142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. The House shall come to order. The Members shall be in their chairs. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance. We shall be led in prayer today by Wayne Padget, the Assistant Doorkeeper."
- Wayne Padget: "Let us pray. Dear Heavenly Father, let us thank You for all of Your countless blessings. And guide our eyes, O Lord, to not just see the faults of others but the goodness they have in their heart. Father, we ask that You help... help us to... guide us along the path that we should be on and help take away the burden of worry. And Father, may we forever be dependent on Your wisdom, guidance and direction. These things we ask in Your Son's name, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Jackson."
- Jackson et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representatives Ford and Gordon-Booth are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Sullivan is excused on the Republican side of the aisle today."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 113

Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a
quorum present. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Gabel, Chairperson from the Committee on Human Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3845. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 1740. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5491, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 220, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 274, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 852, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2674, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2736. Representative Arroyo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-Public Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3224. Representative Franks, Chairperson from the Committee on State Government Administration reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4811, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4811. Representative Chapa Chairperson from the Committee on Elementary & Secondary Education reports the following committee action taken on May

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

30, 2014: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3662; Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3754, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 & 2 to House Bill 3937, Motion to Concur Senate Amendment #1 & 2 to House Bill Representative Rita, Chairperson from the Committee Business & Occupational Licenses reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3044. Representative D'Amico, Chairperson from the Committee on Transportation: Vehicles & Safety reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 54... correction House Bill 4561. Representative Crespo, Chairperson from the Committee on Appropriations-General Services reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2747. Representative McAsey, Chairperson from the Committee on the Environment reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Floor Amendment #1... Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2799. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the Committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5755. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1185, offered by Representative and House Joint Resolution 101, offered Representative Lang are referred to the Rules Committee."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Madigan: "On page 9 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 352.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 352, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a measure that... that establishes that sales taxes, if there is a connection with Illinois business operations that these... these taxes would be collected by the seller and remitted to Illinois governments. It's a way of making sure that main street is on an even playing field with those who operate differently outside the actual borders of the state. And it also says that sales tax collections or lack thereof should not become a factor in competitive behaviors between retailers operating in different business formats. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I'd be grateful for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

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

Harris, D.: "Representative, it's always good sometimes to be the first Bill out of the block or the last Bill out of the block, so maybe you have a decided advantage in terms of when this Bill was called. But, I do have some..."

Currie: "I didn't know it was going to be called, so ... "

Harris, D.: "No. I'm... I do have some questions though. This Bill then puts back into statute a... a tax on Internet resale... wholesale or resalers... retailers with... which was in statute,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

got struck down by the Supreme Court and now we're putting it back in, correct?"

Currie: "We are. And the reason the court struck it down was because the language in the original Bill was very narrow. The court felt that it was not applying in an even handed across the board fashion. So, the definition of what counts as a connection between the ultimate seller and Illinois is a broader definition."

Harris, D.: "Right. And we... we initially passed the tax in what, early of 2011?"

Currie: "2011."

Harris, D.: "Right."

Currie: "2011."

"Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill if I may Harris, D.: just very briefly. We passed this tax in 2011... in early 2011 because we do want to have equity between the... the brick and mortar retailers and those retailers that sell online. Specifically, we were after ... trying to get at Amazon. When we passed the tax there were a number of entities that have what are known as click through relationships with Amazon. And they... and Amazon said as long as you are in Illinois and we have this relationship with you and Illinois is going to levy this tax, we are going to sever our relationship with you. Those entities said rather than sever our relationship with Amazon, we're going to move out of the state and a number of them did. Now subsequently, the tax was, as the Sponsor said, struck down. Let me tell you that I understand the ... the requirement that there be some equity, the disadvantage that online retailers have versus the brick and mortar ones is

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

real. I voted for that tax the first time out, I will tell you that. Let me tell you, however, why I am voting against this one. Because there's been a change on the part of Amazon. Amazon is now working with... with Legislators in a number of states as well as in Washington, D.C., specifically with our own Senator Durbin, to try to enact something that is workable in the Marketplace Fairness Act which would be a federal legislation so that Amazon wouldn't have to worry about thousands of different taxing bodies around the United States. So, my... my point here is that the position of Amazon has changed. I think they are working toward a solution of this problem. I don't think we need to reinstate this tax at this time. For that reason, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I think this is a good Bill for main street retailers, brick and mortar retails in every district in the state. I encourage the feds to act, but they haven't. They've been talking about it for years and in the meantime, I think we cannot afford to wait. I hope you will join me in voting 'yes' for Senate Bill 352."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost, do you seek recognition? After the Bill? Okay. Representative Currie has moved for the passage of the Bill. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 62 people voting 'yes', 50 people voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Senate Bill 727, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Cassidy. The Sponsor requests to take the Bill out of the record. On page 13 of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 3433, Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3433, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Burke on the Amendment."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I adopt the Amendment and then debate it on Third?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments and no Motions are filed."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Madigan: "Put the Bill on the Order of Third Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3433, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Burke."

- Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was up for debate last Friday and we had a lively discussion about some of the features in this Bill. Since that Friday, Senator Morrison and I have talked to many of you to clarify some of your objections. House Floor Amendment 1 responds to some of those objections and will hopefully allow you to cast an 'aye' vote. The changes include an exemption to the voter education requirement for... for boats used on privately owned bodies of water. An exemption for the use of an electric or trolling motor. An exemption for Illinois residents who have a boating safety certification from another state, such as our neighbor Missouri, which also requires this type of education. And the biggest change is a change to the birthdate of those affected by the legislation, from those born after 1991 to those born after 1998. Mr. Speaker, could I ask for the noise to be brought down, please? Thank you. There is al..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, please give your attention to Representative Burke."
- Burke, K.: "Thank you. There's also clarification of the rental livery language. So, it is clear that any... everyone who is renting a motor boat who has not had boating education either in Illinois or in another state must take an abbreviated course of operation and training offered by the rental livery. IDNR will work with the boating community and the rental

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

entities to craft the regulations so they're flexible enough to take into account the different types of liveries and their various facilities. For novice boaters these education requirements will ensure that they start off with at least some idea of the rules of navigation and boating etiquette. For experienced boaters who will not have to take the course of education, mandatory education for the novices will help reduce the likelihood that they will be involved in a preventable accident. Boating is a popular form of recreation all over the state and will hopefully grow as a pastime. Boating safety knowledge gained through the successful education requirement provides the recreational boater with a tool to help manage the risk associated with boating. DNR statistics show that between 2004 and 2013 Illinois boaters were involved in 975 reported accidents, with 682 injuries and 173 fatalities. One of those fatalities was Senator Morrison's nephew who was run over by a boat while tubing on the Chain of Lakes. Experience in other states, such as Virginia, have shown that with more boaters having safety knowledge we should expect a decrease in accidents, injuries, deaths and property damage. A better educated boating community will result in less conflict between boaters, including between recreational boaters and commercial vessels. Eighteen other states have adult education requirements for boating. The trend is toward... the national trend is toward education. This Bill passed the Senate on a 54-0 vote in April of this year. Your Senator voted in favor of this Bill and yet we've not heard any hue and cry from the boating community about these requirements. It's common

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- sense, it takes in safety. It's better safety for both the novice and the experienced boater. There are no opponents to this Bill. I'd welcome any additional questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the passage of the Bill. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sandack."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."
- Sandack: "Thank you. Representative, I was focusing on just one aspect of your opening argument as to the support of this Bill. Eighteen other states have educational requirements akin to this Bill or different than this Bill?"
- Burke, K.: "Similar to this Bill. So, a lot of states have... I think almost all states have child, you know, youth education but eighteen states have education for adults. Most of them are done on a phased in basis such as this with, you know, phasing it in for people. Ours... again, we moved it from... after hearing some of the objections from people who were worried about someone who hadn't taken... had not taken a youth education class, but you know, had 5 or 6 years of boating under their belt being brought into this... into this education requirement, we took the age down to those born after 1998."
- Sandack: "And I... I think you said this is a national trend. Has there been any analytics, metrics, results from the 18 states that have gone to more education?"
- Burke, K.: "So, I... there is not been a comprehensive study. But I've been pointed to both a coast guard report and evidence from Virginia, which actually has a pretty recent... a pretty

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

recent introduction of this kind of Bill. And the… the… the… with the trend toward education, we're at the lowest number of fatalities and injuries in… since they've kept the records. And Virginia has shown a marked decrease. There's not a study that… that links these, but I think you can make a causal connection that a better educated boating public has resulted in safer boating."

Sandack: "And you mentioned Missouri as having a similar statutory scheme. Is there another state, a neighboring state, other than Missouri that has the same type of structure?"

Burke, K.: "Wisconsin."

Sandack: "Wisconsin has the same structure. All right. Thank you."

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Sandack: "To the Bill. I commend the Sponsor in her efforts to increase boater safety. I don't think there's a person here that doesn't support that. My concern still… still is that we are putting the cart before the horse. I didn't want to use a boating analogy. We don't have metrics. We don't have analytics. We don't have anything other than the supposition that more education means safer waterways. That frankly is a little bit easily used in almost any endeavor. More education in any endeavor means a safer outcome, perhaps. I think we're getting ahead of ourselves here. I'm still going to urge a 'no' vote only because we don't have statistics that support this statutory scheme resulting in anything other than additional costs, structure and bureaucracy. And until we have metrics, I think we ought to be… stay the status quo. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Fortner."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Fortner: "Representative, we had a lot of discussion particularly in the area of rental facilities and I want to appreciate what I see in the Amendment which has been added to this Bill.

Just to make sure we understand what this has done, there is some question about who had to require it or not require it.

I see that that has now been changed from 'may' to 'shall'.

Is that correct?"

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

Fortner: "And also the other big area of concern was what about out-of-state renters going to a livery facility? In the original Bill that we had before us, the language seemed to kind of... kind of... was kind of loose as to who had to take the abbreviated course that would be offered, now shall be offered by these livery facilities. So as I understand it now, this is... explicitly applies obviously to an Illinois resident but it's also now explicit that the exemptions that appear at the... at... sort of in the close of the Bill where there's a lot list of exemptions are now clearly indicated that the same exemptions would apply in the case of the rental boats. Is that correct?"

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

Fortner: "Thank you. Just briefly to the Bill. Again, I don't think it's a perfect Bill. I think I would have like to seen more to... if we're going to have boating safety to deal with out-of-state boaters who come from states that unlike, as was suggested in the previous set of comments with Missouri or Wisconsin, that have some standards. I recognize the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

difficulty in doing that under our law, but I... I certainly commend the Sponsor. I think this is a much better Bill and I'll be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I really appreciate how hard you've worked on this Bill and I appreciate you coming to talk to me yesterday about it as well. And I see you've made six Amendments since the Bill didn't get the requisite number of votes to pass last week. I see in this one you provided an exemption for any person using an electric motor to propel the motorboat. Can I ask why you put that exemption in? What... what the rationale was?"

Burke, K.: "That was at the request of a Member who brought to bear a situation where you have a motor... a boat equipped with a motor that is in excess of 10 horsepower but also has an electric trolling mower... motor. And if you were... for instance, in the particular situation you brought up is what about letting one of his kids just or... or... you know, someone who didn't have the certification just putt-putt around with just the electric motor on, not using the actual gas powered motor and brought that up as a concern and in an effort to accommodate that concern, we made the change."

Franks: "And I think that makes sense. So, I think your big issue here is you're worried about the speed, so that's why you wanted to have a... a lower horsepower?"

Burke, K.: "That's correct."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Franks: "Okay. My concern is the question of experience. I can tell you when I was 16 years old, I had just gotten my driver's license and I took out a row of parked cars. Not because of my age, well maybe some of it, but it was more of my inexperience on judging turns and things. My question here is, the way the Bill is written... So, let's assume I want to teach my young son to drive my boat and my boat has more than 50 horsepower. Under the way this Bill is written, it appears that my son cannot drive the boat with me present, even though I may be monitoring the throttle, I might be controlling the throttle, this appears as though my child would be prohibited from driving the boat. Is that correct?"
- Burke, K.: "That is not correct. I think that's a very strange interpretation. I think the... the language clearly states that they need to be a child without their own boating safety certificate, which they currently have to have under law, can... can operate a boat with the supervision of someone who meets the law. Because you, I'm guessing, are born after 1998..."

Franks: "Barely."

- Burke, K.: "...barely... you will meet the law. It is only if you... if he's going to be supervised by someone who falls within that time frame who... if that person didn't have the certificate, that would be a problem. But you in your advanced age would be covered and more than welcome to... to pass on your knowledge about boating to your child."
- Franks: "Okay. If our analysis isn't so clear on that, and we spoke the other day on that..."
- Burke, K.: "I... I think we updated..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Franks: "...because if you look at..."

Burke, K.: "...the analysis, Jack, to make that clear."

Franks: "...look at #3 on the analysis. It says, clarifies that an owner of a motorboat shall not permit a person to operate that motorboat if that person does not meet the boating safety certificate provision requirement. So, I'm... I'm told by staff that the analysis is incorrect. So, what you're saying is, if my... if I wanted to teach my kid how to drive a boat, he doesn't have to have the boater safety certificate ahead of time. That's what I want to make sure."

Burke, K.: "If... if you are going to be on board supervising, sure."

Franks: "Okay. Because that's not what the analysis says. So, I want... so, I want to make...

Burke, K. : "But the..."

Franks: "I want to be clear that the analysis has an error in it.

Because I'll..."

Burke, K.: "Right. So they... they can as long as you're...

Franks: "So, if you have a..."

Burke: "...born after the 1998."

