed Peck have the tickets. So again,

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Senate Bill 2187, Mr. Bradley.

Please read the Bill."

Cell. And go White Sox and go Blackhawks."

White Sox Caucus's next meeting is July 21 at the... at the

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2187, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "This reflects an agreement between the Medical Society, the Nurses' Association and the Psychologists' Association.

I know as this Session began, I don't think any of us believed that we'd reach this point, where the Medical Society would

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

become neutral, where the nurses would become in favor. It creates a limited licensing program for psychologists within the State of Illinois. It requires extensive education, which has been agreed to by the parties. And I feel very comfortable, having attempted to respond to the concerns of people throughout this building as well as in the committee, in coming up with this agreed Amendment. I'd ask... ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, can you describe some of the changes in the Amendment regarding the educational requirements for prescribing psychologists?"

Bradley: "Stipulates the physicians choosing to collaborate with prescribing psychologist must generally prescribe medications to their patients for mental health or illness; clarifies the undergraduate coursework requisite biomedical regimen; clarifies the nature of your requisite 14-month clinical pack... practicum; specify the numbers of hours in annual continuing education; provides for various experiences for which there is no collaborative prescriptive authority, example, patients under the age of 17, pregnant patients, those with serious health conditions; prohibits all Schedule II drugs from collaborative prescriptive delegation and conditions under specifies the which collaborative prescriptive delegations for Schedule III and IV may be delegated and specifies the conditions under which in person, monthly consultations between physicians and psychologists

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

with whom they collaborate must be affected in order to maintain the safety and quality of the clinical care or treatment delivered; provides a cap to the number with which physicians psvchologists may collaborative prescriptive authority; specifies conditions under which the FPR may provide the requisite licensure for prescribing psychologists by endorsement and modifies the composition of the Clinical Psychologist Licensing and Disciplinary Board, adding four members: two licensed physicians, one family practice physician, and one psychiatrist."

Hays: "Thank you very much. And to the Bill. This is a significant and important change that... that the Representative just described and we really are kind of creating a new profession, a profession that will be providing a service to the public. I think it's our responsibility as Legislators to ensure that these professionals have adequate training to provide quality and safe service. And I want to commend the Sponsor and all of the stakeholders involved for crafting an Amendment which aligns the educational requirements for these new prescribing psychologists with the rigorous standards that other Illinois prescribing professionals must currently meet. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "There are eight speakers wishing to speak on this Bill. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Obviously a very difficult process, a very elongated process occurred with respect to how this Bill became an agreed Bill. I wish to commend the Sponsor and all participants in a very well-

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

crafted and tight Bill that makes sure people are safe. Most importantly, good health outcomes are the goal here and I think that a very collaborative process, one that ensures good process, a good exchange of education and trained professionals that will prescribe in a tight con... confined manner. I think this is a great agreed Bill. So, congratulations to the Sponsor and again, to all participants. This could have been a really tough vote where we have friends on both sides and had to come down on something that we didn't necessarily want to. So again, congratulations to all involved."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I... I noticed this Bill contains a Section that allows out-of-state psychologists to obtain a license to be prescribing psychologists in Illinois. The question I have is, do these out-of-state psychologists have to meet the same education and training requirements as a prescribing psychologist in Illinois?"

Bradley: "That's my understanding."

Sullivan: "Thank you. To the Bill. First off, I want to thank Representative Bradley. He's done a yeomen's job to... to get this done. These requirements are important because the education and training requirements in this Bill are much stricter than those in other states like Louisiana and... and New Mexico. And we need to ensure that anyone coming into Illinois seeking and treating our constituents are actually trained to do so to our standards and so, that's... that's

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

wonderful. Amendment #5 is a vast improvement over previous Amendments filed on this legislation. The education and training standards included in this Amendment will go a long way ensuring the competence of prescribing clinical psychologists who may collaborate with a physician to provide mental health services to Illinois patients. The limitations on the ages and the limitations on the classes of drugs that are prohibited to be prescribed are also important elements of this Bill. With that, I believe that this legislation is now in a place to earn our trust. I hope we would all vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Williams: "Just wanted to say I had grave concerns about this Bill as introduced but really appreciate how far you've come. On the subject of collaboration, though, just to clarify on the record, the Bill requires a prescribing psychologist to hold a collaborative agreement with a physician. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Williams: "So, do you agree that then the collaborative agreement is necessary to ensure both the physical and mental health of patients is coordinated and protected?"

Bradley: "I think that's an important part and a cornerstone of what we're doing here today."

Williams: "That's great to hear. It's also my understanding the Amendment will limit the number of collaborative agreements

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that physicians may have with prescribing psychologists. Do you have that number?"

Bradley: "Yeah. I think it's three."

Williams: "Great. Well, thank you, Representative. I want to emphasize the changes to the collaborative agreement requirements ensure both that the physical and mental aspects of patient health care are being considered and adequately addressed. So, thank you for your hard work on this. I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Cassidy: "It's my understanding that this Amendment prohibits psychologists from prescribing to children, pregnant women, senior citizens and anyone suffering from myriad serious health conditions. Is this correct?"

Bradley: "Yeah. As stated earlier, it would limit prescriptions to children, pregnant women and those with serious health conditions."

Cassidy: "Thank you. To the Bill. I want to thank Representative Bradley and all the stakeholders. This really, as other speakers have... have mentioned, this... this has been a long and hard process and everybody has worked very hard to get to this place. All of the individuals we just mentioned have very unique needs and the dangers that these drugs pose to... to children are well documented, the dangers that these drugs pose to pregnant women and their fetuses can be significant, many of our senior citizens and other individuals who are suffering from serious health conditions require

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

comprehensive medical care. These changes allow that to continue while... while solving the problem of access to... to mental health services in our communities. And I am grateful to the Sponsor and the stakeholders for working out. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Flowers: "Representative, first of all, I want to say with all due respect, I really appreciate the hard work and the long hours of negotiations that you had to try to fix this Bill.

And... but I still don't understand why is it necessary? Why is it that we need psychologists and psychiatrists to prescribe more pills? Can you please explain that to me?"

Bradley: "Yeah. Well, first of all, let me say that I listened to what you said in committee and as did the folks that were negotiating on this issue. And so, prescriptive authority to children, people under the age of 17 is restricted. So, your concerns about overmedicating children, this would not be allowed under this Bill. And that is a direct reflection of your concerns and many others. To me, it's an access to care issue. With the proper medical requirements, with the proper training, the proper licensing and safeguards, it's a matter of access to care in many areas of the state that are underserved. But I certainly respect your views and appreciate your comments in committee as reflected by the change in this legislation."

Flowers: "Representative, will a psychologist be able to increase his salary as a result of this legislation?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Bradley: "Yeah. I don't have any idea about that."

Flowers: "Okay. Once again, with all due respect, I appreciate your hard work but I just have problems. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have the utmost respect for my colleague and his hard work and all the conversations that went into this legislation. There was a study put out not too long ago about how African-American children were on Medicaid that was overly medicated because they were on Medicaid. And I want to thank the Sponsor because he has taken children out of the equation. But there's some adults that's walking around today, they are in pain and the pain really cannot be fulfilled or made to go away with the medication, not with the red pills, not with the green pills, not with the yellow pills, not with the purple pills, not with all the prescriptions in the world. And to me, psychologists had a place in this... in this medical field to be able to talk to the patients, to find out, to try to get to the root of the problem as opposed to just trying to give them medication. I think it's going to be unfortunate that a lot of people going to be walking around overly medicated. I think there's going to be a lot of people, once that medication has ran... have worn off, they're going to be needing more medication, but the problems are still going to be there. I understand what you're trying to do, Representative. I think this is a very bad precedent of what we're doing here. I remember when the psychiatrists, before they were able to prescribe medication, you know, it wasn't going to go as far as it has gone. So, it's just a matter of time before the children will be involved in the equation with the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

psychologists as well and the psychiatrists. And I think our... our state will not be better for it. And there's a reason why other states have not got involved with doing this same type of legislation, because they know that there's lots of problems here. There's... there's lots of pit... pits and falls and mines that we're about to embark upon. So, with all due respect, I would appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Bellock: "I just... Thank you very much, Representative Bradley. I just wanted to ask because on our analysis there were seven other groups that were opposed to this. And I received several letters, especially from anesthesiologists that live in my district that were opposed to this. And I just wondered if the NAMI was still opposed, the Family Physicians? I know the Med Society is..."

Bradley: "No. My understanding is that the umbrella of the doctors, that the Medical Society being neutral brings all of the other medical groups along with it."

Bellock: "Really?"

Bradley: "That's my understanding. I may be wrong."

Bellock: "What about the... and would you... what about the pharmacists? 'Cause they're not..."

Bradley: "What?"

Bellock: "The pharmacists, which I think is..."

Bradley: "I don't know about the pharmacists."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Bellock: "Well, 'cause going along with just discussion on this, in the heroin forms that we've had, it's come up two or three times, concerns by the psychiatrists in dealing with people on drugs, about the psychotropic drugs and psychologists. So, I just wanted to ask if there was any other... if that was just the Med Society or if all these other groups were still opposed."

Bradley: "Well, it's my understanding in... in conversation with the Medical Society that the doctors' groups are part of a coalition with the Medical Society. I don't know about the pharmacists."

Bellock: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Representative Bradley, I, too, would like to applaud this Herculean task. I must admit that I had my doubts that you would be able to get two very disparate sides to come to the table on this. But to get to yes is quite a feat and earlier this month, as you know, we worked diligently to get a telehealth Bill out of the House and through the Senate so that people in the very areas you are talking about have access to behavioral health especially but all kinds of health. This... that Bill, along with this, hopefully, will close gaps. This is a new time in health care in our state where we're really looking the needs of patients and the collaboration of professionals. And in the end, I think that each and every one of us, now that everyone has agreed to this Bill, hope that it is the patients in Illinois will be served better. And I encourage an 'aye' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Let me also add my congratulations to Representative Bradley, who took a very difficult issue and has worked extremely hard to bring a number of groups who were opposed to this issue under the guise of being now supportive of the issue. But I can tell you from myself that I have always been in favor of this particular Bill. And for me, the answer is quite simple, access. When you live in communities where, unfortunately, on the medical side of the coin, you don't have the requisite number of professionals that people can access to get services and to get treatment and when you hear about opportunities like that, you want to support them for access purposes. Did I start out saying that the education requirements probably need to be higher than where they were? Absolutely. But I didn't relinquish from the idea of access into communities like some of the ones that I serve. And I think it's extremely important that if you are in a community or an area of the state where you have fewer of these types of... fewer psychiatrist professionals but yet you may psychologists, you know, what's wrong with giving them the opportunity to provide a service into your community that you're not already receiving? And so, when I look at Bills like this, I think, when we can overcome, you know, some of the challenges and focus on access, to give our constituents access, we trust that they are professionals and that they will do the right thing. If not, I'm sure we have plenty of laws or statutes in place that will discipline them accordingly, if that's one of your concerns. But let's consi ...

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

let's... let's not forget access, Ladies and Gentlemen. Access into our community. That's why I'm having a problem with the Dental Society right now, because dental hygienists want to be able to provide services where dentists aren't in those communities. And they're having a problem with that, but yet they tell me that there is a need to provide more services and that some communities are going without. In this situation access, to me, is indeed the key and why we should all support this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. And this sounds as though I'm going to echo what the previous speaker just said, but I know in my area, it's very difficult for someone needing psychiatric services to get those services if they're not hooked up with the mental health... the county mental health that's already in place. If they are hooked up with them, they might get to see a psychiatrist in a few months. If they're not, it could take up to 18 months to get to see a psychiatrist. And when the psychologists in my area have come to me to talk about this Bill, they were really concerned about making sure that people get the kind of quality care that they deserve. So, I want to thank Representative Bradley very much for working so hard on this. He knows that the first time I saw this Bill, I said this is very important, I think, for everybody in the state, but especially for those underserved communities. And I wanted to work with him as much as I could. I've met with area people... my own area people and listened to them and kept bringing the feedback that I

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

was getting. So, this is a good day that we've come to this opportunity to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Welch."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Welch: "Mr. Speaker, as a member of your heroin task force, I've had concerns about ease of access to drugs as well. So, Representative Bradley, I have a question for you. Can you tell us more about the limitation on the types of drugs that psychologists will be able to prescribe?"

Bradley: "Prohibits all Schedule II drugs from collaborative prescriptive delegations. Specifies the conditions under which collaborative prescriptive delegations for Schedule III and IV may be delegated. Example, no prescriptive delegation may be delegated for narcotics."

Welch: "To the Bill. Thank you, Representative Bradley. I, also, want to commend you on a job well done with your negotiation. You know, we're all aware of the risks associated with the Schedule II and other narcotic drugs and I... I certainly do appreciate the limitations that Amendment 5 in particular provides. And I will be supporting this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ford: "I, too, want to thank you for your hard work on this, Representative Bradley, but I have one question. When the Bill first came out, I made a recommendation that something is added... an Amendment be added because this Bill is about access, correct?"