Franks: "So, if you have someone whose 17 years old in the boat, who knows how to drive the boat and they take their little brother out on the boat or their little sister and teaching them how to drive, they would not be violating the law."

Burke, K.: "Okay. So, this is like a law school..."

Franks: "It is?"

Burke, K.: "...an ELSAD question right now."

Franks: "There's no rule of Shelly's case involved here. It's just a straight question."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Burke, K.: "If might be a statute of fraud issue, I don't know." Franks: "Yes."
- Burke, K.: "But... Okay. So, in that particular situation, if that 17-year-old supervisor had his or her boating certificate and because they're under 18 had been designated by the owner of the boat, presumably the parent or grandparent, to supervise the kid, the little kid, they're fine."
- Franks: "Okay. And so, the real age cutoff here is 16? So, you have to... if you're 16 or younger you have to get this boat certificate?"
- Burke, K.: "Well, the... the law won't go into effect until 2016 because we're giving DNR time to implement rules related to, you know, the issuance of this and the livery issue. So it won't go into effect until 2016, at which time it will take a... people would be 18."
- Franks: "Okay. So what... I think what you're trying to do with this Bill if I'm reading it correctly, is to teach young people to drive boats safely, especially if they're driving by themselves."
- Burke, K.: "Exactly. And I used an example for someone else. I have a... a 14-year-old who obviously was born after 1998. Let's say she never picks up boating until she's 40 years old. She would have to take a boating certification class when she's 40 because it's the first time... she's born after 1998 and she's never got the certificate as a kid. So, it's phasing in the requirement for younger people to start becoming educated."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Franks: "All right. I didn't understand that. Okay. So if you're older as well and haven't ... as it's down the road, you'd have to..."

Burke, K.: "Down... far down the road, exactly."

Franks: "Okay. I'll continue listening to debate. Thank you."

Burke, K.: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Willis."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I... I commend the Sponsor on this Bill. She's done a lot of work to try to get it to cover everybody's concerns on it. One of our previous speakers was concerned on the cost of this. How can you put a cost on safety in someone's life? This is a minimal cost to that. If we're going to make our waterways safer I think this is a good Bill. I urge the Body to support it and I urge everyone to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to be brief. So if I understand, Representative, you're... you're making sure that there's an education component involved in this for those who want to become boaters, correct?"

Burke, K.: "Absolutely."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "And... and if I can just interject, Representative? In... in terms of the education required, it can be at no cost. DNR offers boating safety classes and will continue to offer boating safety classes and will work with the boating community to... to provide other venues for getting an in person, no cost education. For those who would rather not go in person, who would rather do it in the convenience, comfort

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of their own home, there is an online component. For that online component is the only time the fee is involved."

Davis, W.: "Thank you... thank you very much. Very briefly, to... to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, to add... to add an education component to something like boating I think is extremely, extremely important. I am not a boater, but I don't know if I'd want to be on the waterways with someone who really doesn't understand what boating means and has the appropriate education. One of the previous speakers, as a matter of fact, the Gentleman from the 81st district said that we needed data. And that data was the only way to determine, I don't even know if he knows I'm talking about him, but the Gentleman from the 81st District talked about the need for data in order to make it better. And I wouldn't necessarily disagree with that but yesterday I had a Bill, Senate Bill 2793, in which we were going to collect data in order to make informed decisions and somehow or another he seemed to be against collecting data in that situation. But now he wants data to be collected for this purpose. So you know, I encourage you to support the Lady's Motion. And you didn't have to wave me off like that."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Mr. Mautino is recognized."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mautino: "As I'm looking at our analysis, and I understand that there might be some things that are incorrect, can you tell me... a 17-year-old, would they now have to have a... an adult on

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

board, direct supervision from parent or guardian under this Bill?"

Burke, K.: "So, the... the law... this Bill, Frank, doesn't change anything in regard to the requirements for those ages 12-18. So if that... if that 12 through 18-year-old has taken the boater... their boating certification class then, no, they don't need anyone on board. But if they don't have that boating safety certification and they want to operate a boat, the person... the person supervising them must meet the requirements of the law. So, it's a similar question to what Representative from McHenry was discussing. So that person supervising would need to meet the requirements of the law, which means they would have to be born after 1998 in order to need the... the certification."

Mautino: "So anyone under the age of 23?"

Burke, K.: "It... yes."

Mautino: "Okay. All right. Thank you. I wanted to, as you mentioned there may be something wrong in our analysis and as I was reading that, I... I know that you've made some... some pretty heavy changes to the Bill itself. I do not... I still do not support your legislation for many of the reasons that were mentioned earlier. But I wanted to make sure that our analysis which might have been... might have been incorrect, if I can get that statement on the record. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "Thank you. I would just like to point out that we do a lot of things to improve the safety of the... the people of the State of Illinois. And I would put this boating education requirement as analogous to the changes we've made for teen

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

drivers, for younger drivers, for novice drivers. And I don't think there's anyone in this Body who would dispute that those changes and the strengthening of the education and training that young drivers go through, I don't think anyone would argue that they have made our roads safer, not only for the teens but for the... the more experienced drivers who may encounter. This Bill can do the same thing for boating. It's common sense, it's measured, it takes into account the experience that current boaters have. I think it's a step forward. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 71 voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1188, offered by Representative Christian Mitchell. This Bill... this Resolution is referred to the House Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Scherer."

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

Scherer: "Today, Representative Brandon Phelps and I have Kalyn Dixon here visiting. And she is one of our guest pages. So everybody give her a big welcome, please."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege." Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

D'Amico: "Today here in the well… in the well, I have two Pages here for the day… for today, Cole Babcock and Luke Damery from Meridian High School. Thanks for coming."

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

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Osmond: "I'd like to introduce Mark Biel's' daughter, Samantha Biel, on our side a Page today."

Speaker Lang: "Thanks for being with us. Mr. Brady."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Brady: "I, too, have a Page today. I'd like to ask Stephanie Chow to stand up, who's here, a seventh grader at Metcalf in Normal, Illinois, with her mother and father in the gallery, Dr. & Mrs. Chow. Welcome to Springfield, Stephanie."

Speaker Lang: "Welcome. Thank you for being here. Mr. Zalewski." Zalewski: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."

Zalewski: "I was told my commercial for White Sox Caucus wasn't strong enough yesterday, so White Sox Caucus July 21. And also, Mr. Speaker, we need the boards to have the Blackhawks game ready to go tonight in case we're working late. I hope you can make that happen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "That sounds like a really good idea, Sir. Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Pers... point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Is that your Page for the day, Sir?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- McAuliffe: "This is my Page for the day, I have my lovely wife,
 Kim, my son Conor and my lovely daughter, Bianca."
- Speaker Lang: "Happy you're here with us. Senate Bill 3443, Mr. Davis. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3443, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. Amendment #4 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #6 is offered by Representative Will Davis."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

- Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I ask that we adopt Floor Amendment #6 and then we can debate the Bill on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

 Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 3443, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3443 represents the implementation of the latest recommendations of the Budgeting for Results Commission or known as the BFR Commission for the elimination of mandated expenditures. The BFR Commission is required to review existing mandated expenditures and include in its annual report to the Governor and the General Assembly recommendations for the termination of mandated expenditures. The BFR Commission created a mandates committee to work with state agencies to identify unnecessary statutory requirements

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

to which agencies are subject based on the recommendations of the committee and various agencies. Senate Bill eliminates or modifies a number of mandates that involve about 16 agencies. Additionally what the Bill does, particularly with the adoption of Amendment #6 is that it also reorganizes the composition of the boards of the legislative support agencies by providing that the boards of LIS, LPU and LRB consist of the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of the Senate and a Clerk and Assistant Clerk of the House rather than 12 Members of the General Assembly. Additionally it implements... again, it implements the recommendations of the Budget ... Budgeting for Results Commission to eliminate an unnecessary mandate of expenditures. It transfers the Serve Illinois Commission from the Department of Human Services to the Department of Public Health while changing the composition of the board, excuse me, of the commission and allowing them to partially match grants to recipients of the AmeriCorps Education Award, also known as the Eli Segal Education Award. clarifies that Ιt the Governor can temporary make appointments to vacant offices only on non-Session days or Perfunctory Session days and states that the appointments for acting appointees must be filled by, excuse me, filled with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Senate in a form established by Senate Rule. Furthermore, it clarifies that the Architect of the Capitol must create a master plan for the Capitol building and all land and state buildings and facilities within the area bounded by Washington, Third, Cook and Pasfield Streets here in Springfield and must monitor the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

implementation of the master plan. Be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Sandack: "Representative Davis, my analysis has a note that since the passage of... in the Senate the Speaker's Office has reinserted multiple programs and boards that the underlying Bill sought to repeal, even though those programs that the Governor's Office and the Budgeting for Results Group... Commission considered obsolete or basically unfunded mandates. Can you address whether there's been a reinsertion of groups or commissions that were taken out by the commission?"

Davis, W.: "I... I believe there have been. Oh, I'm sorry. They...
they were... some were removed but nothing was added back."

Sandack: "There's been no additional groups put in since the Budgeting for Results Commission has eliminated some boards as obsolete or unnecessary?"

Davis, W.: "Apparently, not related to mandates."

Sandack: "So, they're... so whatever boards and commissions that were put into place and/or reinserted they've... they've offered no mandates so that takes them outside the confines of the Budgeting for Results Commission?"

Davis, W.: "Well, let me make sure I understand."

Sandack: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "So, you're saying that with some of the amendatory changes that have taken place that those changes are not part

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of the recommendations of the Budgeting for Results Commission?"

Sandack: "Right."

Davis, W.: "I believe that would be... that would be correct."

Sandack: "All right. And obviously the Budgeting for Results Commission has a great mandate or goal and that's to try and get some valued propositions and some goals and metrics associated with budgeting. Give me your analysis of what you think the efficacy thus far has been. Do you think it's been a good result? Have we gotten our money's worth? Has it been a good end game so far?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I mean, I think as you probably know what the Budgeting for Results Commission is ultimately trying to accomplish toward moving the state forward as it relates to how we spend our dollars."

Sandack: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Part of that process includes some of what's in this particular Bill. So, I... I would say it has been a good process. It's been a worthwhile process."

Sandack: "Well, we just passed a budget... Representative Davis, we just passed a budget a couple days ago. Do you think that was consistent with what the Commission's trying to accomplish?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I guess what I would say is that the Budgeting for Results work is a work in progress. At some point we will flip the switch on budgeting for results, but right now, we are working tirelessly to try to exactly, I guess, massage the way budgeting for results will indeed work. So we haven't gotten there yet, in all fairness to your question, but we

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

are working toward what the implementation of the BFR Commission will do."

Sandack: "Thank you. And to the Bill. I... I respect the Gentleman,
I respect the work of this Commission. I think we're not there
yet and so, but I... I share his ambition and that the flip...
the switch will be flipped and that we'll start seeing some
results consistent with what the goals of Budgeting for
Results Commission seeks to achieve. Thank you,
Representative. No further questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Tryon."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Tryon: "Representative Davis, I noticed that several provisions obviously have been set up and reinserted as it passed from the Senate. But one of the things that... that concerns me a little bit is... is... was the provision that allowed tax... property tax bills to be placed on IDOR's website and now that's been reinserted. But I want know, were there other provisions in the Bill that... that took away the requirements for public notifications through newspapers that are still left in?"

Davis, W.: "I... I don't believe so, Representative. The one that you referred to, we heard from the Press Association as well some other Members. And so, that's why it's not on the final list for lack of a better way of putting it."

Tryon: "Because you... you actually put that back in. And is the Press Association neutral?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, that's ... that's back in so to speak."

Tryon: "So, are they neutral now or in support of this?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Davis, W.: "Yes, they are in full support actually now."

Tryon: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I also see in here that we've allowed or... or clarified that the Supreme Court and the 4th District Appellate Court are exempt from jurisdiction under the Architect of the Capitol master plan. Could you explain that?"

Davis, W.: "Well, I'm told that they're all included because, again, if they fit within that geographic boundary that I mentioned in the opening, then any building in that boundary I believe is under subject to the Architect of the Capitol."

Pritchard: "Well, the language of our analysis seemed to imply that they were exempt. And that's why I wanted the clarification on that point. You say they are not exempt?"

Davis, W.: "I believe they are in there, Sir."

Pritchard: "So, going back to the previous speaker's questions about posting some things online, was there an estimate as to the cost of printing some of these notices as opposed to posting them online?"

Davis, W.: "I don't know if there is a cost associated with this. There were no fiscal notes filed as it relates to... with what cost would have been one way or another. But having talked to some members of the... of the Press Association, again, some members I guess this is trying to appease both sides of the coin. Those that are actively engaged and looking at the Internet and so these things can be posted online for those who are savvy and look at the Internet. But certainly there

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

are certain segments of our population throughout the entire state that don't have access to the Internet, it's not in their homes. It's not easily attainable. So therefore, having the actual paper copy of that, if you will, or that information in a newspaper or a news publication is still worthwhile."