141st Legislative Day

- Bradley: "Yeah. That's... it is about access. Correct."
- Ford: "And so, what guarantees in the Bill are there to guarantee that the underserved communities will have access under this measure?"
- Bradley: "Well, this is certainly an effort and an attempt to guarantee that by opening up greater opportunities for the mental health area of medicine to be served. And coming from an underserved area myself, it's certainly my intention. We're going to put this into place, hopefully, and hopefully it will make a difference in those areas, Representative."
- Ford: "Well, Representative, I gave you a simple suggestion to get... to... for me to support it and it was to have a collaboration with federally qualified health centers. So, if a psychologist wanted to prescribe, then they should have a linkage with an FQHC in communities so that we could guarantee that the intent of this Bill is carried out. Is that in the Bill?"
- Bradley: "I don't believe that that specifically is, but I also don't believe that it's prevented. I don't believe it's prohibited from happening so long as these other requirements are made."
- Ford: "Yeah. So, Representative, I just thought that it would be better if the intent of the Bill was to make sure that underserved communities would receive the services that this Bill is underlying to do, if there was a linkage with an FQHC. FQHCs are federally qualified health centers and they serve underserved communities and they serve poor people and they serve the people that this Bill is intended to help. So,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

because that Amendment is not in, I can't support it. And I appreciate your hard work. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I'd like to commend John Bradley on his work, Herculean task. I didn't quite know you were going to do it but you did. And I think that's a testament to you. I've always been a strict constructionist when it comes to what professionals are supposed to do. I've been sort of hostile sometimes when medical professionals or others will come to us and ask us to solve their problem that solve through their professional they could organizations. Stick to your knitting, I always say. I'm going to vote for this Bill today. I'm going to vote for it today because what John Bradley did was bring these groups together. He talks about access. My other esteemed colleague talked about access. But I think it should also speak to opportunity. You know, one of the things we do sometimes is quote studies and I always tell you when you quote the study, you know, you need to say, you know, who wrote it or what the organization was. But I do remember a study a few years ago, when we were beginning to implement the Affordable Care Act, that the Association for American Colleges of Medicine came out with. And what they said was with the advent of the Affordable Care Act and other reasons, that there was a shortage in physicians, shortage in physicians. So, we will have extra access by allowing certain professionals, psychologists, to be able to prescribe. But I think what you've done, John, is raise consciousness about the fact that we need to educate more medical professionals, certainly in this country and

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

this state. And that's something that I'm going to be working on doing and remember that when some of our great institutions here that we fund that have medical schools, when they come to you talking about the needs that they have for those schools. Thank you very much, John."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley to close."

- Bradley: "I just want to thank everyone for their kind words and this is an attempt to reflect the concerns of the Members of this Body and of the medical community. And I'm very proud and appreciative of all the hard work that's gone into it. It's a humbling process. It's monumental. I would ask for an '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. Dunkin. Mr. Walsh. Please take the record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report."
- Clerk Bolin: "Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 3443."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino on Senate Bill 3530. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3530, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Mautino: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3530 as amended is the agreed Unemployment Insurance Act. Throughout most of this Session, labor has met with business and the Department of Employment Securities. Quick rundown of what is in the Bill, which is now all agreed and has gone through that process is the Press Association's bundle handler's Bill, which passed out of here originally with 80 votes. The... the changes in creation of the work share program and under work sharing, distressed employers reduce workers' hours instead of laying people off. This has been successful program. We're going to adopt its use here in Illinois. And it has certain restrictions and rules based on it. All of the items that have been placed in here by the Department of Employment Securities have been agreed to. Be happy to answer any questions."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving back to Concurrences, page 18 of the Calendar. Page 18 of the Calendar. The first Bill there is House Bill 4745, Representative Sente. Please proceed on your Concurrence Motion."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I concur with the Senate Amendment

1. This was a Bill that we passed out of here unanimously.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

The Senate wanted to remove two of the items and the first two remain. So, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Cabello, Harris. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4745. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4781, Mr. Welch. Please proceed, Sir."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4781. This is an initiative of the Department of Juvenile Justice. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Leitch, McSweeney, Reboletti. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', 19 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 4781. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4783, Mr. Welch. Please proceed."
- Welch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 4783. This is purely a technical change to... to the Bill. It places the language in a newly created Section of the Condominium Property Act instead of

141st Legislative Day

- adding it to an already existing Section. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to concur. Those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yingling. Mr. Yingling. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4783. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4910, Mr. McSweeney. Please proceed."
- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4910. This is the Bill that encourages partnerships between community colleges and manufacturing companies. There are no mandates. The Amendment simply provides that in order for... to qualify for public-private partnership that only five out of seven criteria need to be realized. So, I ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4910. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4916, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which is providing inform... information be released to the attorney rather than an attorney or the

141st Legislative Day

- guardian ad litem appointed under the Juvenile Court Act.

 This was to help with unfunded reports being speeded up under the DCFS laws. I appreciate your support."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Harris, Jakobsson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4916. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4956, Mr. Sullivan. Please proceed, Sir."
- Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 4956. The Amendment simply removes one property from the underlying Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves, Members. Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4956. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5085, Mr. Leitch. Please proceed, Sir."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in this Senate Amendment as well. This Amendment, enacted in the Senate, reflects what the Department of Agriculture told our House Committee, they wanted to change it. It incorporates that. And I would ask for your support."

141st Legislative Day

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5085. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5326, Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."
- Mayfield: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5326. This is merely a technical change requested by the Secretary of State. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Jakobsson. Jakobsson. Please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 5326. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5330. Out of the record. House Bill 5410, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5410. Lead poisoning remains all too common among Illinois children. Completely preventable, lead poisoning can rob young children of their natural potential by causing brain damage and lifelong learning disabilities. House Bill 5410 clarifies elements of the Illinois Lead Poisoning Prevention Act. It gives the Department of Public Health and local health departments the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

tools needed to stop dangerous, illegal work on lead paint and to meet the requirements of federal grant programs that support their work. The Bill also makes clear that personally identifiable information relating to poisoned children is protected from public disclosure. The language in the Bill, however, still ensures that information about hazardous regulated facilities remains buildings and available. Like the identification of other Building Code violations, a finding of the presence of lead-based substances such as paint is not a medical record. This information will continue to be available to help provide parents, renters, advocates and others the information necessary to protect themselves and their communities from the danger of children being lead poisoned. While it is my hope that the Department of Public Health and local health departments will utilize the full resources of the law to ensure that all residences and regulated facilities are free from lead hazards, it is also necessary to protect the rights of parents and tenants to seek recourse through the civil courts, which some of these Amendments do. So, thank you. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jakobsson, Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5410. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5412, Representative Gabel."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Gabel: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 5412. The Senate just made one change to this... this Bill. They added nurses and... a nurse and a doctor to the advisory council. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative, in this Amendment, did the concerns of the Illinois Medical Society... were those addressed and are they now at least neutral?"

Gabel: "Yes. They are."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Gabel: "Thank you."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Crespo, Flowers. Please take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5412. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5416, Mr. Brady. Please proceed, Sir. Mr. Brady on your Concurrence Motion."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply move to concur with the Amendment #1 to the Bill for the Emergency Protection Act under Scott's Law.

I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Can you briefly tell us what the Senate Amendment did, Sir?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Brady: "Sure. What it did was actually reduce down the penalty."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "I'm trying to figure out as well what this Senate

Amendment did. It looks like it reduced the penalty from a

Class B misdemeanor to a Class C misdemeanor... misdemeanor?"

Brady: "Correct."

Franks: "Well, what did the underlying Bill do?"

Brady: "The underlying Bill had a stiffer penalty of... I believe it would be Class 4. And in the Senate, a particular rule that the President of the Senate had about the classification and how... how high up the classification could go on the penalties. This is more of a graduated approach that was a Senate rule. And so, that's why I'm accepting their Amendment."

Franks: "Well, initially, before you had filed this Bill, wasn't it a Class B misdemeanor?"

Brady: "I believe so, yes."

Franks: "So, what the Senate Amendment would do would actually make it a lesser penalty to a Class C misdemeanor?"

Brady: "It would make it a lesser penalty from what my original Bill was."

Franks: "No. But I... I think before your Bill. Let me ask it again."

Brady: "Sure."

Franks: "Before you filed your Bill..."

Brady: "Mmm mmm."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Franks: "...the penalty for the infraction was a Class B misdemeanor."

Brady: "I'd have... I'd have to go back and look, Jack."

Franks: "Well, we need."

Brady: "I thought I..."

Franks: "We need to know that..."

Brady: "You may... you may be correct."

Franks: "...because it looks as though, instead of an enhancement, we're actually... it's having a reduction in penalties from a B to a C. I think your staff might be able to help you out."

Brady: "It's definitely a reduction."

Franks: "It was a reduction from your Bill, but I'm wondering if it's a reduction from the present law?"

Brady: "It... it originally was a business offense. And... and what this particular... what my initial Bill did was raise it up, obviously. And what the Senate has done is brought it down from that Act... or from that level."

Franks: "Well, it had to be some type of moving violation, because what this was is a penalty for failing to yield to a right of way..."

Brady: "Correct."

Franks: "...to an emergency vehicle."

Brady: "That's correct."

Franks: "So, it couldn't have been a business one. It had to have been some type of mover. Maybe the policemen could help me out over there."

Brady: "No. What... what the initial... initial part of my Bill was, the original intent of my Bill, was to enhance the penalty under Scott's Law when there is either death or serious bodily

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

injury when an emergency worker, law enforcement, et cetera, is struck. What occurred in the Senate was a reduction for that penalty, which would eventually be, if found guilty under the Act, a Class 4 Felony."

Franks: "I guess my... I just want to make sure before we vote on this what the present penalty is and whether... and I think we have some folks over there and I'll reserve some comments. I think we have some lights on over there and they might be able to make this... to clarify this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Davidsmeyer: "Quick question. So, my understanding of current law, the way it currently exists, under our analysis it says that it is currently punishable by a business offense, which is... which carries greater possible penalties than a standard moving violation. So, you're... you're bringing this... originally, you were bringing it up to a Class 4, this brings it down to a... or... yeah, Class 4 Felony. You're bringing it down to a Class B misdemeanor."

Brady: "It would be... actually, the Amendment would bring it down to a Class B misdemeanor."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. There's... there's actually mention of Class B as well as Class C misdemeanor under this."

Brady: "The... the Senate Amendment would, again, reduce it down to the Class B misdemeanor. From what my initial intent was, was for a Class 4 Felony."

Davidsmeyer: "Okay. So... so, it's still, no matter how we look at this, it is an increase in penalty?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Brady: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "From current law."

Brady: "Yes."

Davidsmeyer: "It's an increase from current law..."

Brady: "Right."

Davidsmeyer: "...but a decrease from your original intent?"

Brady: "Correct. It is not as much as an increase as my original Bill had sought to do. But I'm concurring with the Amendment or asking for a Concurrence on the Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davidsmeyer, have you completed your comments?"

Davidsmeyer: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello."

Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a decrease in penalty. A decrease. The reason for this law and the reason why it's called Scott's Law is because a state policeman was killed because a vehicle crashed into him and killed him. The reason why we want this to stay and I'm voting against this Bill is because then we are decreasing what we've tried to do before. We came up with a law to make sure that we honor this state policeman and I would hope that we keep that honor that we gave his family for their loss. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the Bill. I... I do have some issues with the Amendment and I appreciate the Sponsor's work on the initial Bill is that when you... when you fail to move over for an emergency vehicle and you end up killing somebody, is what happened to the firefighter, it reduces it from a Class 4 Felony down to a Class B misdemeanor. And a Class B

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

misdemeanor is punishable by a \$1500 fine and less than six months in the county jail. And I reluctantly rise in opposition because I don't think that's the right thing to do, at least at that portion. We could... I know that the other portion of your Bill, Representative, was an increase in penalties. And that... and I know that's an issue as well for some folks with the desire not to raise penalties. But that... that is a portion that I have trouble with and I think that's what some of the Members are struggling with."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

Willis: "Thank you very much. To the Bill. I originally was one of the cosponsors on the Bill because I do believe in Scott's Law and I do believe that we do need to protect our first responders out there. As many of you know, I'm married to one of them. That's what the original intent of this Bill was. It was to protect our first responders, it was to make sure that we came down harder on those people that were negligent. The Senate has changed the intent of this Bill; therefore, I don't feel this is something that we should concur on. I think we need to try to go back to the original Bill the way it was. I know we won't be able to do it this year, but let's work it... let's get the correct intent out there. So, I would urge everyone to not concur on this Bill. Thank you very much. And Representative Franks would like to have the rest of my time. Yield to him, please."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill get the requisite number of votes, I'd request a verification."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Brady to close."

Brady: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll try... try and clarify it one more time. What my initial intent of the Bill was to... to make this a Class 4 Felony. What we fell prey to in the Senate was a Senate Rule that it reduced it down from that initial penalty. In working with my Senator and others involved with the Bill, the thought was that if we could move it and concur, we would then be back next year trying to enhance the penalty to get to a Class 4 Felony, potentially. But out of respect for all those in law enforcement and emergency services that give and pay the ultimate sacrifice, I will be happy to take the Concurrence out of the record, to work with all my colleagues here in the House and certainly stand to continue to try and move forward with the legislation and the original intent that it was. So, thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brady, you are... just wish to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment?"

Brady: "That is correct now. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5416. Returning to the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 2758, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2758, the Bill has been read... Senate Bill 2758, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee. Floor Amendments

141st Legislative Day

- 3, 4, and 5 have been adopted. Floor Amendments 6 and 7 have been adopted. No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

 Speaker Lang: "Have all fiscal notes been filed, Sir?"

 Clerk Bolin: "All notes that have been requested have been filed."

 Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Returning to the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 5523, Representative Sente. No running, Representative. Please proceed when you reach your seat, there."
- Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. This makes two very small, technical changes. The Amendment updates the Criminal Code citation and it merely moves existing language to a different section of the same Code. And secondly, it makes a word change to a more politically correct terminology. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5523. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5666, Mr. DeLuca. Please proceed. Proceed, Sir."
- DeLuca: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 3 to House Bill 5666. The Amendment makes a few changes that were all agreed to when the Bill left the House, going over to the Senate. One that has to do with reiterating the fact that the City of Chicago is not included and reducing one of the reporting requirements from three to two. I ask for your 'yes' vote."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 5666. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5685, Representative Berrios. Please proceed."

Berrios: "Thank you. I would like to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5685, which was a page and line Amendment which added House Bill 5331 to this legislation. We are amending the Residential Mortgage License Act of 1987. House Bill 5331 did leave here unanimously. And I'd like your support to be added to this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hernandez."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hernandez: "...Representative, this... is this your last Bill?"

Berrios: "Yes."

Hernandez: "Well, Representative, I just want you to add me, please, to your Bill. And I think it's a great Bill. I wish you all the best and it's really going to be hard to see you go. But I wanted to just make a point of recognizing your last Bill. Thank you."

Berrios: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Soto: "Thank you. So, Representative, this is your last Bill. So again, too, I want to just thank you for your friendship because when we're here, we become family. But I know you'll be here for Veto Session, so I won't, of course, you know I get emotional. But anyway, it's because, you know, you've done a great job and we appreciate you. So I look forward to still working with you towards Veto Session. But like Representative Lisa Hernandez just mentioned, we're going to miss you when you're not here."

Berrios: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also wanted to rise to congratulate my colleague on the presentation of her final Bill. I appreciate your guidance and your mentorship here in my freshman year. I wish I had many more to serve with you. You've been a tremendous Representative and it's been proud to watch your career. And I am so thrilled that I was able to spend my first two years with you here on the floor, next to you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Kosel."

Kosel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will also be sad to see you go.

But you know, we make a lot of friends here on both sides of
the aisle and Toni has been one of those people whose
friendship I will cherish and hope that I will see her many,
many times in the coming years. She is truly a quality person.
And congratulations on your last Bill and congratulations on
many years of very honorable service."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Williams: "Toni, I know you've been through a lot of ups and downs politically in the last couple years. But I want to just comment that I have never seen anything but a smile on your face and a kind word and encouraging words for all of us on our hard times. And so, I'll really miss your consistent positive mood and optimistic outlook. So, thank you for your friendship and good luck to you in the future."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to say to Representative Berrios, it was truly a... a pleasure and an honor to be on your Banking Committee. You always chaired the committee with a great deal of respect for all, listening to all the Bills and making sure that everyone had an opportunity to speak. You never rushed us through any hearing. And I appreciate your quiet demeanor and I have spoken to you privately, telling you to stay in touch with us, because we know you're going to go far. God bless you. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Speaker. I was hesitant to get up and I thought it was rather premature that we would be saying goodbye to our darling colleague so early, understanding that she's going to be with us to... through the Veto Session. But I didn't want to miss any opportunity to, again, insist on how... I don't think anybody's going to miss you any more than I, Toni. And I know that we are going to have a very long and continuing friendship, in view of the fact that I've introduced her to the love of her life, Jimmy Weiss. So, we're going to be looking forward to that wedding and many, many celebrations in the future. And I love you, Toni Berrios."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Toni, I am also one that I'm going to miss that ride down to Springfield with you, because I believe that we rode together for a lot of years. But I'm going to tell you, I'm not too far from your district, so I still want you to come over and pick me up and drive around the district. You know, you know the business and I know the business, so maybe we can still ride around together and do business and stop and have lunch. And maybe you could still come with me down this way to Springfield once in a while and join us on the floor, 'cause you'll be able to come to the floor. I'm going to miss that ride, Toni, and I still love you as a friend, close friend. Thank you very much for the work you've done down here."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Representative Berrios, when I first met you, little girl, you were only about seven or eight years old and you was holding your dad's hand. And you were just a beautiful young lady then and you have grown to be a more beautiful young woman. I do know that there are great things waiting for you and you will rise to the occasion. So, I'm not going to worry about you. I'm going to say I'll see you later. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To Representative Berrios, and I'm not going to go on and on 'cause I know this isn't your last day. But I just want to say thank you for all your work and how I've enjoyed and all of us on this side of the aisle, especially the Members of COWL, have enjoyed

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

working with you. So, thank you very much and we're not going to go on 'til it is the end. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Berrios to close."

- Berrios: "Thank you all for your kind words. It is... it is my last Bill, but it's not my last day. And it has been an honor to serve in this Body. It's... it's something that I will hold near and dear to my heart forever. So, thank you all very much. And I'd ask for your support on this Bill."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Burke, Drury. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5685. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes the Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 102, offered by Representative Currie, is referred to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair's in receipt of a Motion by Mr. Sandack to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4677. Is there leave? There's leave of the Body. Well, let me do it this way. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Gentleman's Motion carries. And the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4677. House Bill 5686, Leader Currie on a Concurrence Motion. Please proceed."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a measure that deals with... with the standby and short-term

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

guardianships and it... it establishes when a guardian is going to take a child out of state, what the procedures are for notifying the parents and/or the court. The Senate, in its wisdom, eliminated some of the notice requirements. I think this is a good legislation. And I'd appreciate your 'aye' vote."

- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Brauer, Willis. Mr. Brauer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5686.

 And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5689, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 5689. The first... this Bill is the child safe e-cigarettes. It has the child-safe caps for the e-cigarette liquid. And the first Amendment just changed the effective date to January 1 of 2015. And the second Amendment was recommended by the Attorney General's Office and it changes an 'and' to an 'or'. So, it can be a combination of nicotine, flavor or chemicals instead of all three of those together. So, I appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Those who support the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, please. Brady, Hatcher, Poe. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 8 voting

141st Legislative Day

- 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 5689. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5701, Representative Mayfield. Please proceed."
- Mayfield: "Thank you. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5701. Basically, what this does is an agreed upon change. It add... it exempts the ambulance and EMS workers. On the underlying Bill, it was assumed that they were included in the Emergency Responders Act and they were not. So, we wanted to make sure that they, considering that they are emergency responders, that they receive that exemption. Again, this is agreed upon Bill. I want to thank the chamber... the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the Illinois Retail Merchants and all the others in the business community for working so that we can craft this very good Bill. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello, Williams. Williams. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5701. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5707, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."
- Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Amendment... Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5707. As I promised when we passed the Bill out of the House, we continued to work with the School Management Alliance about

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

their concerns about some of the... the data collection and other issues in the Bill. These Amendments address those. The... we removed some of the reporting requirements that were duplicative or ... or overly challenging to the schools but still require... still bring in the data that we need. We make the language around investigating and reporting less strict, less firm so that it... that the ... we can still get timely reporting and timely investigation but be able to get that within a time frame that is workable within the school districts. And then ultimately, the data collection language was... was amended to address concerns from School Management so that the... the data collection language was replaced with data driven evaluation process and removes any... makes... makes clear that they are not required to duplicate any data collection efforts. I appreciate the work of the School Management Alliance and the advocates. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Brady, Evans. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 75 'yes'... voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 5707. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Martwick is recognized."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 5523, the wrong button was pressed. My understanding, there was a large feral cat loose in the chamber and he may have stepped on my 'no'

141st Legislative Day

- switch. But could you please reflect... the record reflect that I intended to vote 'yes'?"
- Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect your intention, Sir. House Bill 5735, Representative Williams. Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill 5785, Mr. Franks. Please proceed."
- Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This was something we tried to get done in the House before we sent it over to the Senate. We simply ran out of time. And this was agreed upon language to the Bill. So, I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Harris, Ives. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5785. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5812, Mr. Stewart. Please proceed, Sir."
- Stewart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to a Concurrence of Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5812. It adds two words to the... to the proposed Bill 'or county'. This was identical then legislation that was passed previously by both the House and the Senate unanimously."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bellock. Please take the record. On this question, there are

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

94 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5812. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5815, Representative Ives. Please proceed, Representative."

Ives: "Thank you. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5815. Basically, this Amendment says that you can currently seal a misdemeanor violation but not an ordinance violation for the same offense such as cannabis or an alcohol violation. This Amendment says that you can seal ordinance violations for that same offense."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cavaletto, Hammond, Pritchard. Please take the record. On this question, there are 81 voting 'yes', 34 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5815. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5828, Mr. Moffitt. Please proceed."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. This applies to rural first responders, brought to me by a fire department. What it says is that they can have an infield upgrade on an emergency response. In the rural areas, a lot of times they're like maybe a basic... EMT basic or even just first responders, but they have members, volunteers, who are advanced degree EMTs or paramedics. This says they can perform levels... skills at the levels that they're licensed for, not just the level of the ambulance or

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

the alternate response vehicle or specialized vehicle. They also... it only applies to rural areas with pop... serving a population of under 7500 and that the vehicle have to be available for annual inspection and have proper storage of equipment and any medications that that advanced degree person can use."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Demmer. Please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5828. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5853, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1, which just makes it that the state agencies shall be responsible providing their own information update to CMS for their contact information."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Evans, Stewart. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5853. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5922, Mr. Sims. Please proceed, Sir."
- Sims: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House...

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

House Bill 5922. The Amendment further clarifies and maintains a commitment I made to Members of the Judiciary Committee and Members of this... this House when we passed House Bill 5922 initially. What this... what the Amendment does is it clarifies that the... it limits the offense to the entrance upon the forbidden part of the right of way. Know of no further opposition. I'd be happy to take any questions, Mr. Speaker."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Beiser, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5922. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5925, Representative Feigenholtz. Please proceed."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1. Again, this is an Amendment that was agreed to when the House passed the Bill. We just ran out of time and the Senate attached it. I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'... Excuse me. Mr. Harms. Mr. Harms does not wish to speak. 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? McAsey. Please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5925. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page 9 of

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 229, Representative Golar. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 229, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It gives me great pleasure to present this... this Bill. It requires the Governor to publish an annual report with information regarding the ethnicity, gender, and disability status of gubernatorial appointments to boards, commissions, and task forces. It also requires those who apply to serve on a State Board of Commission to disclose their demographic information. Requires the Governor's Office to submit an annual report to the Legislature once a year. Requires the Governor's Office to electronically publish the report on an annual basis. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "To the Bill. I rise in support of the Lady's Bill. I think it makes perfect sense because right now, we're not sure who serves on these boards. Even though the question may be asked, it's not required that they be listed. And I think this is important so we can have real diversity and people will know who's serving on these boards and from where. So, I appreciate the Lady bringing this forward. I think it makes perfect sense. And I ask everyone to vote 'aye'."

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

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sosnowski. 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. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3125. Mr. Martwick. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3125, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative Martwick."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to this Bill. What it does is it changes the language of the amusement park... carnival amusement park safety Bill to include the term 'amusement enterprise', which would show that the... the language to this Bill would apply to permanent amusement enterprises as well."

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3125, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, this would... would allow the rules that we passed last year to improve amusement park safety would now apply to all amusement enterprises, which would include permanently affixed as well as temporary

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

carnivals. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Brady, Davis, Flowers. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1172. Representative Monique Davis has filed this. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1172. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we mourn the passing of Maya Angelou, a celebrated poet, memoirist, novelist, educator, dramatist, producer, actress, historian, filmmaker, and civil rights activist, and extend our sincere condolences to her family, friends, and all who knew and loved her; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of Maya Angelou as an expression of our deepest sympathy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Maya Angelou was actually many, many things. She was a novelist, an actress, a writer, a civil rights worker. She worked with Dr. Martin Luther King. She also was a person who tried very hard to get all people to be the best that they could be. She advised people to look at and study Chopin and if you realized he was a musician, he would say also a human being. She said look at

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

all the musicians and just know they're human beings and you, too, can do that. One of the most important things about Maya Angelou today is she spoke for and with many Presidents. She was a part of the Presidential Inauguration of Bill Clinton. President Ford appointed her to several... several women's organizations in order for her to present to them or be a spoke at Barack... Barack them. She inauguration. Some of her poetry has reached international attention. She has written several books, the first one being I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings. She was raped as a young girl, under seven years of age, and she told her parents who did it. And afterwards, the gentleman who did it was found brutally murdered. And Maya didn't talk for about four years after that because she thought her voice had caused the man's death. When she did begin to speak, she learned to speak seven languages. Maya Angelou is one of the people that helped to make America great. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Bellock."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I, too, just wanted to speak a little bit about Maya Angelou, who I think was probably one of the most outstanding women in the last century. And going on what Representative Davis said, in the paper today, they had a few words that I actually had brought to the House Floor with me and I'd just like to say them. These were left behind by her, of her advice on life. Try to be a rainbow in someone's cloud. I've learned that making a living is not the same as making a life. No matter what happens or how bad it seems today, life does go on and it will be a better tomorrow. Love recognizes no barriers. It

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

jumps hurdles, leaps fences, penetrates walls to arrive at its destination full of hope. We spend precious hours fearing the inevitable. It would be wise to use that time adoring our families, cherishing our friends, and living our lives."

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Thank you, Representative Davis. Representative Davis has been asked that all Members be added as cosponsors. With leave of the Body, all Members will be named as cosponsors to this Resolution. Thank you. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2014: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3433; recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 102."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams is recognized."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

- Williams: "I just wanted to recognize and welcome students from Alexander Graham Bell Elementary School in our district. A great example of a neighborhood school that really works. Please welcome the students."
- Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Nice to see all of you. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1158, Mr. Anthony. Please proceed."
- Anthony: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, can you have it be read, please? Can you read the Resolution, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Clerk Bolin: "House Resolution 1158, offered by Representative Anthony. Be it

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we, along with his family and friends, mourn the passing of United States Marine Corps Lance Corporal Steven M. Hancock; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this resolution be presented to the family of LCpl. Steven Hancock as an expression of our sympathy."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony."

Anthony: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise today, along with Representative Cloonen, to ask the chamber to join me in honoring the memory of Lance Corporal Steven Hancock, a U.S. Marine from Coal City who tragically lost his life in a training accident last week. Lance Corporal Hancock was a 2011 graduate of Coal City High School and also earned his Eagle Scout designation that same year. He was a young man who enjoyed the outdoors, especially hunting and fishing. And he was a man of deep, abiding faith. He joined the Marines in March 2012 and served our country with great pride and distinction as chief... crew chief of a V22 Osprey aircraft. We mourn his tragic death and offer our condolences to his parents, Michael and Susan Hancock, his two sisters, grandparents, and many, many beloved extended family members. I move for the adoption of the Resolution and I ask that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors, expressing our deepest sympathies to the Hancock family in remembrance of this hometown hero from Grundy County, Lance

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Corporal Steven Hancock. I also ask that upon adoption of this Resolution, we observe a moment of silence in honor of Lance Corporal Hancock. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Anthony moves that all Members of the House be added as cosponsors. With leave of the Body, all Members of the House will be added as cosponsors. Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion is adopted... or the Resolution is adopted. And the Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Anthony. Mr. Clerk, House Resolution 1176, Representative Sente."