- Pritchard: "And... and you just introduced a whole new area that I'm wondering if the Budgeting for Results Task force is even looking at. I know you serve on that Task force. Are you looking at our community... computer connectivity, Internet connectivity around the state? And are we making progress so that someday we may be able to have all of our schools and our communities, village halls, connected?"
- Davis, W.: "Well, I guess... I guess having been on the Commission for a few years I would probably say yes to that question. Because we are just looking at... in totality the function of State Government as a whole. And... and the conversations ongoing are about ways to better do that, to better to refine the ways in which we connect with our communities from the state moving out, working with the human service providers, you know, collecting data. And we know, collecting data, it requires the necessary upgrades to infrastructure and technology. So it is a significant part of our conversation as we... that I... that I can recall having participated in."
- Pritchard: "Well, I would just ask you as our representative on that Commission to carry back a concern about the connectivity. Certainly you know, as chair of the Education Commission, our assessments are integrally now becoming linked to the ability to take those tests online. And if we

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

don't have the speed and we don't have the connectivity, our state and our... our programs are not going to be as effectively implemented. So I would encourage you to... encourage the Commission to look into that and what we can do to speed up this process."

Davis, W.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Davis to close."

Davis, W.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate all the work over the several months that have been going into completing this Bill. I... I believe it will receive broad bipartisan support because of some of the changes that were made. I certainly encourage everyone in the chamber to support it. 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 record yourselves, Members. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. 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."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 346, Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2694, Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2728; also on the Order of Concurrence, recommends be adopted a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 1463, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 4 and 5 to House Bill 2427, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Bill 3199, Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5512, and Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 5622."
- Speaker Lang: "On page 17 of the Calendar, under the Order of Resolutions, there appears HJR102. Leader Currie is recognized."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. When we have Constitutional Amendments on the ballot we're required to adopt a Resolution explaining the actual language that will be on the ballot and offering arguments for and against the Amendment. So, what this Resolution does is it represents the actual language that will appear with respect to the prohibition against discriminating voter... against voters by virtue of race, ethnicity, gender and so forth. And there will be a short section giving the arguments for passage of the Amendment and a short section giving arguments against passage of the Amendment. I... and all four caucuses have agreed to the language. The opponents and the proponents agree this is the right way to go."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair.

 Representative Sandack is recognized."
- Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Leader yield for a question or two?"
- Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."
- Sandack: "Leader Currie, is there a reason why this didn't go through the committee process?"
- Currie: "You know, generally speaking they have not done so.

 That's the only reason I can give you. Tradition. Tradition."

 Sandack: "You sound like Zero Mostel all of a sudden."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Currie: "I hope so."

Sandack: "But typically I remember this being... the underlying question being in committee and I think we had resolving... resounding excuse me, Barb, bipartisan support for the question. But I'm just wondering why this Resolution wouldn't also go through the typical committee process for the same type of vetting we typically do on typical Resolutions?"

Currie: "Right."

Sandack: "It really wasn't rhetorical. Do you know why, other
 than tradition, we didn't have a committee hearing on this?"
Currie: "Traditionally we don't."

Sandack: "Traditionally we don't. All right. To the Resolution. We do a lot of things around here under the auspices of tradition, much of which is really good, sometimes it's not. And we have... we've had procedural debates and actually the Leader has been a vocal proponent of keeping matters that are procedural, procedural and out of the substantive discussion and dialog. It's always good process to use our committee process because that's the definition of process. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "I would like for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 102. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 102 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', House Joint Resolution 102, having

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby adopted. House Joint Resolution 103, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Resolution would have the ballot language for the Crime Victims' Rights Constitutional Amendment. As with Leader Currie, this has been signed off on by all four caucuses. And I agree that this is traditional, Sir. But I have reviewed this language as the Sponsor of the Crime Victims Amendment and I think it's perfectly fine language. I would ask your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the Gentleman moves that the House... with the late, we have Representative Reis."

Reis: "Caught you there. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative Lang, will you be also carrying the House Joint Resolution to tell the voters about the Constitutional Amendment for term limits?"

Lang: "That wouldn't be me, Sir."

Reis: "What about the one for a fair map?"

Lang: "Well, Sir, I don't think we're going to be preparing language here for those."

Reis: "Oh, that's right. We didn't get a chance to vote on those, did we? Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Lang moves that the House adopt House Joint Resolution 103. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House adopts House Joint

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Resolution 103. On page 10 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 220, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "How about if we... if we adopt the Amendment and then discuss the Bill on Third?"

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 220. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Budget Implementation Act. It's a measure that we are offering so that we can implement the budget that has already been approved in this chamber. We do this every year and in fact, most of the provisions in Senate Bill 220 and the Amendment 2 that we have just adopted are precisely what it will take to make sure that our budget works. Among them are, for example, things like making sure that the Income Tax Refund Fund reflects the money that we anticipate will be used in

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

order to make refunds during the coming fiscal year. Again, many of these items, are things we have done over time. There are several new items for example... for example, the... the Family Residency... Family Practice Residency Act would allow the use of tobacco settlement funds to... to cover the program and include other primary care providers. In addition, it will expand slightly the amount of payments to people who are refugees and seekers of asylum who are not eligible for supplemental security income. And for people who are living with disabilities in institutions and in the community living arrangement, there will be a slight increase in the money that people may keep for personal needs. I'd be happy to answer detailed questions, if you would like to pose them. But again, all we're doing here is making sure that the statutes enable us to implement and enforce the budget."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and to taxpayers and citizens of the State of Illinois, this is actually about as brazen as I've seen a budget exercised in a long, long time. Oftentimes, we've left here over the last 8 or 9 years where we have left for all practical purposes with unbalanced budgets and people have attempted to spin that it's a balanced budget. And of course, we all knew it wasn't. This budget is about as blatant an unbalanced budget as I've seen in a long, long time. The General Assembly back early in the year passed a Resolution that said we had \$34 billion to spend. A couple of days ago our friends on the other side of the aisle passed a new Resolution saying we had \$35.352 billion to spend. And this

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

'bimp' Bill when it's all said done and with the other Bills that accompany it, will have us spending as a state \$35.689 billion. Any way you look at it, this is a blatant disregard for the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And that is one of the main reasons we are in the mess we're in as a state. And the numbers are staggering. This isn't political spin, this is reality. We have the third highest unemployment rate in the country. We have the second highest migration rate in the country. And unlike New Jersey, we don't have a bridge we can close to keep people here. We have the worst funded pension system in the country. We have the worst bond rating in the country. We have the highest taxes we've ever had in the history of this state. And we have an unbalanced budget that is going to be passed that will add even more unpaid bills to the huge mess we have. We currently have 5 to 6 billion dollars of unpaid bills that cost us as a state last year over \$300 million in late fees and penalties, \$300 million in late fees and penalties. Imagine what that would do in the towns of Champaign, Decatur, Carbondale, Rockford, Wheaton; 300 million dollars thrown out the door. And imagine for a moment if you've thought about this or you've talked to anybody, if you are a provider of state services, a hospital, a pharmacist, a social service provider or a human service provider, you're fortunate enough if you're able to stay in business because we're not paying you on time. And yet, this budget that is unbalanced on its face and at the end of this year because of this unbalanced budget and because of the gimmicks and because of the games being played, we will add by your own... your own numbers to those on the other side of

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

the aisle an additional \$2 billion to our unpaid bills. Two more billion dollars to our unpaid bills. Imagine what we could do with \$2 billion. Think about that. Two billion dollars. Why we could even go and buy the LA Clippers with \$2 billion. That's just how bad this budget is. The numbers are astonishing. The numbers are awful. The numbers atrocious. And yet, you don't seem to have gotten the message about the condition of this state. We have got to learn to live within our means; we have got to balance budgets. We have got to spend less than we have available. We've got to improve the job climate, we've got to improve our bond rating and we've got to turn the direction of this state around. This is not an example of that. This is an awful budget. We have more money than we've ever had in the history of the state and yet, you cannot live within the means. It's embarrassing. It's shameful. And it should be no surprise why people are unfortunately are leaving this state at alarming rate. We can turn it around; we need to turn it around. We should turn it around, but this isn't the way we do it. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be voting 'no'. I suspect people on this side of the aisle also will be voting 'no'. And for those of you on the other side of the aisle, if you at all listen to what you say when you're out on the campaign trailer through the year, if you want to practice what you preach you, too, should be voting 'no' on this 'bimp' Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Kay."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Kay: "So Leader, I'm looking at my analysis here and it says that we're going to create a Capital Development Board Revolving Fund We're going to really continue it. So, where does the money come from to continue that revolving fund?"
- Currie: "I... I believe this comes from administration fees. And if we don't... if we don't take this action then that... that fund would not be able to have spending authority. That's all that this does and it does it until June of 2016."
- Kay: "Well, I understand we may need it. I was just asking where
 the funds came from?"
- Currie: "It... it comes from administrative fees given to CDB for managing projects. It's administrative money and in order for CDB to spend it to pay their employees, we have to make this change in the statute."
- Kay: "Okay. What about the... the next line found on pages 27 and 31 of the Bill, transfers from the Road Fund and various state funds to the Professional... I'm sorry, I just reviewed that. Let me skip down to page 48 and 54, transfers from various funds into the Workers' Compensation Revolving Fund. What's that about?"
- Currie: "These are to support CMS workers' comp claims that are not billed to individual agency appropriations. We have done this several times in the past. If... and if there... if we don't do it, then there will be serious cash flow problems that CMS will face in trying to meet workers' comp responsibilities. So, it's an... this is an... administrative issue and you as a businessman should surely know how this kind of... of item operates."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Kay: "Well, maybe so... Yeah. Well, I heard I wasn't a very good one yesterday. So, I'm... I'm going to work from the bottom up here. I'm curious though, where do the funds come from? Because it's my understanding that they're pulled from the Road Fund. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Well, my understanding is that... that these would be...

Yeah. So, it would be the funds wherever the employees are
paid from. So, if it's Road Fund money, it's for Road Fund
employees."

Kay: "Well, now wait minute."

Currie: "So, you could..."

Kay: "Maybe my analysis is wrong, but it says transfers from various funds into the Workers' Compensation Fund."

Currie: "Right. Right. Because..."

Kay: "Are you... are you saying that we're taking... we're aggregating our money, is that what you're saying, into one..."

Currie: "But, yeah, but what we're saying is instead of charging each individual agency its proportionate share of worker' comp claims, CMS does the whole thing and we then transfer funds from those agencies to CMS so the bills can be paid."

Kay: "Are we taking any sums of money from the Road Fund to put in the Revolving Fund for non-IDOT workers, workers compensation bills?"

Currie: "I don't believe that under this provision we are."

Kay: "Do you know of that to be a fact?"

Currie: "I do not."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative Currie, I am looking at the Comptroller's website and under there there are three different ways on which you can view a balanced budget. And looking at based on changes in the budgetary balance, yes, if the balance increases and no, if the balance decreases. According to the Comptroller's website, we have not had a balanced budget since 2001. When this budget goes into the Comptroller's database, will this be a no for a balanced budget or a yes that the budget is balanced based on what we're going to pass today? Will it be..."

Currie: "Well, if I were the Comp..."

Ives: "...no or yes?"

Currie: "If I were the Comptroller, I would definitely say that it is yes a balanced budget. I do believe that the changes that we are making in the Budget Implementation Program, the new revenue that we identified in the Resolutions that were adopted yesterday match up with the proposed spending in fiscal '15."

Ives: "Are you going to stand here today and assure us that that...
that is going to yes on the Comptroller site that we have a
balanced budget?"

Currie: "Representative..."

Ives: "Or will it be no like it has been for the last 12 years?"

Currie: "...I'm not the Comptroller. Let's see if we can get the Comptroller in here and ask her."

Ives: "Well, this is a very important question because according to our Constitution we are to have a balanced budget."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Currie: "I believe the budget is balanced."

Ives: "I believe it's not. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative, I do have just one question. One of the previous speakers indicated that with this Budget Implementation Bill that our spending for FY '15 would be, I believe the figure he used was, \$35,689,000,000, where... when our estimate of revenues was 35,352,000,000. That's a difference of about 3700 Is that..."

Currie: "I don't... I don't agree with the analysis from the previous speaker."

Harris, D.: "Okay. So..."

Currie: "I think there is a match."

Harris, D.: "...so, there's a difference of opinion. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. We do have to do a budget before we leave Springfield in the spring session. We have to pay our workers, we have to meet our financial and contractual obligations. In order for us to do that in the next fiscal year, we must adopt the provisions of Senate Bill 220, the Budget Implementation substantive language that will make the budget work. I urge your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 220 pass?'
All in favor vote 'yes'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 220, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Meier, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Meier: "Mr. Speaker, for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Meier: "I have a thank you here from the cupcake girl, Chloe Sterling. It says, Dear House Members, thank you for passing my Bill. I have learned a lot and I'm excited to get back to baking. I hope you like the cupcakes. Sincerely, Chloe Sterling. Since we've already weighed in and we're done with our weigh in, we have red, white and blue cupcakes in the back in the rooms for all of us and many of our staff members, compliments of Chloe this morning. So, she got home from school late last night or after school and baked till late last night. Her mother was off at work, so these are made by Chloe, not her mother."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative and thank you, Chloe. Senate Bill 274, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 274, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I would urge us to adopt the Amendment and then debate the Bill on Third."

Speaker Turner: "Lady moves that the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 274. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 274, a Bill for an Act concerning

finance. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. The Bill essentially contains three provisions. The first would enable the Governor to do interfund borrowing up to the tune of 650 million to be repaid after... at least by the end of 18 months. For funds that would have accrued interest, interest will also be repaid. This is a cash flow issue. It is a budgetary tool that we have frequently given Governors in the past. And it is one that the Governor requested this year. It does not change total spending, but it does mean that you can manage cash flow. It's a budgetary tool and I think it's a helpful one. Second ... second, there are always questions about Rainy Day Funds, Budget Stabilization Funds. This measure would require COGFA to do a study of revenue volatility trends over time, report that study to us at the end of December with recommendations for the size of a Rainy Day Fund and what kind of cap would be appropriate as well as what kind of revenues might sustain it. The third item in this Bill is... deals with the appropriation for the General Assembly. This would provide for a continuing appropriation. As you know, there was an effort to veto our salaries. The court has said Governors should not do that. This will ensure that a Governor can't do that. In addition, for those of you who are concerned about

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

the state of the state's fiscal program, this would also freeze our cost-of-living increases and it would maintain per diem payments and mileage reimbursements exactly as they are today. So I'd be happy to answer your questions. As I say, three provisions in the Bill. All of them important for operating State Government during the coming fiscal year."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Turner: "She indicates that she will."