Senger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In a day or so, we'll be wrapping up Session and when we return in fall, a significant individual who's been part of the Springfield landscape and who has positively influenced business issues and governance in Illinois will be retiring, my very good friend, Doug Whitley, CEO of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce. Monday's Daily Herald Business Ledger's front page story, entitled 'The Fighter's Final Round: Why Batavia's Whitley Led State Chamber with Such Rare Passion' was a wonderful article about Doug's 16 years at the helm of the State Chamber of Commerce. With grace, wit and charm, Doug has impacted the Statehouse issues and politics for decades. It is my sincere hope that we will see him again in yet another role that benefits our state and makes use of his vast knowledge. I know we will all miss him dearly. I know he's making his way over to the chamber gallery. I first met Doug in 2011 when we came... when he came up to Vernon Hills to listen to an event that Representative Nekritz and I were cohosting to inform our

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

constituents about the budgeting for outcomes legislation. He complimented me on our effort and my passion for changing budgeting principles and Doug has served as a mentor of mine ever since. I've benefited from his wisdom and our numerous conversations. Besides Doug's candid practicality and willingness to work with Members on both sides of the aisle, one of the things I've enjoyed most about Doug are his periodic electronic newsletters. I continually strive to present my communication in a clear, concise, unbiased and interesting manner and frankly, no one does so better than Doug Whitley. If you haven't had an opportunity to read them, I would recommend you review some back issues. So, I filed House Resolution 1176, honoring Doug for his many valuable contributions and years of service to Illinois. I would encourage everyone to sign on to that Resolution, showing your support for Doug and join me in thanking him for his leadership."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of the Lady's Motion and this Resolution. And Doug, I know you're up here. We're going to miss you. You've been a... a steady voice in Springfield, one that's well-respected, a very worthy opponent, very good friend, good to have you on my side on Bills, hated seeing you on the other side. I thought you were always very well-reasoned, very well-respected. You know, you've been here so long, in Springfield. You've been here for at least 30 years. And I know your background with Ameritech and you were here during the... the Edgar administration. And you really know how things work. And when...

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

when... with you leaving, I think that we're going to lose a lot of institutional knowledge and one who really understands how the process should work and for the benefit of all Illinoisans. I hope you don't go too far. We need you to stay close. I know you're going to go on to a different chapter in your life, but I plan to still call you for advice and counsel. And I want to thank you for your service."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just a brief word or two, if I may, regarding Doug. And I go back many years with him as all of us do, but he is really one of the most knowledgeable people who is involved with State Government. From his time as the director of the Department of Revenue to the taxpayer... Taxpayers' Federation to his current position at the Chamber of Commerce, he really knows what he's talking about. He is a thorn and has been a thorn in the side of the Democrats, he has been a thorn in the side of the Republicans. He is bipartisan in picking fights. But I will tell you, it's a joy to work with him because he's knowledgeable, he's straightforward, he tells you what he thinks and his voice will be missed in the halls of State Government. Good luck to you, Doug."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to recognize Doug for all he's done for this state and to be honest, for this country. He was one of the first people that reached out to me when I was first appointed. He's been a terrific friend, a great hunting partner as well, which I... I hope continues. And I just want to tell everybody here that... that I don't

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

know of anybody who reaches out in a more bipartisan fashion for the good of business in this state than Doug Whitley. Doug, thank you. And I really, really will miss you but look forward to hopefully seeing you in a different capacity."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I go back a long ways with Doug Whitley. He's not only a colleague here in Springfield but he's also a close personal friend. And so, not only do I lose somebody today who I respect deeply for his institutional knowledge, but a guy who has been a friend. And Doug, I hope our friendship continues, because I don't know how far you're going, but I... I would suggest it'll be as far as the game is, that is fishing and hunting. So, you're probably not going to be around much. But let me... let me just say this. You have been a premiere person. And I say that from the standpoint that when you brought us information, it was good information. When you got up and talked in front of us, you always told the truth. And you weren't afraid to take on the tough issues, whether it was tort reform, workers' compensation, tax revision and reform. All of the tough issues passed over your desk and you were very articulate in picking up the business community by your good, solid words of advice encouragement. There won't be a day that we won't miss you. Although you've got a good replacement coming on board, there won't be a day that we miss your institutional knowledge, your capability, your capacity. And finally, I just have to say this. One of my dearest friends on the floor here reminded me that you're an SIU grad. And that's wonderful. So, congratulations on a wonderful career. And as one of the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

previous speakers said, you have done this state yeoman's work and it will not be forgotten ever. Thank you, Doug."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, Doug Whitley has represented the Illinois Chamber all across the state and has done his best at engaging our communities in the political and the legislative process. He's an individual that has been tireless. I'm sure he's been in your communities. But of recent time, what I think is most important about what Doug has done is to look at the positive side of Illinois. We hear so much about the negative and there is something negative. But there's also a lot of blessings and accomplishments and reasons that we can attract business and do much better than we have been doing at creating jobs and creating new businesses in our state. So, Doug, I want to certainly thank you for that positive message and the positive message you have been taking around this state for so many years. I hope you won't quit doing that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you... thank you, Speaker. I also rise to thank Doug for all the work he's done here but also to recognize even as he's been busy working issues with the Legislature and the State Government, it's been my pleasure, of course, to work with him locally as a constituent living in Kane County, seeing him in his capacity as a committeeman through lots of local events and knowing that he brings that same knowledge and expertise, really, to every level at which he has been involved. And I just want to add my thanks as well. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. Congratulations, Doug. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions. Don't get too excited."
- Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1170, offered by Representative Lang. House Resolution 1174, offered by Representative Greg Harris. House Resolution 1175, offered by Representative David Harris. House Resolution 1177, offered by Representative Jones. And House Resolution 1178, offered by Representative Dunkin."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Page 21 of the Calendar, Order of Resolutions, House Joint Resolution 73, Mr. Bradley. Please proceed, Sir."
- Bradley: "This would designate a part of Highway 148 (sic-184) after Private George Allan Jones. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Verschoore. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 91, Representative Kifowit. Please proceed."
- Kifowit: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 91 addresses a growing issue of veteran suicide. We lose many veterans that are coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan each day to taking their own lives after the effects of war that

141st Legislative Day

- they have seen. And this Resolution establishes a veterans' suicide task force."
- 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Cross, McAuliffe. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 95, Representative Tracy. Please proceed."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 95 urges the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to develop amendments to specified and specific rules concerning levee construction and flood risks."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cabello. Gentleman does not wish to speak.

 Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The
 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Joint
 Resolution 97, Representative Golar. Please proceed."
- Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 97 designates the month of June 2014 as Prescription Monitoring Month... Monitoring Month. For nearly 30 years, this prescription monitoring program has been a national model for tracking prescriptions. Its goal is to assist prescribers and dispensers in the effective treatment of patients seeking medical care. The... this particular program is federally funded and is a part of the Illinois Department of Human Services. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 825, Representative Hatcher. Out of

141st Legislative Day

- the record. House Resolution 917, Representative Bellock. Please proceed."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 9... what is it... 917, I'm sorry, is to raise the awareness about heroin abuse, an awareness day."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 934, Mr. McSweeney. Please proceed. Out of the record. House Resolution 984, Mr. Cross. Please proceed."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This perhaps has a... could use a different title but it is a very serious title, a very serious issue. We found in the... we heard... when we were in committee, we heard from a father and turns out there are numerous cases around the state centered around eating disorders and people losing their lives over the eating disorders, especially... and I shouldn't say especially women. It actually affects men and women from the sporting world to kids worrying about the appearance of their weight. This attempts to get at the issue of eating disorders and one of the respond... one of the areas that's involved with eating disorders is the... I guess you would almost use the term addiction to laxatives. So, I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Beiser, Franks, Rita. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 986, Mr. Cabello. Please proceed."

141st Legislative Day

- Cabello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution is trying to get the GED back down to \$50. Right now, the... the price tag is \$150. Many people that need to go through a GED program are financially at a disadvantage. We would hope that they would bring it back down. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 998, Mr. Meier. Please proceed."
- Meier: "Yes. This Resolution asks DHS to complete the study on the Jacksonville closure and to release it as soon as possible."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1047, Leader Turner. Please proceed."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Resolution 1047 encourages schools participating in the school breakfast program to utilize alternative delivery models such as the breakfast in the classroom, grab and go, and second chance breakfast to provide breakfast after the bell to all students at no cost to students."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1069, Mr. Ford. Please proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Leader and Members of the House. House Resolution 1069 simply urges the Governor and the Department of Corrections to discourage prosecutors from recommending and judges from sentencing low-level offenders to the county

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

jail or to the Department of Corrections. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti on the Motion."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't have a chance to hear the Representative. I do know what the Resolution does, but if he could state the purpose again."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford, could you explain the Resolution again, Sir?"

Ford: "Yes, Speaker. The Resolution, HR1096 (sic-HR1069) urges the Governor and the Department of Corrections to discourage prosecutors from recommending and judges from sentencing low-level drug offenders to the county jail or to the Department of Corrections."

Reboletti: "I have some questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Representative, who would this Resolution be delivered to?"

Ford: "This Resolution would be delivered to the Governor and to the Department of Corrections' director."

Reboletti: "And the purpose of the Resolution is to... I mean, I would assume right now that the Department of Corrections probably has the ability by their own rule and by statute to release anybody who's within a year of... on parole, they can release people within a year of their outdate. So, are you asking them to do that now by this Resolution?"

Ford: "Well, I think that the goal is to change the tone of what prosecutors and... and judges do when it comes to sending low-level offenders to jail. SPAC did a study and I just want to share the numbers since you asked. We have right now in the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

State of Illinois 10,999 Class 4 felons in the Department of Corrections, around that number."

- Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate that, Representative. I have talked to SPAC and we had the numbers on the Class 3s and Class 4s.

 What do you consider a low-level drug offender?"
- Ford: "Well, I mean, I think that what's classified under the law, a low-level drug offender would be possession of a controlled substance, what would that... I guess about the 3,575 people that's incarcerated in the Department of Corrections right now would be the people that I would consider low-level drug offenders."
- Reboletti: "And the only thing you would ask is that instead of placing them in custody in the county jail or in DOC, you'd want them to be placed in home confinement."
- Ford: "I don't want to make that determination. What I want to do is make sure that we're thinking differently in the state and make sure that we use all the proper considerations for taxpayer dollars."
- Reboletti: "Well, and I appreciate that, Representative. I think you and I share the desire to deal with the issue of drug addiction for those that are plagued by it from a public health perspective. But one of the issues is that you... you ask that they be released to home confinement."

Ford: "That's a consideration."

Reboletti: "And I'm... and... and I... I'm trying to figure out what would they derive from home confinement? How would that be monitored?"

Ford: "Okay. That's good."

Reboletti: "Are they on GPS?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Ford: "Yeah."

Reboletti: "Is parole monitoring? Can you please..."

Ford: "Yeah. Yeah, it would be GPS. I mean, in Cook County right now, there's home confinement. I'm sure that there's home confinement in other counties. But the goal is to make sure that people are out in their own communities where they can receive mental health support or they could receive support from their families, where they could receive support they... they need because we hear far too often that the Department of Corrections is strapped for cash and they are not able to provide the care that the people need in those departments."

Reboletti: "And I understand that. But when you're releasing people to home confinement, there isn't necessarily any programming for the individual at home confinement, is there?"

Ford: "That's not true. I think that when you're released and you're released under the care of still being paroled to someone and you're still incarcerated, but you're just serving your time at home. And so, I think that that's better for taxpayer dollars. I think the cost of home confinement is substantially lower than keeping a low-level offender that is no threat to society incarcerated on taxpayer dollars."

Reboletti: "And I don't disagree that it's a... it cost less. I guess the problem is, Representative, at some point, there has to be a penalty somewhere because I can tell you that when I was a narcotics prosecutor, sometimes individuals would come back either from DOC or from the county jail and tell... and they would thank me because that's where they hit rock bottom, that's where they began to turn their life around

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

because it stopped them from using. It's also a deterrent. So, are you suggesting, then, that there be no penalty, then..." Ford: "No."

Reboletti: "...for..."

Ford: "That's... home confinement is incarceration but is confined to your own home. I'm suggesting that we continue to provide the support for the criminal and make sure that they receive their services, but not at the expense of taxpayers. And we should be penny-wise and pound-foolish. And in this case, I think that sending people to home confinement that poses no threat to the community is the best way to do it."

Reboletti: "And besides possession cases, low-level, small amounts of... of controlled substances, would this include... would low-level drug offenders include drug dealers?"

Ford: "Well, I didn't... I didn't identify and I don't intend to identify who should be a part of this program. It'd be up to the... it'd be up to the judges and the prosecutors. But I think that the goal of the Resolution is to change the mindset and be more of a productive state and not more of a state where we're locking people up in Department of Corrections or in county jails."

Reboletti: "Well, to the Resolution briefly, Mr. Speaker. I... I continue looking forward to working with Representative Ford in the numerous committees and task forces I'm sure I'll be working on over the summer to resolve some of these issues. But I think that prosecutors also do as much as they can in the courtroom to help those that are afflicted with addiction to try to divert them from incarceration and place them into treatment. I think they've been trying to do best practices

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

but we continue to evolve in that arena. And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for a Roll Call."

Speaker Lang: "Your request will be acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I concur with my colleague who just spoke on many aspects and I... I think the sentiment of this Resolution is something that I would like to support except some of the words in it... and this is really to my side of the aisle, I caution people before voting 'yes' on this because it's now a Roll Call, that in addition to the sentiment of keeping low-level offenders out of jail so that we don't have overpopulation, which is a sentiment I think many agree with, this also says it encourages the Governor and the director of Corrections to do everything in their power to have low-level drug offenders currently serving sentences in the Department of Correction facilities be released to home confinement. I think that is overreaching and... and really, for that part of the Resolution, which is why I voted 'no' against it in committee, I encourage a 'no' vote on this Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford to close."

Ford: "You heard enough. Thank you. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cross, DeLuca. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes', 67 voting 'no'. And the Resolution fails. House Resolution 1073, Mr. Bradley. Mr. Bradley. Mr.

141st Legislative Day

- John Bradley. Please proceed. Out of the record. House Resolution 1076, Representative Mautino. Please proceed."
- Mautino: "House Resolution 1076 urges the United States Congress and the President of the United States to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, which expires in December 31 of 2014. Appreciate your 'aye' votes. Be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1079, Mr. Moffitt. Please proceed."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1079 is one that we're doing for workforce investment and it recognizes the week of August 25 through August 31, 2014 as Workforce Development Week in the State of Illinois and encourages individuals, business, and governmental organizations to visit and promote the progress and services offered through local workforce investment boards. They're around the state and I hope you will do that. And this recognizes them."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1081, Mr. Ford. Please proceed."
- Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Resolution 1081 urges the President to do everything in America's power to assist for the release and return of the young ladies abducted by the Boko Haram militant forces. And... and so, I urge a 'aye' vote on House Resolution... House Resolution 1081."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1086, Representative Wheeler. Please proceed."
- Wheeler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1086 urges the President Obama and Congress to review the case for Loren Duke Abdalla to receive the Medal of Honor for his actions during World War II."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1092, Mr. Martwick. Please proceed."
- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1092 urges medical marijuana dispensaries to dispense the product in locking containers, four-digit locking code containers to prevent access to drugs by those who are not entitled to them. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1093, Representative Gabel. Please proceed."
- Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1093 urges the Governor to design and execute a strategy for dealing with poverty and hunger by having six of our task forces and advisory groups work together to address this problem."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1099, Mr. Reboletti. Mr. Reboletti. Is that your best speed, Sir? Mr. Reboletti on the Resolution."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. I would just ask that we designate June 21 of this year as Strike Out Rett Syndrome Day in the state."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1101, Mr. Moylan. Please proceed."
- Moylan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1101 commends
 Honeywell UOP for its century of service to the state and
 designates June 17, 2014 as Honeywell UOP Day."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1114, Mr. Brown. Please proceed."
- Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1114 designates the month of May 2014 as ALS Awareness or Lou Gehrig's Disease Awareness Month in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1119, Representative Tracy. Please proceed. Representative Tracy."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 1119 urges the Illinois House of Representatives to recognize that every student is unique and that all children learn at a different pace. We're urging the Illinois Board of Education to encourage and promote inclusiveness of children with special needs in any way possible in the regular classrooms and curriculum within our school systems. We've found that very much it's... it's good for the students of the special needs, their families, and likewise of... of students in the regular classroom and their families as well. And that is the gist of this Resolution."

141st Legislative Day

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

 Senate Joint Resolution 47, Mr. Unes. Please proceed."
- Unes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 47 names a portion of Illinois State Route 116 between... on Farmington Road between Hanna City and Elmwood Assistant Fire Chief Brian T. Hauk Memorial Highway. Chief Hauk died in the line of duty in 1997. The community has really come together for this fire department. There's a lot of community pride. They just recently opened a new fire station and this is entirely appropriate and fitting to name this portion of highway for Chief Hauk. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mautino, Sims. Sims. Sims. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 48, Representative Tracy. Please proceed."
- Tracy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 48 asks that the Illinois General Assembly pay honor and respect to the Warren County Sheriff's Deputy George V. Darnell who was killed in the line of action in 1981 on U.S. Route 67 north of Monmouth in Warren County, Illinois. And so, we're asking that the Illinois Department of Transportation post a appropriate signage along that highway to commemorate and honor Deputy Sheriff George V. Darnell who gave up his life while serving his state. Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Resolution will vote 'yes'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McAuliffe. Please take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Turner for a Motion."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to suspend the posting requirement for Senate Bill 1740."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to suspend the posting requirement for Senate Bill 1740. I know there's no objection from the other side. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the posting notice is suspended for Senate Bill 1740. On the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 5330, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. You're looking mighty fine today. We were just... reason why I was over there, first of all, is I was looking for an interpreter, Mr. Forby for Mr. Brown. Senate Amendment #1, all it does is adds three members to the... to be appointed to the task force, one bilingual educator, school principal of Chicago Public Schools and special ed. I'll take any questions. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the Concurrence with Senate Amendment 1. Those in favor vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Reis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5330. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Arroyo is

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

recognized. So, he's... so, you're not recognized. Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "I have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "State your inquiry."

Reboletti: "I see the Speaker's on the floor. I was wondering what the rest of the day looked like as far as any committees or floor action?"

Speaker Lang: "When we have all of that information, Sir, we'll provide it to you."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "At my earliest possible opportunity. Under the Order of Resolutions, on page 25 of the Calendar, there appears House Resolution 1146. Speaker Madigan on the Resolution."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Resolution is concerned with power and power production for the State of Illinois. It's recently come to our attention that there's a concern and a danger that the nuclear power plants at the Quad Cities and at Clinton might eventually be forced to shut down, which would be a dramatic change in the power supply for the state. It all gets very complicated. It gets into power production, power pricing, a lot of which is done by the Illinois Power Authority. This Resolution recites the current problems with power supply in the state. It recites the problems that have been caused by oversupply from certain sectors. And the Resolution simply requests that several state agencies get involved in a study of the problem and then report back as to how the state, generally through the Illinois Power Authority, might be able to manage the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

situation so that we maintain the level of power and the price of power that we have today, which is very favorable. And so, I would move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney on the Resolution."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Resolution. This is a commonsense Resolution that will promote this long-term economic development in Illinois. These nuclear power plants are very important. They're base load power and the alternative and what I'm glad we're not sitting here discussing is for Exelon to come and demand a state bailout. That's not what this is. This is a bipartisan call for action at the federal and state level to make sure that market-based solutions are helping to facilitate the continuing operations of these nuclear facilities. I fully support this Resolution and urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Smiddy."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor of the Resolution yields."

Smiddy: "To the Resolution. One of the power plants is in my district in Cordova, Illinois and the economic impact that this will have, if we do not try to do something, is 800 permanent jobs in my district along with several million dollars in property tax revenue and loss of funds for our school district. I would like to thank Speaker Madigan and Leader Durkin for bringing this forward. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I want to thank the Speaker and reiterate a comment made by one of my

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

colleagues. This is a bipartisan effort. Leader Durkin also is in favor of this. I think it makes good common sense. And again, I want to thank all involved in bringing this Resolution forward. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Martwick: "Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Green Caucus and some of the environmental organizations have expressed with... expressed some concerns with this. There was a piece of advocacy... written advocacy that expressed that there... there were subsidies to nuclear power plants involved in this Resolution. Can you speak to that? Are there any subsidies that would be created by this Resolution?"

Madigan: "Well, the answer is no. The Resolution does what I said and what Mr. McSweeney said. It simply calls upon the appropriate state agencies to do a good study on the question of power, power supply, power pricing. That's all it does."

Martwick: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you. I, also, rise in support of the Speaker's Resolution. I... I do want to mention, though, that not only do... are nukes important, a balance is important. And 40... 47 percent of our power is provided by... by coal. And as we move forward and we look at... at not only this Resolution but I think there's another Resolution that's pending out there, we have to send a message that it's important for we, the states, that have the opportunity to make sure that our power grid is fed at a level that's affordable to the... to our constituents,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that it allows for both the fuels that we use right now as we develop other green fuels. But I do stand in support of it.

I hope that the other Resolution gets called as well."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I know Nekritz: there's a lot of pot... support for this Resolution on the floor and everyone that's spoken so far is for that. But lest we think that everyone in the State of Illinois supports nuclear... supports nuclear power, there... and it is the policy of the State of Illinois, actually, under our current statutes not to expand nuclear power. And while I'm... I have a lot of sympathy for the communities that might suffer some... some very significant consequences if some of our plants were to close down and we do need to have a significant... a strong base load here in Illinois. I think that... that there are some concerns about nuclear power generally and the waste that's produced from that and what we're doing with that and how we're handling it. And so, a Resolution like this, I think, needs to... there needs to at least be some expression of the concern of ... of those who don't think that ... that we ought to be promoting and... and lauding nuclear power and overlooking the significant downsides that exist from it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To... to the Bill. So, I appreciate the energy and jobs that nuclear power brings to the state but I also would also would like us to recognize the... the energy and jobs that the renewable sector could bring to the state as well. And my, you know, main question with this Resolution is really the idea that nuclear power is clean. I

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

think that, although it doesn't emit carbon, there are still quite a few radioisotopes and other things that it puts into the atmosphere. And also the whole issue of... of nuclear waste. So, I appreciate the energy and jobs that nuclear power brings and look forward to working with everyone on this issue next year."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution 103, offered by Representative Lang. This is referred to the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please give your attention to the Chair. We are prepared to recess so that the Appropriations-Public Safety Committee can meet immediately in Room 114. Immediately upon the conclusion of that committee, the Republicans will caucus in Room 118. And the House will be in recess to the call of the Chair. We will be back after the Republican Caucus. The House will be in recess. The House will be in order. Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the… Representative Sosnowski could be excused for the rest of the day."

Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that, Sir. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House

141st Legislative Day

- Bill 3794. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 29, 2014: recommends be adopted, referred to the Order of Resolutions is House Joint Resolution 103."
- Speaker Lang: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 3794. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 3794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Arroyo, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo on the Amendment."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to adopt Amendment #1. It contains appropriations in the amount of \$1 million. I'd like to adopt."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to adopt the Amendment. Those in favor 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 3794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3794 contains appropriations in the amount of \$1.1 million. The appropriation comes from Transportation Bond Series D Fund. One billion is for statewide road projects. The remainder... the remaining \$1 million is for a total apportion to be distributed in the same manner as the Motor Fuel Tax formula.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

The Department of Transportation has supplied a list of shovel-ready projects for the summer which their moneys would be used. This is... I am happy to answer any questions. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Gabel."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Gabel: "So, is it... it's \$1.1 billion, right, not million?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Gabel: "Okay. And the... it lays out where the... where the million goes, but where does the billion go?"

Arroyo: "What was that question, again?"

Gabel: "It looks like in the Bill that... that it's described where the million goes, but I'm not sure if it says where the billion goes? Or is that in the Bill too?"

Arroyo: "One hundred million will go into Motor Fuel Tax formula."

Gabel: "And the billion? Where does that..."

Arroyo: "And the billion would be distributed by IDOT for road projects that are ready to go that have been in the... been ready to go for... since the summer."

Gabel: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz. Representative Nekritz."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Nekritz: "Representative, how... we're going to be spending a billion one here that we're going to be bonding for. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Nekritz: "And what is the revenue source through which we're going to pay that?"

Arroyo: "I believe that comes from IDOT. IDOT is asking for the money to spend it on projects that were shovel-ready."

Nekritz: "The money comes from IDOT?"

Arroyo: "The debt sever... the debt services."

Nekritz: "So, isn't that... And how... So, there's... IDOT is paying debt service now? How are we going to pay for more debt service out of this?"

Arroyo: "The debt services would be from GRF."

Nekritz: "So, we're going to be spending GRF on a brand new capital program?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Nekritz: "So, I thought we passed a... an appropriations Bill, some... some spending Bills a few days ago that we... that I didn't... I didn't know there was additional GRF from what we were... from what we were spending when we passed the... the regular appropriations Bills a few days ago."

Arroyo: "None of this would be in the debt services in FY15."

Nekritz: "And after that?"

Arroyo: "Then it would be included."

Nekritz: "I'm sorry. It would be what?"

Arroyo: "Then it would be included."

Nekritz: "Included in what?"

Arroyo: "In the debt service."

Nekritz: "Okay. I... I apologize, Representative. I'm... I'm not following you very well. So, this comes out of GRF?"

Arroyo: "The first debt services would be in FY2015... '16."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Nekritz: "Okay. I got it. So... so, we're not going to issue the bonds right now so there won't be any debt service to be paid in FY15. So, starting in FY16, we're going to be... we're going to be obligating more General Revenue to go to this... to go to this program?"

Arroyo: "Correct."

Nekritz: "Okay. So, we already have a pretty significant hole in our FY16 budget I'm looking for. And what are... what are the nature of the projects that are going to be spent? Or what are we... what are we going to be buying when we're issuing these bonds?"

Arroyo: "We're going to be spending the money on shovel-ready projects that are ready right now."

Nekritz: "And what kind of... what kind of projects are those?"

Arroyo: "Mostly road projects."

Nekritz: "Are there any... are there any transit projects in there?"

Arroyo: "No. I... I believe it's all road projects."

Nekritz: "It's all roads and bridges?"

Arroyo: "Yep."

Nekritz: "And do you have any idea, are those road and bridges all over the state?"

Arroyo: "I believe so. Yes."

Nekritz: "Okay. So..."

Arroyo: "Statewide... statewide projects."

Nekritz: "...so, we're going to be... we're going to be increase...

and... and the other thing we're doing here is we're going to
be, in conjunction with this, not in this Bill but in
conjunction with this, we're going to be raising our debt
service?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Arroyo: "Correct. In a later Bill."

Nekritz: "So, let me get this straight. So, we're going to be raising our debt service. We are going to be spending money out of GRF and we're going to be doing only roads and bridges..."

Arroyo: "Correct."

Nekritz: "...in... in districts all over the state?"

Arroyo: "Yes. I believe there are nine districts."