Sandack: "Leader Currie, I want to just focus on one of the three aspects of this Bill and that relates to the 650 million in transfers. Is this the same 650 that was mentioned in our budget discussions, of which actually increase the level of spending above what we as a House earlier put as a spending ceiling?"

Currie: "This is consistent with the latest revenue estimate. And as I say, it's really a budgetary tool. It should make no difference to the bottom line. The money has to be repaid within 18 months. If interest would have accrued, then interest will be part of the repayment. So it's only a management tool, it is not to change the bottom line expenditures for fiscal '15."

Sandack: "Well, it's a management tool that this Body and the Governor has used in the past and it's essentially borrowing, correct?"

Currie: "It is borrowing within State Government funds with a clear schedule for repayment."

Sandack: "Right. That..."

Currie: "But that's a cash management program issue."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sandack: "It's... it's a cash management program."

Currie: "Right."

Sandack: "Could we have made it a higher number?"

Currie: "We could have, but we didn't. We feel we can... the Governor's Office can manage... OMB can manage with the \$650 million cap."

Sandack: "Has this Governor managed discretionary funds in the past appropriately in your estimation?"

Currie: "I certainly anticipate that that... the answer to that question should be yes."

Sandack: "Well, you're… you're familiar with the Neighborhood Recovery Initiative. Was that a good use of a discretionary appropriation?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. Shall we talk about what's in this Bill,
Representative? The Chair perhaps will encourage..."

Sandack: "I was asking the question about discretionary..."

Currie: "...us to speak to this Bill."

Sandack: "Yes. And I will speak to this Bill. The idea of borrowing and calling it cash management I think is a misnomer. It's really mismanagement. This Body has consistently borrowed, played budgetary and accounting gimmicks and spends year over year more than the previous year. And we wonder why the state is in a financial tailspin. I'll adopt some of the comments of an earlier speaker on the previous Bill, the 'bimp' Bill. This is more of the same and yet we expect a different outcome. This state's financial situation is in dire circumstances and we continue to borrow year over year and spend year over year more. And we wonder why the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

unemployment's high, out migration's high and the state of our state is in such fiscal disarray. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, can we please take the side conversations to the rear of the chamber so that those interested can hear the debate? Thank you very much. Representative Nekritz."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would like to Nekritz: speak to the... the portion of this Bill that deals with the volatility study. I think this is a very important mechanism or tool that we will be able to use to determine the nature of our... the nature of our income and how we can really establish a real Rainy Day Fund. Right now, we have a Rainy Day Fund, our Budget Stabilization Fund, but it really is a working cash fund. We... as everyone knows here, we pay into it, we borrow out of it and we pay it back all within the same fiscal year. It does ... it really does not do us any good. And this is important... this is an important budgetary tool for us to develop in the future, so that when we have a downturn in the economy, hopefully never again as bad as we did in 2009, but if we have something like that, we have a reserve on which we can draw so that we don't have to go through the ups and downs of the kinds of budgets we've been through over the last several years. This is a very... this is one of the tools that the rating agencies look to very strongly when they're determining the fiscal health and the bond rating of the state. So, this is the first step in establishing that kind of a legitimate real reserve... a legitimate real Rainy Day Fund that then can be part of our

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

recovery and get us to the point where we can have... improve our bond rating. So, I'd ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Leader will yield."

Franks: "Thank you. Representative, I like your idea of freezing the per diem and the mileage reimbursement, I think that's fiscally prudent. I also think, we're having COGFA do a study is certainly fiscally prudent. My questions are going to focus though much like one of the previous speakers had on the interfund borrowing. Do we have a specific list? You're talking of borrowing \$650 million. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Well, the cap would be 650 million. There's no requirement that the Governor engage in interfund borrowing.

I believe he would only choose to do so as a cash management device and to avoid prompt payment penalties, if the alternative is to delay our payments to vendors."

Franks: "I proposed some things to the Governor's Office and I met with some of their agencies on the prompt payment issues and they've not followed up. And I wish they would because I thought of some ways that they would cut their... their interest and their payments in half, but they haven't followed up. But that's a different issue. What I'm concerned about with the interfund borrowing is I'm not sure which funds would be... because they'd essentially be swept and then they would be reimbursed at some latter time."

Currie: "Within 18 months. And if it were a fund that accrued interest, then interest payments would be part of the repayment schedule. There are some funds you can't. Under

Federal Law, for example, there may be some funds that we cannot access for this purpose. So if it's... if we can't do

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

it, we won't. But there are plenty of funds that we, in the past, have seen can be used for another purpose for a short period of time. The fiscal issue in my view is, are we paying it back? And the answer is, yes we are. Under this language there is no way we're talking about theft on the part of the Governor of funds that were created for a different purpose." Franks: "No, I agree. And ... and to the Bill. And I appreciate what the Lady's trying to do. But... and here's my problem with the interfund borrowing. I believe it's unconstitutional for this reason, I believe that people are being charged specific fees to pay for specific services. So they put these moneys into a specific fund, whatever it might be. But then those moneys aren't being used for those funds... those funds are not being used for those purposes. Instead, those moneys are now being swept to be a backdoor tax increase on the individuals because they're paying fees for services they never received. Because if they have these additional funds that means one of two things, either the services weren't provided or they're charging too much for those services and they should cut those fees. So what this essentially is doing is ensuring a backdoor tax increase on everyone who has to pay for these fees. And I think it's unconstitutional to sweep these, even if you do pay them back because they're either not getting the services or they are just being allowed to be taxed for services

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

they're not receiving. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no'."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This is exactly what they like to do. They like to throw in really good stuff like the volatility study, they like to throw in things like Legislators aren't deserving of a COLA and we shouldn't get one and then they add in a \$650 million fund sweep that is going to have to be probably paid back when the next Governor takes over. This is such bad policy. So when I go to vote 'no' it doesn't mean that I think that I should get a COLA as a Legislator. It means that I think that we shouldn't blow a hole in our FY '16 budget 'cause eventually this money has to get paid back. This is such a bad process. Once again, this is the last day of Session. This is how the sausage is made and it's very ugly. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. I rise in support of the Lady's legislation. I just wanted to speak briefly about the provision which would allow for payback, the interfund borrowing. It's been said by some of the folks in their questioning that this would be a sweeping of the funds. Back in 2009 we swept funds and did not pay them back. Coming from that point we stopped doing that. Then we had administrative chargebacks and then from that point we created interfund borrowing. The idea being to use money for cash flow cir... circumstances when budgets are tight. This authorizes exactly what we did the last time, which was 650 million in borrowing. These funds cannot come from anywhere there are federal moneys paid back to them. In the past we had found that those had to be paid back. Those funds could not be used. So some of the concerns that were addressed

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

earlier by other Members have been taken care of this. This has actually worked very well for us as cash flow. The Treasurer controls those 600 and some funds that are out there. They have to be certified. Money is in those funds at the time and that we do not overdraw from those funds. If we do request more funds to manage our cash and manage our bills then that fund is certified. If they need the money back there's a process in place where that money is paid back. It gives us the ability to continue to make operations, to pay our bills. And in the past year... in years when we have done this, the Governor's Office and the Treasurer have worked well to make sure those funds went to their designed purposes. So in a very difficult budget year, I think that this is going to be a very smart, responsible and useful tool. And I commend the Lady for bringing this Bill forward. And as I... my final comment is, we have a... to my daughter who has joined with us, she just gave you a thumbs up, too, Barb. So, Luciana says you've done a great job. I commend the Lady for what... what she has done. It's a responsible Bill; it'll help us through a very difficult year. So please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Members, again, can we please bring the noise level down a bit so that we can hear the debate? Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, since this is considered a fund sweep basically, bear with me as I read some of the funds that may be swept and... and tell me if I'm wrong if any of these will not be included or be excluded. So, we have the After School

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Rescue Fund, the Alzheimer's Disease Research Fund, the American Red Cross Fund, the Amusement Ride and Patron Safety Fund, the Anti-Pollution Fund, the Anna Veterans Home Fund, the African-Americans HIV/AIDS Response Fund, the Assistance to the Homeless Fund, the Autism Awareness Fund, the Child Abuse Prevention Fund, the Childhood Cancer Research Fund, the Council on Developmental Disabilities Fund, the Disabled Veterans Property Tax Relief Fund, Domestic Violence Shelter and Service Fund, the Penny Severens Breast, Cervical and Ovarian Cancer Fund, Alzheimer's Disease Research, Hunger Relief, Diabetes Research, Autism Research, Epilepsy Disease, Military Family Relief, Prostrate Cancer, Fire Prevention, Hunger Relief, Illinois Clean Water, the Illinois Police Association, Illinois Veterans Fund, and I won't even list the others including the September 11th Fund. Will... will any of the dollars from those funds be swept, Madam?"

Currie: "Representative, there's a mistake in assumption behind your question. And that is, that this is not a fund sweep. We are not taking money brought into the state for one purpose and denying the use of that money for the stated purpose. We are borrowing to the extent that one of those funds doesn't have an adequate amount of money to pay its appropriate bills then that money will come from general revenues. This is not a fund sweep."

Reboletti: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. In the regular world of gotcha politics on the last day of Session, we're right back up to the normal fund sweep or transferring funds from one fund to another. So I can only imagine how an average family would address this issue. Do they transfer money from paying

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

the utility bills, from that fund to buying... to the grocery fund? Yet another example of taking a Chase card out to pay your Visa card off and will promise to pay it back later. Why do we continue to do this and then pretend that everything is okay and that we're going to send a balanced budget to the second floor? All of these gimmicks and all of these tricks are present here every year. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Management tools so that we can manage... the Governor can manage the budget in fiscal '15. A proper address to the issue of a Rainy Day Fund, a continuing appropriation for General Assembly operations and a freeze so that you will not otherwise get a cost-of-living increase this year nor would you get a larger per diem nor would you be entitled to a larger share of mileage reimbursement. If you really want those things then of course you can vote 'no' on Senate Bill 274. But I think the responsible approach to Illinois State Government going into fiscal '15 is a 'yes' vote on the provisions of Senate Bill 274."

Speaker Turner: "You've all heard the debate. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 27... 274 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 65 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 274, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 852, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 852, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative McAuliffe, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Yes. Floor Amendment 1 would give a two-day... would give a two-day blanket so that we could have a tobacco shop in Rosemont at the convention center. And I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 852. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 852, a Bill for an Act concerning

safety. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill will give a two-day window so a tobacco company could come to the Donald E. Stephens Convention Center in Rosemont and be able to smoke during the two days. It has a sunset and the sunset would be in October of 2015. It'd bring in a lot of economic business to the area. And be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Williams." Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Williams: "Representative, did you vote for the Smoke Free Act when it was passed in the General Assembly?"

McAuliffe: "Yes, I did."

Williams: "Okay. Do you... have you voted for any exemptions since then to the Smoke Free Act or do you support further eroding the Smoke Free Act?"

McAuliffe: "The last Bill I remember voting on that had anything to do with Smoke Free was to make campuses smoke free, which I think you sponsored..."

Williams: "Sure."

McAuliffe: "...and I did vote for that."

Williams: "I appreciate that. My concern on this Bill is as drafted it appears to conceivably allow a tobacco convention every day through the sunset date. Is... would you be willing to further tighten the language to make sure it is, in fact, only that two-day convention? 'Cause if you look at the language, it... it's pretty vague and technically could have two-day conventions every two days. Do you read it that way or can you give me a sense of why it was drafted that way?"

McAuliffe: "I didn't read it drafted that way and this is specific for only the Donald E. Stephens Convention Center, which is in Rosemont in my district. It would only be for those two days. They couldn't, even if they wanted to, have a smoke free because there's other... other conventions coming. And that's not the intent of the Bill or of this legislation."

Williams: "Do you know what dates the... this convention is scheduled for at this time? Do you know the dates?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- McAuliffe: "They would... if this Bill would pass, they would be looking for it to come late next summer or... or early in the fall."
- Williams: "And even though the language, as I read it, doesn't provide you're saying there will be no more than two days where there will be smoking allowed, period?"
- McAuliffe: "Right. There'd only be those two days."
- Williams: "Philosophically though, aren't you concerned now that this could open the flood gates for maybe another town or another convention center to permit smoking only for two days there and yet another one there? I mean, that's a concern I have, that we're starting to... this would be the first step we would take backwards, moving away from Smoke Free Illinois, moving away from the important public health protections we put in by passing Smoke Free Illinois."
- McAuliffe: "The company that's doing this is the biggest... they have the biggest trade show in the world. Currently they're in Las Vegas. So I would think to come to Rosemont that this would only be a onetime thing that maybe they would come year after year, but this is only trying to get them here once. I don't think there'd be other exemptions that would qualify, you know, to go to another convention center. There's only so many of them that are there..."

Williams: "So... Yeah."

- McAuliffe: "...that I think this would be the only one that would come here to Illinois."
- Williams: "Okay. So, I'm a little confused. Did you say this is something... this has a... an expiration, but are you saying this is something you'd look to do again next year and then have

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

it done on an annual basis? Or are you saying this is a onetime deal when that's not your intention?"