Nekritz: "Okay. Very good. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. I'm... I'm really troubled by this, the way we're approaching this right now. I know that we're not... that this doesn't include any FY15 General Revenue Funds, but it is obligating us at a time when we don't know what's going to be the situation in our FY16 budget. And if I look down the road, at this juncture, as we're doing this right now, that... that is not a pretty picture for FY16. So, I think that this is not the right time for us to be considering obligating General Revenue Funds in the future at a time, again, when we don't know what that's going to be. And for us to be only doing roads and bridges, not considering transit, not considering the full transpo... transportation needs of this state, I think this is the wrong approach."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Speaker. I just rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. This Bill will take about a billion dollars in shovel-ready projects, bring them forward using the multiyear plan. There's no new capital structure within this. We are going to bring those forward and the idea behind it is

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

that when we did the Illinois First bonds, we had a revenue stream which is produced by that. As those bonds are paid down, we look at those revenues. They are producing more dollars than... than what the... than what was needed for that. So, we will use that as the revenue stream going forward. It will not cost from the GRF in '16. That's the intention. And it is to take shovel-ready projects, not new projects, because I agree with the previous speaker, we need a full-blown capital program but we also need to look statewide. We need to maintain, through spending this out, the traditional split between upstate and downstate. This is very fair. It's just projects brought forward. So, I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you. A few questions of the Sponsor, please?"
Speaker Lang: "Proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, I just want to focus a little bit on the list of projects that the \$1 billion will be addressing."

Arroyo: "I believe... I believe, Mr. Sandack, that IDOT will be releasing the list of the projects on their website within the next day or so."

Sandack: "I hadn't even asked the question yet, but I... I appreciate that premeditated response. Let's just walk through this a little slowly. So, the idea is IDOT is going to have a transparent process, identifying the shovel-ready projects that this money will address?"

Arroyo: "What was your question, again?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sandack: "Is it your idea, is it your intention, to your knowledge, will IDOT have a transparent process identifying the shovel-ready projects?"

Arroyo: "I believe so. I believe so."

Sandack: "Have you seen the list of the projects that this money will address?"

Arroyo: "I did see some of it."

Sandack: "Have you seen all of it?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "In the body of the Bill, will the projects be listed?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sandack: "In what way will the projects be attached to a list consistent with this Bill? What will connect the two?"

Arroyo: "We just got a commitment from the secretary of IDOT."

Sandack: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. Pardon me?"

Arroyo: "We just got a commitment from the secretary of IDOT."

Sandack: "In the form of what? How was that commitment parlayed?"

Arroyo: "That she's going to list the projects. I believe some of the Members have probably seen some of the projects, some of the projects that were ready... shovel-ready."

Sandack: "Have... as the Sponsor of this Bill, have you seen the comprehensive list that the 1.1 billion will address in capital projects?"

Arroyo: "No, I have not."

Sandack: "Does it concern you at all that you have not seen the list yet?"

Arroyo: "No. No, it does not. I believe that the secretary of IDOT has been very good at what she does and she's got a... I go by her word and her word has been good so far."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sandack: "And I have no doubt that we shouldn't trust it, but of course, we're talking about a major capital... capital expenditure of 1.1 billion. Is it your intention that there'll be any letter of intent or some type of letter, written memorialization..."

Arroyo: "I don't know. I don't know about no letter."

Sandack: "...to the Bill? Representative, how are we going to attach..."

Arroyo: "The... the secretary..."

Sandack: "...the projects..."

Arroyo: "...their secretary..."

Sandack: "...to the Bill?"

Arroyo: "...has committed that she will release some of the list on the computer, on the website, in the next couple of days."

Sandack: "In the next couple of days. Will the Bill somehow connect to that website?"

Arroyo: "She... she committed to those projects that are shovel-ready."

Sandack: "Okay. And..."

Arroyo: "In writing."

Sandack: "In writing?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sandack: "She has."

Arroyo: "She will. She will. She hasn't."

Sandack: "And is there a current list available to Members of the General Assembly to see which projects are shovel-ready?"

Arroyo: "There is a list available and staff has it."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Sandack: "Representative, is... will there be a Memorandum of Understanding or some type of letter of intent ultimately that will be appended to this capital Bill?"

Arroyo: "Our understanding would be that there's going to be a letter of intent. Yes."

Sandack: "Thank you, Sir. I appreciate that. I don't have anything further, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, men... much of the revenue that is going to be allocated to paying off these bonds was passed before most of us were in this chamber, back in '98. A few of you were here. As those bonds get paid off, that revenue is still coming in from those... those increases. And that's what IDOT and the Governor's Office is going to reallocate that money that's coming in that no longer has to pay off bonds to these new bonds. There's no new taxes, there's no new fees. Most of our side of the aisle, especially me, wouldn't necessarily advocate for that. So, this is a good thing that we're reinvesting that money into infrastructure and not, as some may have put forth a few years ago, going to pay pensions, going to pay for a new program. So, this is money that's already been allocated. It's coming in. We're going to reissue the bonds. The projects are going to be scattered throughout the state. We had a very bad winter this year. There are a lot of miles of roads and bridges in Illinois that need to be taken care of. And I would hope that people, regardless of how their district looks, I don't get

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

very much money out of this, but you know what? Projects that were on the list got moved up. Some projects that may have not been in the... in the one-year program this year are probably going to get moved into that. It helps the whole state. It helps the whole district. I would encourage an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And a few questions of the Sponsor, if I may?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I understand that this is a spending Bill, an appropriation Bill rather than a revenue Bill, but there has been some questions coming up about revenue. So, let me just make sure that I'm clear and that the other Members are clear about the funding on this. It's my understanding that we are going to be using... I don't want to say proceeds because... we have the Illinois First program in effect, which was funded by some vehicle fees, alcohol fees, I think there was a soda tax in there that has funding the series of bonds that is used for Illinois First. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Not the soda tax but everything else, yes."

Harris, D.: "Everything else except the soda tax. And I think there was some vehicle registration fees included or something like that. That's... that's all part of what funds Illinois First. Correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes. Yes."

Harris, D.: "Is that... is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, those... those revenues are... that revenue stream is going to continue."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "So, as the series of bonds for Illinois First is retired, that means that's debt service that we no longer have to pay. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, that's debt service that we no longer have to pay, which not having to pay that debt service would mean that that would have been going into General Revenue. But in this case, instead of going to General Revenue, we're able to float new bonds under this program, which... for which the interest will not be due for at least two fiscal years. Is that correct?"

Arrovo: "Yes."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So, I think we're getting..."

Arroyo: "We're getting there."

Harris, D.: "...greater clarity about what... what... how this is... how this is working. So, we're going to float some new bonds based on a revenue stream which is augmented by the retirement of other bonds. So, there's not an immediate affect to General Revenue. The... there is, if you want, an impact on General Revenue in that the bonds that are retired, that debt service, would have gone into General Revenue as debt service that would not have to be paid. But in this case, it's simply going to stay in that stream of debt service retirement. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "That's correct."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification.

And I will tell you that, while it is a workable program to address a definite need here in the State of Illinois with the... the horrible winter we've had and the road conditions that we have, this is a reasonable approach to funding this bonding... bonded program. And I stand in support of the program and I hope others will as well."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Drury: "Representative Arroyo, you've been asked a lot of questions, but I still don't have a clue as to how this program works. So, in your own words, can you explain to us what this Bill does?"

Arroyo: "This Bill is going to fix a lot of roads. Since we had such a bad winter, this is a good Bill to be able to fix some of those roads that have been waiting to fix. So, these dollars would be able to do that and IDOT. I'm pretty sure a lot of roads downstate, upstate, all the districts in the... in IDOT, I believe there's nine districts and there's a lot of funding that needs to be passed through here to fix those roads and bridges 'cause of this rough winter."

Drury: "Okay. I appreciate it was a rough winter and I appreciate we're going to fix some roads, but can you explain in your own words where... where this money, this billion one is coming from?"

Arroyo: "Bond proceeds."

Drury: "What... what bonds? Have we sold these bonds yet?"

Arroyo: "No."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Drury: "We have not sold the bonds?"

Arroyo: "No."

Drury: "So, when do we plan to... to issue these bonds?"

Arroyo: "We... we would have to vote on the authorization tomorrow to sell the bonds."

Drury: "So, tomorrow, we're going to... we're going to vote to authorize to sell a billion dollars in bonds?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Drury: "And what is the rate cap going to be on that sale?"

Arroyo: "We don't ... I don't have that right offhand."

Drury: "I..."

Arroyo: "But I can get it to you."

Drury: "Is that known?"

Arroyo: "I would have to get that to you."

Drury: "Okay. And there's been a lot of talk about retiring bonds or something. Do you know what any of that is? I wasn't here back in 1998. What... what are they talking about, these bonds that were sold in 1998?"

Arroyo: "It's bonds from the old Illinois First project then."

Drury: "What was the rate that those bonds were sold at back in 1998?"

Arroyo: "We don't have that right now, but I can get that to you."

Drury: "Well, can... can you take this out of the record 'til we get the information?"

Arroyo: "No."

Drury: "Why not?"

Arroyo: "Because we have a deadline here to meet."

141st Legislative Day

- Drury: "Well, I'm not saying... I'm not saying all day. I'm just saying for a few minutes so we can get the rate of the 1998 bond sale."
- Arroyo: "I believe we can't do that right now, Representative.

 We're ready to move this Bill."
- Drury: "Okay. So... so, do you know if bond rate... Was Illinois credit rating better in 1998 than it is today?"
- Arroyo: "Probably so."
- Drury: "Okay. So, was the bond rate in 1998 lower than... then we can presume that the bond rate in 1998 is lower than the bond rate in 2014 given the fiscal state of Illinois."
- Arroyo: "Probably so."
- Drury: "Okay. So, we're paying off old debt and as that debt is... is, I guess, paid off, we're now going to buy new bonds at a higher rate?"
- Arroyo: "Probably."
- Drury: "Probably. Well, is it probably or is it actually?"
- Arroyo: "I... I would say probably. Right now, I don't have the answer for that."
- Drury: "Well, okay. And so, I mean, Illinois has the worst credit rating in the country right now, correct?"
- Arroyo: "I could say the... the ratings are very low right now, but we don't have the projections right now to give you actual numbers."
- Drury: "Okay. So, you don't ... you don't know, then, if Illinois has the worst credit rating in... in the country?"
- Arroyo: "I don't... I don't follow that. I'm here to pass a Bill to try to get roads and bridges for the State of Illinois. So,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

I couldn't give you that. But I'll be happy to give you that information..."

Drury: "Okay. And so, then I..."

Arroyo: "...at a later time."

Drury: "There were some earlier questions that... so, we're going to find out the bond rate, possibly tomorrow, what the cap is going to be. And then you're also saying that tomorrow or in the next few days, we'll find out what these projects are?"

Arroyo: "We know what the projects are, but we could give you what you're asking for for the rate, what the rate is going to be."

Drury: "But where's the list of the projects? Can I look that up right now somewhere?"

Arroyo: "They are going to give it to you within the next day."

Drury: "In the next day? Okay."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Drury: "Do you listen to music, Representative Arroyo?"

Arroyo: "Excuse me?"

Drury: "Do you lis... Sorry. Are you... are you a music fan?"

Arroyo: "Every... every now and then I listen to a radio."

Drury: "Okay. Do you... do you ever buy concert tickets or anything like that?"

Arroyo: "I've bought plenty of concert tickets."

Drury: "Okay. So then you might know in recent years, bands have started selling their concert tickets before the new album comes out. Are you aware of that... that new... that new trend?"

Arroyo: "Yes, Sir."

Drury: "And... and the reason that they do that is because they know that the album is bad and that if you buy the tickets

141st Legislative Day

- after the album's out, no one would actually buy it. Are you aware of that?"
- Arroyo: "Speaker, it's loud. I can't hear what he's saying. I... I don't know what kind of concert he's talking about, but I'm... I'm interesting to find out where we're going with this concert tickets."
- Drury: "Well, I mean, I just think it's curious that, you know, it's known in the music industry that... that bands will sell their tickets before an album comes out because they know the album's going to suck and they want to get all the money upfront. And so, now what you're asking us to do is to vote on a Bill where we don't know what the projects are going to be until tomorrow. And so, what's the difference between the concert ticket scenario and this Bill that you're running here?"
- Arroyo: "This is... I wouldn't compare it to a concert because this is a road... roads and bridges that we have to repair. I don't see the concept with the selling the tickets ahead of time if they're going to lose the rate of the value. I'm lost right now for words when it comes to a concert tickets. Usually when I buy concert tickets, I go to the concert. I don't buy them ahead of time. Where I come from, we don't buy anything ahead of time until the concert comes up. So..."
- Drury: "But... but where you're from, you'll buy a hundred billion...
 a billion dollars in... in bonds before you know what it's going
 to be used for specifically."
- Arroyo: "The... the only tickets I've ever bought is probably a hundred dollar ticket. You know, if you want to compare a

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

hundred dollars to a billion dollars, I think there's a.m. it's a big difference."

Drury: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is... we're about to authorize spending a billion dollars on some unknown projects at a... and we're going to do it at an unknown rate, which we'll all find out tomorrow. But for some reason, they want us to buy today. This is the definition of irresponsible. It's the definition, if we think of the... over the debate the last few days, the definition of hypocrisy in this chamber. And we should all be a... a 'no' vote on this until we have more information. I mean, it's... it is just the definition of irresponsibility."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I don't know that... that you're going to have an answer to this question, but there's a House Bill that we often refer to as a 'bimp' Bill and I happen to be reviewing that. And in there, there's a revolving fund for workers' compensation where there's 20 to 25 million dollars that's coming out of the Road Fund. Do you know why that is?"

Arroyo: "Like you said, Kay, I don't know."

Kay: "I'm Dwight."

Arroyo: "Dwight. I don't know anything about the Road Fund right now."

Kay: "Well, I quess..."

Arroyo: "It's not part of this."

Kay: "...my question is everybody that I've heard ask you questions have asked you about how we're paying for things, about

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

bonding, about future benefits. And I'm going to ask you some more questions. But if we're taking money out of the..."

Arroyo: "I'm pretty sure."

Kay: "...Road Fund, why would we even begin to borrow or additional bond for the Road Fund?"

Arroyo: "Dwight, this is not nothing to do with the Road Fund."

Kay: "Okay. Why would we..."

Arroyo: "Why would you want to open up..."

Kay: "...why would we put any general obligation bo..."

Arroyo: "Do you want to open up a conversation..."

Kay: "I'm talking right now."

Arroyo: "...about the Road Fund?"

Kay: "Pardon me. I'm talking. I know a little bit about this Bill. But I'm curious as to why we have a revolving fund. We take money out of the Road Fund and then we issue general obligation bonds for down the road to pay for road work. Is there a reason for that?"

Arroyo: "Representative, there's no money from the Road Fund in this Bill."

Kay: "Not in this Bill."

Arroyo: "No."

Kay: "But that wasn't my question."

Arroyo: "Well, could you repeat your question? Maybe I misunderstood. When you talk about the Road Fund, I get really confused."

Kay: "I understand that. Let me... let me just get away from the 'bimp' Bill because what I'm saying is that we're going to take money to pay workers' compensation claims from the Road Fund in the 'bimp' Bill, and yet we're going to borrow money

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

to build or continue what I heard to be shovel-ready programs. And I think that's just wrong. Even though it's 20 or 25 million, that's just wrong. Okay. Let's start over again. So, a general obligation bond is what?"

Arroyo: "I didn't hear that, Representative?"

Kay: "A general obligation bond is what? What does it constitute?
What does it give you? What does it represent?"

Arroyo: "It's a debt service. Debt interment backed by the full faith in credit of the State of Illinois."

Kay: "It... it's debt?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "It is debt. Okay. So, I've heard Representative Reis and other people say that as we have reduced our general obligation bonds that we now are in a better position to progress along with a general obligation in the future. In other words, up the ante again so that we're right back where we started. Isn't that sort of correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. So, my next question is do you have a schedule that will tell me what our debt burden is over the next 20 years for these general obligation bonds even if they're at 10 percent?"

Arroyo: "We haven't issued them yet so we don't know that."

Kay: "Well, how in the world, Luis, can we sit here and talk about spending this kind of money without any idea as to... you have no schedule with regard to debt service? You mean..."

Arroyo: "I don't think..."

Kay: "...I... I think the people of the State of Illinois have... have a stake in this. And I think they expect more than to say

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

we'll have it tomorrow because, you know, we're spending money before we even have the revenue source in place. Doesn't that concern you a little bit?"

Arroyo: "Yes, it does. But Dwight, I don't think we have anything that we could project a 20-year window, what's going to happen in 20 years."

Kay: "Well, what kind of railroad are we running here?"

Arroyo: "I thought I was General Assembly. I didn't know I was on the railroad."

Kay: "Well, that may seem real funny. But my comments..."

Arroyo: "Well, I'm trying to..."

Kay: "...but my comments are not meant to be funny."

Arroyo: "...I'm trying to answer your questions."

Kay: "I guess I'll put it a different way. What kind of State
Government are we running here?"

Arroyo: "I'm not going to answer that either."

Kay: "Would you run a business like this?"

Arroyo: "Yeah. I think so."

Kay: "Yeah. Well, my experience is that business might fail pretty quickly with the management that you're advocating. Let me ask you another question. And maybe... maybe Representative Drury asked you this and I apologize if he did. But in this Bill, where we've got shovel-ready projects, are those projects built in and clearly stated in this Bill as the projects that will be built?"

Arroyo: "They are not line itemed..."

Kay: "Why not?"

Arroyo: "...into the Bill."

Kay: "Why not?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Arroyo: "We've never historically done this with a line item."

Kay: "Well, historically, we've done a lot of things that aren't good. But my question, Representative, is why aren't they in here? Because there is no certainty that you can predict to me or anybody in this General Assembly that those projects are going to get done unless they're in the Bill. Is that not correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Kay: "As a matter of fact, you haven't been able to substantiate today one good business reason other than we need to get these projects done so that we can move them out of the queue and move other ones up. There's not one good reason that anyone should vote... vote on this Bill today from a great or a practical financial perspective. Is that true?"

Arroyo: "No."

Kay: "Well, then answer my questions, please."

Arroyo: "I tried to answer your questions as best I can. What was your question that you didn't get answered?"

Kay: "Well, we don't have a schedule of indebtedness. We don't
know what we're borrowing."

Arroyo: "We... we haven't issued the bonds yet, Dwight."

Kay: "Well, and that's my first point. You know, we're spending money before we have a revenue stream and that's the first thing that's wrong. I mean, who in the world does that? Do you buy a house before you go to the bank? Luis, let me just be... I don't want to be... I don't want to be rude at all, but this... this is not a way to run State Government. And I'm sorry. And I know a lot of people in here think that this is a great idea. As a matter of fact, I think it's a great idea

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

to the extent that Representative Nekritz raised a great point. All we've argued about all year is holding back and try to keep spending in check and making sure that we could survive one more year, eke out another appropriations Bill for education that made sense. We've tried but we now are starting to forget what we're all about and that's providing security to the people of this state. Now, maybe that's building roads. Maybe that's shovel-ready projects. But Sir, you haven't answered one of my questions today. You've got a cadre of staff that's standing behind you that should have those answers and so should mine. But I think it's wrong to bring something like this to the floor when you can't answer very specific but general propositions to spending... a spending Bill that is going to impact the state, maybe not immediately, but in the long-term. So, I'm very disappointed, not necessarily in you because I know you're taking orders as to what to do. But I think as a practical matter, for us to sit here and say that this is good government, it's good business is simply wrong because there has not been one answer to one question that Representative Nekritz, Representative Drury or myself have asked you. And I think if I'm in your I'm a little uncomfortable. Thank you, Mr. position, Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Luis, I think we all want to have a cap... we all want capital projects. I don't think anybody questions that. We all know that we need them. We know we had a tough winter.

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

And you're right. We need to fix our roads. We need to fix our bridges. But I'm listening to the debate and I'm concerned because it appears what this Bill will do is it's going to lift our debt ceiling. But I don't know how we're going to pay for it except through General Revenue Funds. Now, I know when we did bonding under Illinois First back in 1999, that those bonds are due to expire in a few years. So, that would... that would give the state additional moneys to spend for other projects. For instance, you know, we had to cut social services, et cetera. I'm concerned that we're obligating General Revenue Funds and extending our debt ceiling and increasing our debt ceiling. And I want to know your thoughts on that."

Arroyo: "Road projects are a very important part of government, and so..."

Franks: "I get that. I want... I want you to focus on the debt ceiling portion of it. We all agree that we need projects.

But what I'm concerned about is how we're going to pay for this, if we're going to be using GRF revenue."

Arroyo: "General Revenue service will be paying the debt service in the next few years."

Franks: "How much do we... will the debt service be each year? Now, I understand one of the speakers had talked about, I think it was Mr. Harris who said for a couple of years, it wouldn't affect GRF. What happens in the third year? What would the payments be from GRF?"

Arroyo: "We won't know exactly but about 82 million."

Franks: "About \$82 million."

Arroyo: "Eighty-two to a hundred million."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Franks: "And what kind of revenue are we getting now from those additional fees and taxes that we instituted for the... for the Illinois First program?"

Arroyo: "I don't have the exact number but we can get that to you, Representative Franks."

Franks: "I'm just trying to... to see what the real hit on our budget would be because if those bonds would expire, I'm wondering how much additional capital we'd have. And the other issue that concerns me is we don't know what we're voting on. Let me ask you this. This is a billion dollars that I presume, are those the IDOT projects that you would refer to that billion?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Franks: "Okay. Then there's a hundred million separate and it looks like 49 million goes to municipalities, 16.7 goes to... looks like DuPage and Cook and then \$18 million to counties under a million inhabitants. Do we have any idea how that... how those moneys are going to be spent?"

Arroyo: "That is the current formula..."

Franks: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...from motor fuel tax that was... and it'll be... it'll be up to the locals to decide."

Franks: "All right. So, it's the same formula."

Arroyo: "Yes."

Franks: "So... so, that brings me to a segue which I'm glad you brought up, was the motor fuel tax. When we were working on our... on our task force when we came up with our opinions yesterday, our recommendations, one of the diversions that we see from the Road Funds are the tax subsidies given to E10

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

and E15. And what I would submit to you would be a better use of funds, instead of using GRF but instead of diverting money from the Road Funds, is to terminate the tax incentives we give to E10 and E15 and instead use those moneys for the bonding, thereby freeing up the GRF money for the other state agencies. And that way, we would have a revenue stream without having to attack GRF."

Arroyo: "This is from the motor fuel tax, Representative, not the Road Fund."

Franks: "No, that's the hundred million. Let's go back to the billion now. The billion is from the GRF. So, instead of using GRF funds, what I would suggest is that we terminate these tax subsidies we're giving for E10 and E15, use those moneys for road projects, so instead of diverting it from the Road Funds, use those moneys for this. And I think there'd be enough money to bond it. Has that been discussed?"

Arroyo: "That's something that we will be willing to look at in the future."

Franks: "But the problem is we got to vote on this Bill now, which is going to obligate the GRF funds. I mean, I'd prefer that we do this smart. And if we got rid of those subsidies, I think we could pay for this."

Arroyo: "Those subsidies would go into GRF, so we'll be talking about that."

Franks: "Do we have a number what those might be?"

Arroyo: "It's about approximately 280 million per year."

Franks: "Two hundred and eighty million dollars per year. And you're..."

Arroyo: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Franks: "...and you're talking about the bond payments here being \$82 million a year, correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes. Eighty to a hundred."

Franks: "So, there's an additional \$200 million a year if we do my plan, which we could have a real capital plan then. Which... and we could all have some input in it. Because right now, you're asking us to vote on a capital plan that we don't know what's in here. Here, we'd have a verifiable funding source that would bring additional moneys to GRF without the necessity of tax increases while still getting a full capital plan. Don't you think that makes more sense?"

Arroyo: "Is that a question, Jack? Was that a question?"

Franks: "Yeah. It was. I just..."

Arroyo: "Well, I... I know that... I didn't know you had a plan, Jack, but if you had a plan... you have a plan, we would be interest... we will be able to look at that next year maybe. But this is the... what we have in front of us right now."

Franks: "Okay. I appreciate... I appreciate that, Luis. I understand what you're trying to do and we all want a capital plan. And our friends in labor really want a capital plan and we want to help our friends. Certainly, that's part of the things we need... we... we do down here. But we also have an obligation to taxpayers to make sure we're making the right decisions. And though we need certain projects, I think there's a much better way to fund this than what we're looking at. And I'm very concerned because I think we're taking too much of a short-term view on this instead of looking at it long-term, because if we took a long-term view, we'd take the... the suggestion that I just put out there, saving the taxpayers hundreds of

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

millions of dollars while fully funding a real capital project. So, I'd like to listen to the rest of the debate."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

McSweeney: "What will the maturity of these bonds be? That... that's a basic question. Are these 10-year bonds, 20-year bonds, 30-year bonds? What is it?"

Arroyo: "We're not sure. We'll have to get back to you."

McSweeney: "You have to be sure. There's no way to do a capital plan without knowing the bonds. And respectfully, does the Governor's Office know? What is the maturity date for the bonds? You can't even start to talk about a Bill if you don't know the maturity date for the Bill... for the bonds."

Arroyo: "It's a maximum of 25 years."

McSweeney: "But what is it going to be, Sir? Is it going to be 10 years, 20 years? Because that's going to impact how much money we're going to spend. How can we do a Bill if you don't know the maturity of the bonds?"

Arroyo: "We'll do that when we issue the bonds."

McSweeney: "It's impossible. It's impossible to pass a capital plan if you don't know the final maturity of the bonds. It's impossible. You can't do it."

Arroyo: "It's 25 years."

McSweeney: "Well, and what is the assumed interest rate on those bonds?"

Arroyo: "The last interest rate was 4.5 percent."

McSweeney: "And what are you assuming for purposes of..."

Arroyo: "Four point one."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- McSweeney: "...what are you assuming for purposes of this discussion? Are you assuming that it's going to be higher or lower today? What is the exact interest rate going to be?"
- Arroyo: "We won't know until we go to market, 'til we sell the bonds."
- McSweeney: "Right. Can you guarantee... are you standing here today and when you say that these will be 25-year bonds? Is that correct?"
- Arroyo: "We will be saying they will be no longer than 25 years."
- McSweeney: "No, no, no. That... that's not my question. The question is will they be 25-year bonds? That will impact everything we're doing here today. You can't pass a..."

Arroyo: "Each... each..."

- McSweeney: "...capital Bill if you don't know what the maturity of the bonds is. So, tell me. Is it... is it 10 years, 15 years, 20 or 25? That'll impact how much money we're going to spend."
- Arroyo: "Each bond has a different maturity to their bond."
- McSweeney: "No. See, that's the problem here. You don't know the maturity of the bonds. You're passing a capital Bill. You don't know the maturity of the bonds. So, no we... we know we now have a 3 to 4 billion dollar hole in fiscal year '16. So, we're now going to take \$100 million from GRF. What funds are you going to sweep to get this \$100 million? What funds are you going to sweep? Are you going to sweep Red Cross? Are you going to... are you going to sweep the Alzheimer's fund? What... what fund are you going to... are you going to sweep to get this money?"