McAuliffe: "This is just a onetime deal."

Williams: "So you don't anticipate coming back and asking us for another exception?"

McAuliffe: "Not at this time, no."

Williams: "Do you... well, would you... what about the slippery slope argument? I mean, what if there was a Bill for an event in Peoria, for example, would you support that? Or do you see that this is a onetime, one city only and that... is this something that we're going to start seeing in cities all over?"

McAuliffe: "I think this is just going to be a onetime only."

Williams: "Okay."

McAuliffe: "This is the biggest trade show. I don't see why somebody else would..."

Williams: "Yeah. Okay."

McAuliffe: "...conflict and go somewhere else."

Williams: "So, but maybe they have a smaller trade show. So will you... will you stand with me then in voting 'no' on any further exemptions or exceptions to Smoke Free Illinois, any other con... like limited conventions, even with expiration? Will you stand with me then and... and have this just be a onetime deal?"

McAuliffe: "I will..."

Williams: "So we don't end up..."

McAuliffe: "...I will..."

Williams: "...eroding Smoke Free?"

McAuliffe: "...I would say that unless maybe if they would ever want to go back to Rosemont again and if we were able to open

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

a window and it was successful for two days, I would want to support that."

Williams: "Have you given any thought to the workers? Because obviously, if you go to a cigar convention where there's going to be cigar smoking you've acquiesced to the fact that you'll be breathing dangerous second hand smoke. But the workers, what about the workers?"

McAuliffe: "The workers they would come in two days ahead of time, do the work, leave. The show would go on for two days. After the show is done for two days, the workers come back and come one day. They are... a lot of them aren't permanent workers, they work on a revolving scale. Some may be working somewhere else. If for some reason they didn't even want to enter the building before or after they had the two day event they could always opt out 'cause there's just a gigantic pool there. So I don't think there would be a lot of workers in the vicinity of where that smoke area is going to be. Most of... all the workers are all trade workers."

Williams: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill causes me great concern because whether it's two days or two weeks there is no limitation on any further attempts to erode the Smoke Free Act. Even if this Bill in itself is not the end of the world, it certainly sets a precedent for us to make exemptions to an Act that we established for extremely important public safety or public health reasons. We all know the dangers of second hand smoke, we all know the costs to public health. We all know the financial costs to the state when we're providing for health care for our residents. This is a dangerous precedent. It

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

opens the floodgates; it opens the door to future erosion of Smoke Free. We made a policy decision on behalf of public health as a state and I don't think we should go back. I would strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel."

Gabel: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I would like to clarify the analysis. On some... on some people's computers the Bill says pending and the proponent shows as the American Lung Association or the Respiratory Health Association and that is not correct. Let me read the correct opponents to this Bill. The opponents are the American Cancer Society, Cancer Action Network, American Lung Association, Illinois Environmental Council, American Heart Association, American Stroke Association, Respiratory Health Association, the IDHA, Sinai Health Association, Department of Public Health are all opponents to this Bill. And the proponent is Village of Rosemont. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... I'm going to ask a few questions.

I don't know if you know the answer specifically but do you know how many jobs this would create for tradesmen that would be setting up the show, taking down the show and for vendors and all of that?"

McAuliffe: "Representative, I'd say it would... a couple of hundred people would work off that plus the economic development that these people would be bringing from coming all over the world, the hotels, the restaurants, the outlet mall across the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

street. The taxes that would generate for the State of Illinois would bring a lot of money and a lot of jobs here."

- Reboletti: "Do... do you know how many visitors that the trade show anticipates would attend if Rosemont were to gain this as a new show?"
- McAuliffe: "I don't... I couldn't give you a specific amount but they say that they come from 30 different countries all over the world to go to Las Vegas. So I would assume if they would go to Las Vegas, they would come to Rosemont also."
- Reboletti: "And to the Bill. And I joined Representative McAuliffe up there because one of the things that we have done in this state is that we have a lot of trade shows. And Chicago is one... is one of the top, and so is Rosemont, in the nation. And we're always in competition with two other locations, that being Las Vegas and the other one Orlando. And for those of you that were here a few years ago, if you recall, we had to reform that system because we were losing trade shows to those venues. And so, now because of this technicality we will send millions of dollars to some other state in some other community where the Village of Rosemont and the State of Illinois and local workers from... from northern Illinois will have the opportunity to go to work. And once Rosemont can gain this show, I would anticipate that they would be able to keep it and would be able to continue on year after year. So I would urge a 'yes' vote. Let's keep people working. Rosemont is a great jewel for tourism and trade shows. And let's keep that going. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McAuliffe to close."

McAuliffe: "Thank you. I just ask for a favorable vote."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves that the House pass Senate Bill 852. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 78 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 852, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Davidsmeyer, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Davidsmeyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will... point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."
- Davidsmeyer: "Today I'm happy to be joined by my youngest, Pax, my oldest who's four and a half, Lennox and my wife, Kristin who I could not do this without. And he… he wanted to say hello to everybody on the microphone."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Thank you,
 Representative. Senate Bill 2590, Representative Mautino.
 Clerk, out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2590,
 Representative Mautino."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2590, the Bill's been read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 2590, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Mautino: "Thank you. This is legislation which is agreed to and it changes the definition for 'travel insurance'. It allows for there to be a license for selling that limited line. And I know of no opposition, be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Will the Speaker... will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Thank you. Representative Mautino, Amendment #2, can you just walk me through what that does?"

Mautino: "The... the Amendment, which is actually still in Rules."

Sandack: "Ah."

Mautino: "We didn't adopt that to the Bill. And it would have just taken the Bill itself, rolled it into one and it would have added the ability for a business entity. But since it's not on the Bill, it's not part of the discussion."

Sandack: "And... and you have no intentions of moving the... the Amendment?"

Mautino: "I... I would like to, but there's still being work done on it. So given the time, I don't want to stop the... the underlying Bill from passage."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2590 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting
is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record.
On a count of 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

'present', Senate Bill 2590, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bost: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if Representative Kosel could be excused for the rest of the afternoon."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. House Bill 5491, Leader Currie. On page 16 of the Calendar under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 5491. Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. I'm sorry. Leader Currie."

"Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This makes a variety of changes in the State Procurement Code. The Bill started out with a small provision prohibiting a bidder from getting bidding preference because they gave money to some other organization. But what the Bill generally does is it makes the certification process a lot cleaner, a lot easier, extends some exemptions given to the state universities, changes the small business program to increase thresholds for participation, makes it possible for the CPO's to enforce penalties that today is reserved only to CMS and doesn't require agencies posting their contracts on their own websites because they are available in a variety of places including the procurement bulletins on the Comptroller's website. And it... it... so those are the ... the principle issues. It does increase the amount at issue if you have to make certain kinds of financial disclosures. That was a very important item to the State Chamber of Commerce. I know of no opposition. I'd be happy to answer your questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

- Pritchard: "Representative, thank you for working with the various groups that had concerns about our... our Procurement Code and process. I know the Chief Procurement Officer had a number of suggestions, as did the Illinois Chamber and the various universities. Does this new change respond to their concerns about research exemptions from the Procurement Code?"
- Currie: "I believe it does. It extends some exemptions and also for some... some university items... some university requests would provide for a permanent exemption."
- Pritchard: "And does this also deal with some exemptions that deal with the student externships?"
- Currie: "Yes. Yes. And that... that's an important one. And the universities will have full exemption from requirements for following the Procurement Code when it comes to student internships, externships, practicums and so forth."
- Pritchard: "Well, we certainly appreciate the... the enhancements and changes you've made for the universities. We've heard almost from the very beginning of our Procurement Code that they had some serious issues and problems complying with the load... with... with the law. I also noticed under the Chamber's request for changes a definition of 'subcontractor'."

Currie: "Yes."

Pritchard: "How are we now defining that?"

Currie: "Well, if a... a subcontractor is... is provided professional and artistic services then they would... they would have to disclose over \$50 thousand, which had not been the rule in the past."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Pritchard: "So, what this is doing, it... it is changing that reporting requirement or is it giving an exemption for the subcontractor who may be purchasing goods and supplies incidental to completing the actual contract?"
- Currie: "Yeah. So, yeah, we're... created a new definition so that...
 so that we're separating the subcontractor from the person
 who's providing the... the materials."
- Pritchard: "That... that certainly is an important enhancement. I...

 I thank you, Leader, for bringing this forward. And I hope we can be responsive to further issues as they arise."

Currie: "I appreciate your support."

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Join Representative Pritchard and me, vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Currie moves that the House concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5491. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5491. Representative Bellock, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Bellock: "I just want to... Representative Naomi Jakobsson is with me and we just wanted to remind all the women that the new leadership is next week down at UIC and that's what we raised the money for. We'll have 20 young women, the juniors in college. As of this year, we will have graduated 180 women

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

who will be women leaders in Illinois. And a lot of the women are participating and I'm just reminding them that there will be a dinner mid-week at the union league and there will be an opening dinner at UIC. And then, all of you that are participating in the panels, we look forward to you coming and joining with us. And anybody that wants to still join in, there's still time. So, if you'll see Representative Jakobsson or myself or Representative Pihos, we'll be glad to help. Thanks so much."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Bellock. Under the Order of Concurrences, on page 14 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 2427, Representative Gabel."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Gabel: Amendment 4 and 5 to House Bill 2427. House Bill 2427 is an agreed Bill supported by energy companies, labor unions and the environmental groups. This Bill directs the Illinois Power Agency to buy solar renewable energy credits using funds that have already been collected and are waiting to be spent on renewable energy. In 2007, the renewable energy portfolio standard was passed and required that an increasing amount of our electricity come from renewable energy, with 6 percent of that from solar energy. Currently, we are very behind with that number. In the last two years the IPA has not been able to have a renewable energy procurement process because of the technical problems with the setup of the RPS program. Although this does not fix the structural problems with the RPS, it allows us to spend a one-time allocation of up to 30 million for this purpose. The Bill provides for a competitive procurement process for solar energy, the same as for other

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

power procurements. Solar energy is a booming industry in states that have made it a priority. This Bill will jump-start the solar industry here in Illinois creating jobs and improving our economy. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative McSweeney."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

McSweeney: "I want to applaud you for this legislation. I do want to clarify that this will apply to both existing and new solar projects?"

Gabel: "Yes, it will."

McSweeney: "Thank you very much. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis. Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Will you be able to purchase renewable energy credits
 outside of Illinois?"

Gabel: "Yes."

Ives: "How... So, literally we could actually be providing job creation for states outside of Illinois by the purchase of these renewable credits?"

Gabel: "There are constitutional parameters that make it difficult for us to limit this to Illinois. But..."

Ives: "Okay."

Gabel: "...from my understanding, there are many Illinois companies that will be bidding on this. We expect Illinois to be very competitive."

Ives: "Well, I know for a fact that if you look at wind, and I know this is about solar, there's not a lot of wind projects

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

happening in Illinois anymore. We're buying renewable credits outside of the state. So if you're talking about job creation, how much of this is going to happen in Illinois? Can you tell me definitively?"

Gabel: "We do expect most... most of all of it to be in Illinois.

The solar panels on top of houses will be from Illinois. And the... the... the procurements that are done from companies that already exist will be from Illinois, we expect."

Ives: "What does this do to the price of energy for the average consumer? Will this be a rate increase?"

Gabel: "There... this has no affect on price because this money has already been collected."

Ives: "Okay. I have reservations about this Bill. I'll be voting
 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, when I happened to hear this presentation in committee today, even though I wasn't on the committee, we spoke and so I just wanted to engage you in a little dialogue because when it relates to the energy sector and because of the tenuous nature of the fact that when there might be increases in price, those prices are generally passed on to consumers. One of the battles that I've been trying to figure out how to fight with the energy companies is that when we talk about minority participation in that, the pushback is always, well, if my costs are increased because of minority participation through marketers or maybe some

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

other pieces of it other than those that may produce, and I know we're talking about solar, the... the thing is that if... I can't do it because the costs are going to increase and I have to... I would have to pass that cost down to consumers. Then ICC is going to smack my hand because, you know, they're trying to support the consumers and keep the costs down. So, I'm... I'm just concerned that as we continue to do these things, will we ever get to a point where there will be substantial minority participation in the energy sector?"

- Gabel: "Well, there... there are minority developers and aggregators in the market today. This is a new industry and I think this is a great place for entrepreneurs from the minority community. They will have an opportunity to participate to the extent that state procurement laws cover minority participation. They are incorporated herein."
- Davis, W.: "Well, but in addition to whatever procurement laws there are as I learned earlier, this is always about the lowest costs."

Gabel: "It is."

- Davis, W.: "So, certainly if the onset or bringing in minority participation as to someone's bid, if it potentially raises their cost, then they're never going to get a chance to participate because this is all about the lowest cost, correct?"
- Gabel: "Well, this encourages those... them to participate and as you know, I spoke with Brian Granahan, the legal counsel for the Illinois Power Agency, and they would be happy to meet with you and discuss this further as well."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Davis, W.: "Well, I... I certainly appreciate their interest and their desire. And just very briefly, to the Bill. Again, we appreciate what the... the Lady is doing in terms of the onset of more of renewable energy sources in the overall power delivery portion of it, but at some point, and I don't know if it's a legislative action or if we can work through some of the other regulatory bodies, whether or not we'll be able to get to a point where we can have significant minority participation in the energy sector and not just through the companies that deliver the energy with them hiring lobbyists and their employees. There has to be room for businesses in the energy sector that play in the energy sector like marketers in particular, you know, for them to be able to... to be able to, you know, survive and to... and to do work from the state level as it relates to the energy sector. So, again, I am going to support the Lady's Motion, but hopefully we'll be able to engage in significant conversation about how to increase all aspects of minority participation moving forward. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, I just have one question. Those who use solar energy, will their utility costs decrease?"