Arroyo: "We're not going to sweep no bonds."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

McSweeney: "Well, they... there's no way to pay for it. So, we don't know the interest rate. We don't know the maturity of the bonds. We're going to sweep the money again. This is outrageous. To the Bill. This process is broken. We need a capital Bill. Let's start with the Auditor's report. Only 52 percent of the money in the Road Fund is being spent on roads. The rest of it's being spent on administration. Let's start spending that money. But let me be exact, so everybody understands. Nobody can tell us what the maturity of the bonds is, so we have no idea what we're spending. So, if you vote for this Bill, you are voting to sweep funds because we don't have the money. Stop the madness. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, we've had a lot of discussions with a lot of different people, so I just kind of want to go back and talk a little bit about the debt schedule, talk a little bit about a lot of the other things that have taken place. First off, the projects themselves. According to testimony, the secretary of Transportation said these are existing projects in the five-year plan that are being pushed earlier because they're shovel-ready. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "So, these are projects that can be let this summer and get jobs in Illinois moving forward this summer?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Thank you. So, let's also talk a little bit about debt schedules and interest rates and so forth, because the

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Gentleman from Highland Park seems to want to have a litigation right now. Why don't we get to the knit... nuts and bolts of what went on? Debt schedules. Interest rates. In 1999, did we have higher or lower interest rates than we have today?"

Arroyo: "Higher."

Sullivan: "Certainly, we had higher interest rates. So, according to the Gentleman from Highland Park, he's wrong. 'Cause we are going to be paying a lower interest rate than we did in 1999. Is that correct?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. When we want to talk about maturity of these issuance, we're talking about Transportation D-Bonds that are 20, 25 years. Is that correct?"

Arrovo: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Have we ever written into a Bill what the maturity level of the bonds would be or the interest rate or the debt schedule?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sullivan: "Ever in the history of Illinois, we've never done that?"

Arroyo: "No."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a little bit of smoke and mirrors to try and kill a capital Bill. Here's the facts. We don't know what the interest rate is because we haven't sold the bonds. We don't know what the debt schedule is because we haven't sold the bonds. We know approximately it's going to be between 80 and 90 million dollars because that's what the going rate is today. So, let's

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

not kind of go over here and over here and get from what we're trying to do today. We're trying to take existing projects that have already been in the program and move them forward to create jobs in Illinois. Now, the funding source is very simple. Under a Republican Governor and a Republican Senate, we came up with an idea how to fund a project in 1999. We have excess money from that because, guess what? There's more money 'cause it's doing well, not because we're paying off bonds or paying off this. It's because we have excess revenue that we can now use for the intended purpose originally. The intended purpose originally was for a capital program. So, why wouldn't we use that excess money for this capital program? That's what we're talking about, people. Let's not go off into a separate little argument about different things and let's get back to what this Bill is today. Let's pass this Bill. Let's get Illinoisans working again."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay, your name was... Mr. Kay, you spoke in debate, Sir. Why do you rise?"

Kay: "I gu... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a verified vote."

Speaker Lang: "Sure. We'll give you a verified vote, Sir. Mr. Drury, you spoke in debate. Why is your light on?"

Drury: "My name was used in debate, Mr. Speaker. It was used by Mr. Kay."

Speaker Lang: "I do believe Mr. Kay mentioned Mr. Drury's name.

Please proceed, Sir."

Drury: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Drury: "I just want to be clear, Representative Arroyo, that when you were asked questions from the last Representative that

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

you are telling us that the rates we will get these bonds at, you... you can guarantee that they will be lower than they were in 1998?"

Arroyo: "Generally..."

Drury: "I don't like telling you... you just said that they'd be lower, so I want to make sure..."

Arroyo: "We... we can't guar ..."

Drury: "...we're clear."

Arroyo: "...we can't guarantee anything..."

Drury: "Okay."

Arroyo: "...right now."

Drury: "So... so, we don't know what the interest rate's going to be. And then, can you tell me this? I... I know roads are important but are schools important?"

Arroyo: "There's a lot of important things."

Drury: "Are... are human services agencies important?"

Arroyo: "Yes."

Drury: "And have you seen a list? Is there any list anywhere in the State of Illinois of what the priorities are when we have extra money?"

Arroyo: "Everybody has their own list."

Drury: "But is there a list? Does Illinois have a capital list or any sort of list that prioritizes roads over building schools?

Have you seen such a list?"

Arroyo: "No."

Drury: "Okay. So, do you know whether or not taking this extra money, and it's going to be extra money, whether it's there that's seemingly burning a hole in our pockets to spend today,

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

whether the priority has to be building a road or building schools in impoverished areas? What is more important?"

Arroyo: "I... I could tell you that this Bill, what it does is roads and bridges."

Drury: "I'm not asking what the Bill does, Mr."

Arroyo: "We can tell you..."

Drury: "I'm asking you what is more important."

Arroyo: "We can't... I'm not here to tell you what's more important."

Speaker Lang: "Can you Gentlemen suspend for one moment? Ladies and Gentlemen, the noise in the chamber is overwhelming. All of the conversations will move to the rear of the chamber. Members will be in their seats. I will not continue the debate until that happens. All Members will be in their chairs or I will not finish this debate. Mr. Arroyo, please continue."

Arroyo: "Mr. Drury, I'm not here to debate on what's more important. I am here to pass a capital Bill and that's what I want to talk about. A lot of the Members are telling me that if I knew... if I know what is... what the bud... what the percentage of the bonds are going to be 10 years. If I knew what the percentage of those bonds would be in 10 years, I wouldn't be sitting here. I would be doing something else, probably selling bonds. So, I'm not... I'm not going to debate only on what's in front of me and what's in front of the computer. I'm not here to go on to another tangent about what is more important. Right now, what's more important is this capital Bill that everybody here is interested about roads and bridges. That's what I want to talk about."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Drury: "And I'm glad that that's what you're interested in. As a General Assembly, we need to be interested in the full picture. As a General Assembly, there's a lot of needs in this state and it's schools, it's transit, it's... it's human services, it's prisons. And so, what I want to know, does anyone in this... in this House have a list of what our priorities are before we burn through a billion dollars and just spend it on roads? Have you seen that list, Representative Arroyo?"

Arroyo: "No, Sir."

Drury: "Okay. Do... does the list exist? Does Illinois have a list of priorities that when we have a little extra money that we don't know how much it's going to cost to get, do... is there a list that exists so we can know what we should be spending it on?"

Arroyo: "Not on appropriations."

Drury: "Okay. So... so, there's no list. So, now this money's coming in and instead of trying to put together a list of where this money should go, whether the program was good in '98 that got us this money or whether it wasn't doesn't matter. We're being asked to just spend it on... on something that... that you said this is your priority. But do you know if this is the priority of the entire State of Illinois?"

Arroyo: "I believe so."

Drury: "You believe... How did... did you do a poll?"

Arroyo: "I could do one, if that's what you want."

Drury: "You can? Well, can you do it... can you take it out of the record and do the poll so we can know what our priorities are?"

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Arroyo: "Scott, you've been trying to take this Bill out of the...
out of the roll, but it's not going to happen. We want to
call this Bill right now, as soon as you're finished
speaking."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury, you've had two bites at the apple."

Drury: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Can you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Drury: "I think everybody knows where I stand."

Speaker Lang: "Think we do. Mr. Davidsmeyer."

Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Due to a potential conflict of interest, I will be voting 'present'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. There is a priority list. That priority list is set up through our agencies. Now, I may disagree with a lot of people on this floor now and again, but when we're talking about roads, there is a list set up by the agency. We do have, for road construction and road repair, a five-year plan that we put in place. And we've had it in place for many years. There is a reason why I believe that this is focused only on road projects and that is because it is that prioritized list. I think there's been a lot of rhetoric, but... but the reality is, it is about fixing the roads."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Mr. Speaker, this is sort of hard for me to do, but this has been such a pathetic experience that I'm simply going to withdraw my request for a verification for the reason... for the reason that it makes no difference because we simply don't care about doing things the right way."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Speaker Lang: "Leader Durkin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. No surprise, this is not a perfect process. This is not a perfect building. But it's been said over and over again during the course of this debate about what has happened to the State of Illinois and its infrastructure over the past six months. And I think that we cannot neglect it. This is the miniest of mini capital Bills we've seen in a long time, and for many of you octogenarians who've been around here for a while, we know that we do this. I wish we could do a bigger, grander, fullscale capital program and we're prepared to do it and we're prepared to negotiate once we get out of here to do it as soon as we can next Session or even next fall. But the fact of the matter is this is what we're left with. And I think it's the right thing to do. Folks, our roads were clobbered. Drive anywhere in the State of Illinois. It's just not Chicago, the suburbs. It's downstate Illinois. We have a responsibility to do the best we can to make sure that our roads are going to be operating, that they're going to be smooth and trucks and cars are going to be able to... be able to get to where they need to go. Goods and services rely upon good roads. Our families and our... our schools rely upon good roads so those buses can take our kids to school. So, I think this is something that we cannot neglect. Now, the way this came down a couple days ago, and I think this is very important for people to know, is it originally was brought to me as a \$1.6 billion program. One... \$1.1 billion would go towards the roads. There'd be another \$500 million towards vertical spending. I'll be quite honest with you. I had

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

concerns about what I thought... I perceived as discretionary spending. Some people call that pork barrel spending. My response was that we are for a capital program. We are for a program that is going to help make our roads better. But we are not going to participate in a program that's going to possibly have this discretionary-type spending, which we've seen in the past, something that really bothers me. And I am very pleased at the Governor, the Speaker, the President of the Senate and the Minority Leader in the Senate, they have agreed with me on that position. That's why that \$1.6 billion went down to 1.1. It's a smaller Bill, but this is going to get us through the end of the year. And I think it's a responsible vote. And again, as I said earlier, we are pleased... we are more than welcome to work with the other side of the aisle on any type of capital Bill, one which is of ... would be of a bigger scale if it's done responsibly. And what we've done today is a very narrow-focused Bill on an imminent problem and an obvious problem in the State of Illinois with our infrastructure. So, I appreciate the accommodations that the Speaker's made in my request that we keep any of this discretionary spending out of this Bill 'cause I think that that's... we should operate moving forward on infrastructure Bills, capital Bills. I don't want pork barrel spending in any of these types of programs and that's what we got today. We don't have that in this Bill. So, thank you and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, we've had a very full debate on the issue. There was a certain amount of

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

misinformation that found its way into the debate because of some of the participants in the debate. So, let me go through this in simple steps. There's a certain amount of money which had been dedicated to what's called debt payment service, money that the state used to pay off old debt. Some of that debt has been retired. It's been paid off. And the revenue stream that was used to support it is now available. Now, some would say let's make it available for a different purpose. That's a legitimate difference of opinion. This Bill would say since that money is available, let's use it as a revenue stream to support the issuance of debt for the road program. Now, here again, some people may say, well, don't give it to the road program, give it to some other purpose. Another legitimate difference of opinion. In the debate, some people were saying we don't know where this money's going to go. Well, that's not true because for those of you who follow the road program and follow the work of the Illinois Department of Transportation, every year... every year IDOT issues a new five-year plan which sets out the road projects that they've proposed to do over the next five years. That doesn't change. What will happen here is that under the fiveyear plan, some projects won't be done 'til sometime in the future. This will say that new money will be put into the road program, new money will be used to do more of those projects in the five-year plan. So, it could be said legitimately that some projects will be accelerated in the five-year plan, but everybody will know what projects will be done. In addition, there's money here for local governments. So, if you're interested in a local government and their

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

street program, street repair, street resurfacing, there's a hundred million dollars for distribution to local governments. Bottom line, this is going to put people to work. Those people will pay taxes. Some of those taxes will come to the State of Illinois for spending by this Legislature. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good Bill. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Feigenholtz, Ford. Please take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar, under the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 4020, Representative Soto. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4020, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Soto, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. House Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 4020. House Floor Amendment number is an initiative of the Latino Family Commission. The Commission's intentions with this language is to ensure members of Medicaid MCOs who have limited English proficiency receive appropriate support to their care and... and dealings with the MCOs. This language is an agreed language upon the Latino Family Commission and the Illinois Association of Medicaid Health Claims and serves as

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

the continuation of the original intention of House Bill 4706, which was drafted incorrectly. IAMHP did raise a concern about the House Floor Amendment #1. It's drafted as a technical in nature. The language states that MCEs shall develop language access policy but does not specify that all Medicaid MCEs are entities... I'm sorry... are in this policy, only not all MCEs. This may be cleaned up in a... in a future Amendment. But this is the cleanup Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative, in your opening comment, you said Amendment 1, but you meant Amendment 2, did you not?"

Soto: "Amendment 2. Yes, I did. I'm sorry."

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

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 4020, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Soto."

Soto: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote... 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Mr. Tryon. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting no. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Ladies and Gentlemen, please listen to the committee announcements."

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. Human Services is meeting in D-1, Revenue & Finance is meeting in 122, the Executive Committee is meeting in 118, Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges is meeting in 413, and Appropriations-Public Safety is meeting in C-1. Meeting at 9:30 a.m. is State Government Administration in Room 114, Elementary & Secondary Education in D-1, Higher Education in 413, Business & Occupational Licenses in C-1 and Transportation: Vehicles & Safety in 115. Meeting at 10 a.m. is Appropriations-General Services in 114, the Judiciary in C-1 and Environment in 413."
- Speaker Lang: "And now... Representative Reis is recognized. Mr. Reis."
- Reis: "Well, depending on your answer, maybe people won't be saying aw, but for planning purposes, there's rumors going around. Should we, those of us who stay in hotels, check out tomorrow morning?"
- Speaker Lang: "The unfortunate answer is we don't know, Sir. And now, allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Friday, May 30 at the hour of 10:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 30 at the hour of 10:30 a.m. Have a wonderful evening."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1169, offered
 by Representative Hurley; House Resolution 1171, offered by
 Representative Cross; House Resolution 1173, offered by
 Representative Moffitt; and House Resolution 1179, offered by

141st Legislative Day

5/29/2014

Representative McAuliffe are referred to the Rules Committee. Second Reading of House Bills. House Bill 498, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Second Reading of this House Bill. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."