Gabel: "No, not as a result of this."

Davis, M.: "It will not be a result?"

Gabel: "No."

Davis, M.: "Okay. Well, I'd like to thank you for sponsoring this Bill and for the hard work that you've put in on getting it

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

passed. I rise in support of House Bill 2427 because it provides an impetus for the strong network of existing solar generation facilities in this state, as well as encouraging the development of additional new solar generation to provide for any demand that cannot be efficiently fulfilled by our existing facilities. While the Bill will likely result in the creation of new solar generation facilities, the intent of the Bill is clearly also to capitalize on existing solar generation facilities and their ability to contribute to the Illinois Power Agency's portfolio... portfolio of renewable energy resource credits. I think it's a great Bill. It's time has certainly come. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Gabel to close."

Gabel: "Well, thank you for all the discussion on this Bill. As I said, it's an agreed Bill and it will have a very impressive impact on the solar economy here in Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments #4 and 5 to House Bill 2427?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Heave all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', the House does concur with Amendments #4 and 5 to House Bill 2427. Senate Bill 32... On page 13 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 3224. Mr. Clerk."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3224, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. 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 Turner: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, are we at the Amendment stage?"

Speaker Turner: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "I would move for the adoption of the Amendment and then debate the matter on Third Reading."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 3224. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3224, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that would raise the debt limit for the purpose of issuing debt for the road program for this summer. We thoroughly debated this issue yesterday when we passed the Appropriation Bill. This is the companion Bill and this would be needed in order to issue the debt to pay for the program. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 3224 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Anthony, Hatcher. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 97 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', Senate Bill 3224, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Feigenholtz."

- Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to reflect that I... my switch was not working on the Motion to Concur on 2427 House Bill. I meant to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Turner: "Journal will reflect your request,
 Representative. On page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order
 of Concurrences, we have House Bill 2747, Representative
 Crespo."
- Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. And I move a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2747. This was formally House Bill 3820, which passed the House a couple of weeks ago with over 80, 85 votes. It's known as the Grant Accountability and Transparency Act. Yeah, background on the Bill. The Act is intended to comply with the General Assembly's directive to develop a coordinated and nonredundant process for the provision of effective and efficient oversight of the selection and monitoring of grant recipients; thereby, ensuring quality programs and limiting fraud, waste and abuse. It defines the purpose, scope and responsibilities in the life cycle of the grant. Number two, the Act is intended to increase the accountability and transparency in the use of grant funds from whatever source to reduce administrative burdens on both state agencies, grantees by adopting federal guidelines... guidance and regulations to such grant funds. And the Act is consistent

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

with the state's intent to improve performance and outcomes while ensuring transparency and the financial integrity of taxpayer dollars. The Senate Amendment that we are moving today does the following, several things; these are the most salient points. It requires each grant-making agency to appoint a chief accountability officer. This individual shall serve as a contact to the Grant Accountability and Transparency Unit and take responsibility for implementing this Act within the agency. It clarifies the state catalog of financial assistance maintained by OMB. It requires it to be public website, describes on а each requirements, application process, statutory authorization, administrative rules, responsible agent, financial nonfinancial assistance covered by the grant and audit and reporting requirements. And it also requires performance related reporting by state agencies and grant recipients. I want to thank Senators Kotowski and Althoff for their work on this Bill in the Senate, but a... a special thanks to our good friend Representative Patti... Patti Bellock. She's been intimately involved with this for quite some time and I appreciate her work on this and she definitely moved the ball forward on this Bill. With that, I'll be happy to answer any questions."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative Crespo and thank you for all of your work on this. We really appreciate that

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- and you've done a great job. Does this Bill provide an exemption for the universities?"
- Crespo: "No. The universities requested language to clarify that their direct federal money is already subject to a federal rules for grants or 2 CFR 200. The Amendment clarifies that their state grants and any state or federal pass-through grants are subject to the Act."
- Bellock: "Thank you. Are the state agencies, universities and community colleges and grantees required to receive services provided by the Grant Accountability and Transparency Unit?"
- Crespo: "Thank you. The... the Act does not give state agencies, public institutions of higher education or grantees the right to refuse services provided by the Grant Accountability and Transparency Unit. It also does not give them any ability to opt out of the legislation."
- Bellock: "Thank you. And how will this Bill impact the universities?"
- Crespo: "Thank you. The universities are subject to federal rules for grants or 2 CFR 200. The intent of the legislation is to require them to adopt similar rules and processes as will be required of other state agencies to ensure the proper management and oversight of grants. The universities will not be subject to a lower standard of grant accountability and transparency."
- Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative. And to the Bill.

 I just want to say thank you, again, to Representative Crespo
 and to Senator Althoff and Senator Kotowski for all the work
 on the Bill because this Bill has been about two years in the
 making. The Single Audit Commission that we all voted on last

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

year worked very hard all summer on this. This Bill addresses transparency and accountability in all grants in the State of Illinois. And the Federal Government has single criteria for grants and that's how they monitor theirs. This will do something similar in Illinois. And the universities, there was a lot of discussion about that before, they are all fine with this now, with how we worked with them on this. And I would just say that I'm in full support of this Bill. There is billions of dollars that come into the state every year and they are monitored if they're federal grants. This will just put more accountability and transparency into the state grants. And I appreciate all the work also that Carol Krause from DHS did with this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, can you explain to me the Single Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "Single Audit Commission was put in place and it was a by-product of a Bill that Representative Bellock put together a couple of years ago. And it reviewed grants in the state agencies and their pretty much mission was to come up with a way to streamline those grants and come up with some type of accountability and transparency. They talked about the audit reports and monitoring of... of such grants. They definitely wanted to address how we dealt with the grants on the front end to make sure that there's some accountability there, some direction to those agencies that receive the grants as well."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Davis, W.: "Who makes up the Audit Commission that Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "The Audit Commission... give me one second. If you're talking about the Commission that under this Bill or the..."

Davis, W.: "Well, it makes references as was stated..."

Crespo: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...earlier to the Single Audit Commission.

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "Who makes up..."

Crespo: "The Single Audit Commission under this Bill, all four caucuses will be able to appoint someone. The Govenor..."

Davis, W.: "...you... you said will be able to?"

Crespo: "...will appoint someone. These..."

Davis, W.: "So, it doesn't have... I mean is it a functioning Audit Commission? Because this implies that the Audit Commission has made decisions or is this to implement the Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "The... the Audit Commission under this Bill will work jointly with OMB in coming up with the rules."

Davis, W.: "So I'm asking, who is the Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "There will be four appointees, each one coming from each Caucus: the Republicans, House and Senate as well as the Democrats, the House and Senate. The Governor will get to appoint three from the universities..."

Davis, W.: "So..."

Crespo: "...and four from the service providers."

Davis, W.: "...so... so, the members of the Audit Commission don't exist?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Crespo: "It sunsets. There was an Audit Commission originally and this is the by-product of... of what they did. Under this Bill, we're again, reinstating the Audit Commission with the members that I just outlined."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So this Bill reestablishes something called the Single Audit Commission?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "So the Audit Commission that, I guess, that was their predecessor is what worked on this Bill, correct?"

Crespo: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Then tell me who the members of the Audit Commission are?"

Crespo: "One second. So... so, in terms of... of the General Assembly we had, obviously, Representative Patti Bellock, we had Senator Kotowski, Pam Althoff and Leader Currie and the 13 largest grant-making agencies in the state were a part of this Commission."

Davis, W.: "So, Members of the General Assembly and agency representatives..."

Crespo: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "...made up that Commission?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "And it was the directors of those agencies?"

Crespo: "What was the question?"

Davis, W.: "It was the directors of those agencies?"

Crespo: "Those individuals with grant expertise. Most said this was basically their core of confidence and this is what they do."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Davis, W.: "So, representatives from the various agencies that worked on grants and granting?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "Did it include anyone else outside of, say, the State Government?"

Crespo: "There is a few members of the provider community involved in this as well."

Davis, W.: "A few members of the provider..."

Crespo: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "...committee."

Crespo: "Yeah."

Davis, W.: "Were any of those members or did any of those members represent minority interests?"

Crespo: "On that one, Representative, I know obviously there's some agencies 'cause we dealt with this when we had to build a house, I felt that they were left out. Obviously, you can't invite everybody. Under this new... it's not a new agency, but today with this Bill we take care of that. So, we will allow for..."

Davis, W.: "But... but this Bill is the result of previous work?" Crespo: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "So, let's talk about the people who put in the work to create this Bill. So while I understand what you said that you couldn't invite everybody, I'm just asking those that were invited, did they represent any minority interest?"

Crespo: "Representative, you know, the... it was limited in terms of the members of that committee. To your point, I don't know. I know moving forward with the Single Audit Commission we address those issues."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, we can get to how that you're address the issues moving forward, but again, the work of that Commission resulted in House Bill 2747?"
- Crespo: "Right."
- Davis, W.: "So, I'm just trying to find out if anyone who was a part of that conversation in the provider community because presumably... Well, let me even ask that question. When you look at within the agencies?"
- Crespo: "Again, we had 13 providers that participated with the initial Single Audit Commission. Their expertise were in grants and they dealt with all kinds of... of members out there of any minority group. I mean, they are the interface for a lot of those groups, so I'm pretty sure as part of the process they..."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I... I... I can appreciate what you're saying, but let me just use IDOT as an... as an example. There are people who have worked in IDOT for a number of years who have talked about or participated in the contracting process and on occasion they leave minority participation out of... out of the RFPs, out of the contracts that they put out there. So, again, I'm not even focusing on the agencies. You said from the provider community that there was some participation and I just simply ask whether or not any of those individuals represent any minority interest."
- Crespo: "And I will say that of the 13 agencies that were there,
 I'm pretty sure..."
- Davis, W.: "I'm not asking about... are you... when you say agencies, are you talking about state agencies?"
- Crespo: "The providers... providers. The providers."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "Okay."
- Crespo: "And as a minority I feel comfortable with the outcome of this Single Audit Commission."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Maybe you do because you're carrying the Bill.

 But can you..."
- Crespo: "Regardless."
- Davis, W.: "...at least answer my question? Were there any that represented minority interest?"
- Crespo: "You know what, we would have to look at the list, Representative and see who was... who was sitting... the 13 providers. Again, I submit to you and the rest of the House that I... as a minority myself, I feel comfortable with... with the end product. And those 13 agencies, I'm pretty sure... or providers, dealt with minority groups too."
- Davis, W.: "Did you say as a minority myself that you feel comfortable? Is that what you said?"
- Crespo: "I feel comfortable with the outcome of the Single Audit Commission?"
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, is the answer to the question either no or you don't know?"
- Crespo: "The answer to your question, no. There's 13 providers and we can... I can get you a list afterwards. I don't have the list in front of me right now. And I'm pretty sure..."
- Davis, W.: "I'd think if you were a part of it, I'm just asking you... again, if you were a part of it for the last two years, as you've indicated, can you state whether or not any of those agencies... provide... excuse me, providers..."

Crespo: "Right."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "...if they represented any minority interest in the conversation? That's all."
- Crespo: "Yeah. Like I said, the list is out there. I can submit the list to you later on as to who those 13 providers were. In terms of this Bill moving forward, the Single Audit Commission will definitely address those issues."
- Davis, W.: "So, you don't know?"
- Crespo: "That... I gave you my answer, Representative. There's a list of 13 out there, I don't have the list before me right now."
- Davis, W.: "But you've given an answer, but I'm... you haven't given an answer to my question. And... and maybe the answer is, I don't know. And that's cool if you don't know, just say I don't know."
- Crespo: "Well, I'll... I'll give you the list of 13 providers, you can take a look at that list."
- Davis, W.: "So you can't just either say I don't know?"
- Crespo: "I gave you my answer."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. You have a tendency to not answer the question.

 And this is the second time... this is the second time that you and I've had a dialogue and I asked you what I thought was a very direct question. And so I'm just simply asking, do they..."
- Crespo: "I don't have the list before me right now, Representative."
- Davis, W.: "...or don't they?"
- Crespo: "I don't have the list before me right now."
- Davis, W.: "You... you said that you were a part of this conversation for two years..."
- Crespo: "I was not a part..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "...I'm asking a simple question."
- Crespo: "...I was the Commission assistant and my answer to you again, I'll be more than happy to submit that list to you later on. You can take a look at the list and see if those... any of those 13 providers fit the description you're talking about."
- Davis, W.: "Fit the description of what I'm talking about? So they have to fit into a certain description? For all I know everyone that represented those providers might have been white. For... for all I know. So I'm asking you, you said that you were a part of the conversation for two years, can you tell me if anybody at that table represented any minority interest? Can you answer that question?"
- Crespo: "And my answer to your question, Representative, I'll have... I'll gladly give you the list of the 13."
- Davis, W.: "So that's... that's the best that you can do is offer a list to me?"
- Crespo: "Yes, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well... so now that this work is going to transfer to the Single Audit Commission, how will those interests be represented on the Single Audit Commission?"
- Crespo: "They'll be four appointees from the general provider list and we have... we understand... we've asked that make sure that they have some minority representation."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. But that's just a list. Who will ultimately make the decisions on who from that list makes the Commission?"
- Crespo: "The Governor's Office."
- Davis, W.: "So it'll be up to the Governor's Office to determine...

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Crespo: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...the minority participation part of it?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "That's it. So... so you saying that there was a list that will be created that will... that presumably will have minority participation on it?"

Crespo: "We have asked the Governor's Office to make sure he takes that into account."

Davis, W.: "You said we? Who's we?"

Crespo: "I have."

Davis, W.: "You have asked for..."

Crespo: "And the Senator Kotowski as well."

Davis, W.: "Really? Okay. So having asked you a question about the previous Commission, should I trust that you're ask... moving forward will be honored?"

Crespo: "Well, I believe there's like 118 Members here heard me answer that question, so it'd be kind of difficult to not do that now, right? But that's the intent and that's my understanding when we talked to the Governor's Office, as well as on the Senate side, we made that very clear."

Davis, W.: "That we'll... that we'll make that? Well, as you can probably understand what my concern moving forward will be, Representative, is that this is a big decision as it relates to the grant-making process for entities across the state?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, W.: "Okay. And we've seen time and time again where the interests of minorities and the minority communities are not met, they're not recognized. For what it's worth, nobody seems to sometimes give a damn about what minority communities want.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

So again, not knowing whether they were a part of the conversation that got us to this point, you know, I may be having a little trouble trusting that their interests will be a part of the conversation moving forward. I mean, I hope you can appreciate that?"

Crespo: "Sure."

Davis, W.: "And I... I apologize, I'm not trying to attack you. But I hope you can appreciate the sentiment of how I feel about this and making sure that those interests are ... are covered. Because even in the budgeting for results process that I'm a part of it seems like I am struggling to make sure that the interest of minority communities are met in that. Because we're talking about making substantial changes to grantmaking process, assuming that everybody's on the same level. And unfortunately, everyone is not on the same level. And there's a need to work to bring... to make sure everybody's on the same level so that there's parity across the board. We've seen too many times where large agencies that generally are not minority always seems to be the ones to get the grants. And they have the responsibility of spreading those grants out into our communities. But they don't know our communities, nor do they have an interest in getting to know our communities to make that happen. So what you're suggesting here is huge. It's huge. And for me to just kind of stand by and to not say anything about stuff that's going to potentially impact minority communities would be wrong of me not to do so."

Crespo: "I understand, point well-taken."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Davis, W.: "So, again, I hope you can appreciate that. I know you have a representative from the Governor's Office standing there with you and I hope that she's hearing this as well. And this will translate down to the Governor's Office to make sure that our interests are represented on these... in this process. But not only just represented in the process, hopefully what's said in the conversation will be taken into consideration. Because again, as we start to try to refine more and more about this grant-making process because those dollars have always never benefited our communities and our organizations, so they ... so they need the help in terms of raising their level of expertise. They need the help in terms of raising the level of their capacity, they need that help. And it's always seems to be overlooked in a lot of different ways. So again, what you're suggesting here is a big deal. And unfortunately, we've seen examples of where when it comes to making sure that those interests are upheld sometimes people miss the ... miss the boat. And it's unfortunately an arbitrary decision made by someone. And then you have to go back and make it better and then groups that were in line to get what they were going to get now want to file suits again State Government because they felt like you're being unfair. Well, unfair is not in making it inclusive in the first place. That's unfair. So again, what you're suggesting here is a big deal. And we have to make sure. So again, as this Bill moves forward I'm sure it will get bipartisan support and that's fine. And that's fine. 'Cause there are some people in here I don't expect them to represent my interests. I have to represent my interests. And I'm trying to do so right now."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Crespo: "To your point, Representative. There was concerned when we first had this Bill in the House that ... and you're right, we do have some providers out there that are very, very good at... at their core of confidence and what they're supposed to do in the living services. They struggle sometimes with the reporting mechanism. We... we know that. And under this Bill, there's actually a requirement for OMB to, you know, take them by the hand, walk them through the process to make sure they help them meet those... those standards... reporting requirements. I should also add that this morning we... we talked to the African-American Family Commission and the Black Chamber of Commerce expressed come concerns. And they were told by the Governor's Office as well as me that we'll make sure that they have representation in this new Commission... not in the new Commission, but in putting this Commission together."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Crespo: "So it's addressed and your point is well-taken. And I think you do an exceptional job in representing certain interests like we all do. So I'm not offended. That... you... you're great... you do a great job. But again, I just want to make sure you understand that we're very sensitive to the needs. OMB will be required to help these agencies and do a fantastic job, do what they're supposed to do. And again, we did talk to those two groups this morning and we told them that they will be a part of this Commission."

Davis, W.: "Okay. You've made mention of the Single Audit Commission and I'm looking at your list here and you know, if I had to just simply examine names, unfortunately and/or

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

locations, it doesn't appear that we're represented in that conversation at least up to this point. So again, you're saying that there will be opportunities to be represented in the conversation moving forward. I certainly hope, you know, all I can do is hope that that is indeed the case. That before any appointments are made to the Commission... before any appointments are made to the Commission that there will be significant dialogue with those that will appoint or make the appointments to make sure that the communities are represented. But not just one person, you know. I mean, I don't know how many people are going to be on this Commission but you know having one person on there is not enough. There have to be several individuals on there to make sure that the voices are heard. And then let me... let me just also say for the record here, in... in... in terms of being forthright, if I'm not mistaken when you passed this out of the House the first time, I actually voted for it. I'm not against transparency. against transparency. But again, conversations continue to move forward and then you start to go back and think, well, you know, is it going to impact me? How is it going to impact my communities? And then you start to wonder. And then you start to think, well, I'm not so sure anymore. You know, but ... but that's why today even though I voted for it the first time, Concurrences usually make it better in some case where we're trying to alleviate the interests of some group or the opposition of some groups, that's why I'm standing here now having this dialogue with you just trying to make sure. Just trying to make sure 'cause, again, when it comes to grant making we've seen too many times

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

where grants don't make their way into our communities. And to no fault of the entity that's applying for the grant, they don't always meet the requirements because we keep raising and raising the bar of the requirements to make it impossible for certain organizations to get access to state money. We make it impossible for them to do so. So, we have to figure out ways to build capacity in organizations, to give them a competitive, well, not competitive, but give them at least the opportunity... a competitive opportunity to try to go after state funds. And it seems like with some of the legislation that we attempt to pass that we don't do enough of that, to give them opportunities. So again, that's why I'm... I'm happy to be on the Budgeting for Results Commission because I think that's a voice that as I look around that table, if I wasn't there nobody... nobody would be talking about that. Because everybody is trying to figure out just how to make it better. You know when sometimes making it better you can actually make it worse."

Speaker Turner: "Excuse me..."

Davis, W.: "And as it relates to our communities. I need to stand in lieu of making it better. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Crespo: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Davis, M.: "Representative, will these be competitively granted grants?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Crespo: "These will be any... any state grants, that doesn't change. They're still very competitive. I think the value here is that on the front end these will be posted, number 1, so it will be open to general public. And those agencies that apply I think there's value cause on the front end we're going to walk them through the process rather than... than just giving out the grant and finding out there in the... the life cycle, there in the... there in the grant or at the end after an audit that there was some breakdown.

Davis, M.: "Let me... let me just..."

Crespo: "So we'll be spending a lot of time on the..."

Davis, M.: "...excuse me. Let me just agree with Representative Davis, whose words exactly... signify exactly what I think of this legislation. Representative Davis stated that too often the African-American community and the Latino community they're not given the grants because they can't afford to hire the most competitive grant writer. I was shocked to find that the Department of Public Health gives competitive grants for people who are offering health services to women who need it. I would think you'd want to give it to those who need it the most rather than those who can write the best grant. It's appalling to me that women who need mammograms or other services won't get it in their community because there was no great expensive grant writer to present to people who made those choices. So, it is significantly important. I also asked in some of the committee meetings we've had, I asked for a list of factors that are considered by those who are choosing which grants to accept and to fund. They... they say it's competitive. Well, who makes the decision... who makes the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

decision... who are the people who make the decision that this one is acceptable and that one isn't? I would like a list of the questions that are asked and the rating scale. You know, how is that rated? There are many ways to keep people out. The conditions in many of our communities is a direct result of what happens here. It... it's what happens right here that is a result of what happens in my community or doesn't happen. Now, I know that there's absolutely nothing in this Bill that gives a grant to anybody. Is that right?"

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, M.: "It doesn't offer anybody a grant. There's no grant in here for anybody."

Crespo: "Right."

Davis, M.: "It just decides how a person would get to receive a grant."

Crespo: "Right. It'll be posted online with all the instructions, all the departments..."

Davis, M.: "Every... I think someone should point it out to you, Representative, everybody doesn't have a computer. And in many of those computers... people... neighborhood where there are no computers, there's no access. There's no access for everyone to have a computer."

Crespo: "Rep... is that a question or a statement? I'm sorry."

Davis, M.: "I just said, why is it just online when everyone doesn't have access to a computer?"

Crespo: "Well, each agency's going to have a point person who is going to be working close with OMB. So I guess if they make a phone call, they talk to the agency, this person will walk

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

them through the process as well in the absence of a computer."

Davis, M.: "Well, I'm not very pleased with this legislation. I'm sure your attempt is simply to follow the directions of whoever gave you the Bill to make it appear to be transparent or have a lot of transparency. But I think what it does, it continues and even puts a hard gavel on the ability of those making those decisions to continue to deny those who they don't want to get access to grants. It's not fair, it's unjust, it shouldn't happen. And we should never have a table or a group of people making decisions for everyone when they're not represented at the table. It's not fair. Representative Davis, I'm not sure what your result will be, but I think I'm going to be a firm 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Riley."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Riley: "Thank you. Fred, we have talked about this Bill a... a few times. There were a lot of people calling me, certain community-based organizations, they were trying to follow the Bill. For what reason did it change from the designation of 3820 to 2747? What happened?"

Crespo: "I'm not sure why it happened. They is... there was a Senate Amendment and for some reason they chose to take a different Bill number. I'm not... I'm not sure if it's a posting requirement issue. I'm very unclear as to why it happened. But it just basically took the original Bill and this is again, they made some changes. We had some issues with some of the providers, there were some concerns. The universities

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

had some issues as well, so we ironed those out in the Senate and now that they've all been... they're all neutral on the Bill."

Riley: "Yeah, I understand. But... but I think you can understand that a Bill like this that a lot of community-based organizations and up until this Amendment some of the universities had problems with, if there are those agencies that deem it to be very important to them and all of a sudden the Bill number changes, you can imagine that there might be some feelings of distrust. Or that, you know, there's some hanky panky going on and... and this was what was being communicated to me. And no matter where you come from on this Bill, I think that, you know, you have to be sensitive to that process because a lot of people just think that this is going to be an impediment for them to... to receive a grant. You mentioned the African-American Family Commission was consulted on this recently?"

Crespo: "They approached us, I believe it was either last night or this morning, we spoke to both the African American Family Commission, the Black Chamber of Commerce also weighed in on this. We explained the Bill. There was some concerns which were expressed by the Representative earlier in terms of not being able to meet new requirements. Let me explain to them that under this Bill we actually require OMB to walk them through the process, which we're lacking right now. So on the front end they'll be walking through that process. There was concern about the… the makeup of the Commission and we assured them that they will be included in that… as part of that Commission as well."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Riley: "Okay. Again, I didn't hear all of the debate between you and Will Davis, but again, one of the concerns especially with a Bill like this is that maybe they should have been involved in the beginning. When people are involved in the beginning, they can take ownership to something that they help craft. We do that all the time, where we'll have other groups come in and help us craft a Bill. Let me just ask another question. I always had a concern that the departments under the Governor, you know, that issued out grants were not maybe doing their own due diligence. And they weren't monitoring the very community-based organizations that they issued the grant to. I don't want to feel that this takes them off the hook. I have told agencies, many of them, some of our larger agencies under the Governor that they have a responsibility to monitor, you know, those community-based organizations or whoever the organizations are, because they're the ones that's supposed to do that. So a piece of legislation from us shouldn't take away their responsibility to do that due diligence. So how would you characterize that? Don't you think that those departments still have a great responsibility, a matter of fact, primary responsibility for doing their auditing of people that they give grants to?"

Crespo: "Yes, yes and yes. They do have a primary responsibility and that's one of the problems that we have. As we look at the agencies giving out the grants, there's all kinds of rules, there's no standards. And I sit on the Audit Commission and when they come before us we see the breakdown in terms of them monitoring and auditing those grants. This sets a very clear standard that they all have to abide by. So there's...

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

there's no different standards. And we make accommodations, again, for those providers that we know, especially in minority communities that do a very good job in providing services, but as the former speaker pointed out, sometimes they just don't have the grant write... they don't know how to write a grant. They just don't know how to fill out the reports or they... they just have issues with that. This Bill addresses that."

Riley: "But it... well, you know, that's good, but I think that we have to maybe point out every situation that oc... that occurs. Many of these organizations do know how to write grants. They've got people in these organizations that have been with them 20 and 30 years, and one of the concerns that I think some of the other speakers were talking about, and I would... I would go along with it, is that they will send the grant in and they will meet all the criteria and they still don't get it. I mean, that... that's a little different. And that was the point about, they wanted to you know, you know... what were the criteria? How... how, can I, you know, meet up with everything that's in the tenets of the RFP and still not get it? So I think those are... are two issues. Finally, let... let me... let me ask this, at the bottom it says there's various technical, conforming and organizational changes. Can you tell me what some of those are? That's kind of an ominous little... little bullet point. What... what do those mean?"

Crespo: "What... what are you looking at?"

Riley: "All right. In... in the analysis I think right at the bottom it says, makes various... you know what the Bill does, makes

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

various technical, conforming and organizational changes. Name some? I just want to know what they are."

Crespo: "I know one of them had to do with the reporting date that we needed to change, that's one of the technical changes that is alluded there. And we reordered the Bill. It has to be more readable. So I think that addresses the language that you're making reference to."

Riley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate. So I just wanted to comment on the issue and I went over to Representative Davis just to show him that when we started the original issue of this a lot of the social service agencies came into my office and a couple of them were diverse groups. And so, when it came time for the Commission, I recommended that they take some diverse groups and one of the ones that was suggested, that I guess they chose, was a group of human service partners which is made up of a coalition of like 40 different groups of which we were just looking through, of which I would say at least 25 percent or more, when Representative Davis and I were going through it, were groups of different diversities such as African American, Hispanic, there was Asian, there were several on there. And that group, Illinois Partners for Human Service, they always go back to their group and tell them what's going on. In fact, that was one of the reasons why they came to my office. So I... I encourage the Governor on the open spots to make sure to have one of those spots be a group for diversity because it's

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

extremely important for the parity that we were talking about in here. And I would encourage that. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After listening to the debate, I just rise to ask a couple of questions. Do you know at this point the percentage of grants that are in minority communities?"

Crespo: "No, I don't."

Lilly: "Do you know... do you know the number of communities... of minority communities in need of grants and services?"

Crespo: "I don't... I don't have that in front of me, Representative."

Lilly: "What happens... have you thought about this? What happens if no grants are awarded to the communities in need and particularly in those communities of color?"

Crespo: "Under this Bill, Representative, I don't think that really impacts who gets grants or not. I... I mean, these entities can still apply for the grant. All this Bill does is to make sure that we set a certain standard that they all have to abide by, make sure that we'll help walk them through the process and they know exactly what the expectations are when they get their grant. So the intent here is not to be punitive in any way or fashion, it's basically just help these institutions meet the standards and... and get those grants. But that process... the process you're making reference to, this Bill doesn't address that. Whatever that process is they'll go out there... initially it was pointed out, we do have some agencies... several agencies that they have different rules. It's very confusing. When you talk to these agencies,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

they get grants from different providers. They get grants from different agencies with different standards and different rules. This would make sure that we streamline that process. So that will make it a lot easier moving forward."

"Under... understandable, Representative. What we are Lilly: experiencing in many communities throughout our great state is funds that are available in our state are not getting to the communities and to the people who are really in need of them. I'm hoping that we put legislation forward that increases that need. When it does not meet that need what tends to happen is many of those needs are met by outside groups, who were capable of meeting the standards and following the guidelines of what those particular RFP's are requesting. And that then says that many of the needs that are being met are met and served by outside entities. And you do real... you really do not get the opportunity of those communities being involved and apart of the solution of what's happening in their very own community. The Commission is something good, I do understand that. But the reality is that we are struggling to make sure we have those community organizations, key stakeholders being a part of that process. Representation is important in every point of meeting the needs of our community in the grant process. Transparency, it begins, yes, at the beginning of the process, but it also is important at the end of the process. Many of those entities who are providing services may or may not really and truly be meeting the needs of those individuals in that community. And we see that from time to time here in our state. So, I understand the importance, but I'm very much concerned that

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

I have other colleagues who have risen to speak to this point. So, I'm hoping you're hearing the concern very, very seriously because it does make a difference when people cannot be a part of their own solutions and the state is part... appears to be a part of that concern. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Zalewski."

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

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Crespo to close."

Crespo: "Thank you, Speaker. And I want to thank all of the folks who spoke to this issue. I'm very sensitive to the points that were brought out. I see that firsthand too when I deal with the agencies and sometimes you wonder if on the front end they're manipulating some of the information that gets out there, some agencies might not know about this. I get that. I think under this Bill that would address some of those concerns. I should also point out that the Act sunsets in five years. In five years, we're going to be able to go back and decide whether to extend it, whether we tweak it, whether it was a good Act or not. But in closing, I'll say this. I think it's a big step... a big one in the right direction to gain the trust of residents in the State of Illinois, that their tax dollars will be monitored and spent wisely. I'm also hoping that when we vote for this today, you will show me a little bit more love than you did last week when I ran the doomsday budget. So, I ask for... for an 'aye' vote."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Amendment #3 to House Bill 2747?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 96 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 10 voting 'present', House Bill... the House concurs with Amendment #3 to House Bill 2747. Representative Poe, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Poe: "Point of personal privilege. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to direct your attention up to my right. We got Jeff Dennis up there today in the gallery and he was our Chief Page here on the floor from 1995 for a few years. So, thank... welcome back."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you and welcome to your Capitol.

 Representative Anthony."
- Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that I was a 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 3224."
- Speaker Turner: "The record will reflect your request.

 Representative Christian Mitchell."
- Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the Journal to reflect... the Journal to reflect that on House Bill 2427 I intended to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request,

 Representative. Leader Lang in the Chair."
- Speaker Lang: "The last day of Session would not be complete without that. On page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, there appears House Bill 2494, Leader Currie.

 Out of the record. Mr. Clerk."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 727."
- Speaker Lang: "The Chair's in receipt of a Motion from Representative Monique Davis on House Bill 5333. She moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. Representative Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur... nonconcur with the Senate Amendment #1 that actually removed any... any sensible meaning to the legislation. It just removed what... it doesn't make any sense with... with that Amendment on it. So we're removing it."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5333. Mr. Clerk, on page 9 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 346, Speaker Madigan. Mr. Clerk, please place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 346, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. The Bill was read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Bradley."
- Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "I would move for the adoption of the Amendment and then debate the issue on Third Reading."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

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

Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 346, a Bill for an Act concerning

revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan."

"Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue is concerned with the EDGE Tax Credit. And this was the credit that brought to light the fact that there are so many Illinois corporations not paying any Illinois Corporate Income Tax. Because there were several instances where corporations had applied to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, they had qualified for the EDGE credit under the requirements of the statute, but they weren't able to get the money because they didn't have any corporate tax liability. In light of that situation, I requested the House Revenue Committee to conduct a series of hearings on potential changes to the EDGE Tax Credit, but then our desire was to go beyond that and to do a broad-based change in the Illinois Tax Code as it relates to Illinois business. Unfortunately, we've run out of time during this Session of the General Assembly, and what I'm offering today would simply be changes in the EDGE Tax Credit which are strongly recommended by the Director of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, Mr. Adam Pollet, who appeared before the Revenue Committee as a witness. Let me take you through some of these changes. Concerning the small business capital requirement, the Amendment removes the \$1 million capital investment requirement for businesses with less than 100 employees. Going forward, a business with less than 100 employees will

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

be eligible for the EDGE credit if it creates at least 5 new jobs without any capital investment requirement. Two, concerning an affidavit for the but/for requirement, every EDGE application will be required to contain an affidavit by the business chief executive and financial officers stating that but/for the EDGE credit the business would not locate or retain the new project in Illinois. Next, concerning job retention in the high need area. The amount of the credit will be statutorily limited for projects in which jobs are retained. Again, concerning simply retention of jobs, there will be a statutory limitation on the application of the credit. The language provides that for retained jobs the credit will be up to 40 percent of the income tax attributable to each job with a higher percentage being awarded based on the severity of poverty or unemployment in the project location or in the areas from which project employees are drawn. This is consistent with how DCEO currently awards credit amounts, but the focus on targeted areas is new. Next, new rules for special EDGE credits. When we talk about a special EDGE credit we're talking about the credits which have been granted after the passage of legislation. The Amendment addresses the special EDGE agreements which give qualified businesses the option of utilizing their credits earned against the income taxes withheld from their employees. These special agreements have been approved by the General Assembly by a law in the past. Going forward businesses seeking this special treatment from the General Assembly will have to meet higher standards. Such as, the businesses must agree to create new jobs. This special

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

treatment will not be available to businesses that are only retaining employees in the state. Next, the new jobs must be created in an area of high poverty or high unemployment or must draw at least 65 percent of their new employees from an area of high poverty or high unemployment. High poverty means a census track with over 20 percent of residents living below the poverty level. High unemployment means a census track where the unemployment rate is more than 3 percentage points above the state average. Businesses will be required to submit detailed payroll information annually to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity for verification employee residence in high unemployment or high poverty areas. Businesses must agree to disclose income information during the term of the EDGE agreement, including gross income, the amount of income allocated to Illinois and net income before and after credits are applied. This information will be publicly available on the website of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill gets us out of the business of picking winners and losers. Remember last December I think it was or maybe early this year we had ADM come down here and we had Univar Chemical and we had Zurich Insurance saying, hey, we want a special deal under the EDGE Program. We want a special deal. We, the Legislature, were going to have to determine whether or not we were going to give them that special deal. We had to pick winners and losers. We shouldn't be doing that,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

shouldn't be doing that. This Bill effectively stops it in a way that some people may be uncomfortable with, but it effectively stops us having to pick winners and losers. Okay, let's go back just for a second. The EDGE credit, remember, is available to any company that qualifies. What this Bill does, it actually broadens the availability of a company to take advantage of the EDGE credit because the smaller companies, 100 or fewer employees, used to have to put in a capital investment of a million dollars. eliminated, which means the smaller companies can now take advantage of the EDGE credit without having to put in a capital requirement of a million dollars. That is a good thing. The EDGE credit is more widely available. And remember, whether we like it or not, we are in a competitive environment. We need a competitive tool to compete with those other states that throw benefits out there like crazy. The EDGE credit gives us that tool. We want to make it as broadbased as possible, this Bill does that. Now, what about that special EDGE that has been such a thorn in our side? And what do we mean by that special EDGE? The... the EDGE Tax Credit remember is a tax credit against your corporate liability. Well, what if you don't have any corporate liability and there are many companies in the State of Illinois that have no corporate tax liability. So if they have a credit, there's nothing to apply it against. That's where they come to us and say, we want the special deal. We have this credit and we don't have any corporate tax liability, but we pay quarterly withholding taxes every quarter. We want to use that credit against the employee withholding taxes. That's the special

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

deal. That special deal has only been given to 9 firms... 9 firms out of the more than 700 firms that have advantage of the tax... of the EDGE Tax Credit. So on 9 occasions and I stand here and say I've been... voted for some of them, wish I didn't have to, but on 9 occasions we've given that special EDGE deal. And then all a the sudden, other companies are saying, hey, we want to take advantage of that tax credit. ADM, one of the biggest corporations in the State of Illinois, doesn't have a tax... corporate tax liability so they come to us and say, hey, we want to use that tax... that EDGE Tax Credit against our withholding taxes. We want that special deal that you've given out and we were going to be placed in the position of having to pick winners and losers. That's wrong. Now, the way it does it is not especially comfortable because if a company wants to take advantage of that special tax credit, in effect they have to ... have to swallow a poison pill. They have to... they have to provide information which is so onerous to them as a company, so distasteful to them as a company that they would say, uh, uh, I'm not putting that kind of information out there for the public to see, okay. It effectively stops the company unless they're willing to do everything that's in the Bill which my sense is no company would be willing to do, it effectively stops that special tax credit request from coming to us. It stops us from having to pick winners and losers. We may not like the mechanism here of what... what the Sponsor has done in terms of the way it does it, but folks, it gets us out of the business of picking winners and losers and I cannot say it enough. In that regard, this is a positive Bill, as well as the fact that it broadens...

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

it broadens the applicability of the EDGE Tax Credit to firms which up to now have been cut out. The other part of the Bill... the other part of the Amendment which extends the Manufacturer's Purchase Credit is also a very positive part of the Amendment which is needed on... on both elements of this Bill. I stand in strong support and hope you will vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will Speaker Madigan yield for a few questions, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Speaker yields."

Sandack: "Speaker, I want to be clear that my analysis is correct.

This change if it's adopted into law would be perspective only? It would have no effect on current EDGE recipients."

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Sandack: "And to the Gentleman's previous comment, the... one of the reasons for this would be frankly to make this program far more equitable and... and get out of the business of picking winners and losers?"

Madigan: "Mr. Harris said it very, very well. We don't belong in the business of picking winners and losers."

Sandack: "I'm... I know there's been some business opposition, have you... have you heard from DCEO as to how they feel about these purported changes?"

Madigan: "The director of DCEO appeared before the committee as a witness in support of these ideas."

Sandack: "And obviously, the other portion of your Bill speaks to the Manufacturer's Purchase Credit which would be extended.

And I think business uniformly supports that initiative?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. I also stand in strong support. To Representative Harris's points, getting out of the business of picking winners and losers is actually a very strong compelling reason to vote in favor of this, even if you don't like some of the changes to the EDGE Program. Because frankly, we do it pretty poorly and we end up only picking losers. I think we ought to get out of that, let that program be run on an even well-known basis upon which applicants can make a decision whether they want to apply or not, and give DCEO a tool that's consistent. And obviously, I stand in strong support of the Manufacturer's Purchase Credit which ought to be extended. So I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Mr. Speaker, this extends the Manufacturer's Purchase Credit for 6 months. Is there a reason that this wasn't extended a longer period of time?"

Madigan: "Yes, there is. I mentioned in my remarks that we had been hopeful of a broader-based Bill and we just ran out of time during this Session. And the purpose of that Section is to have that available as we continue these discussions through the summer into the fall Session. I happen to think that there's a real good opportunity for Illinois to make some significant, meaningful changes in the Business Tax Code that will help Illinois, help Illinois business going forward. And I plan to continue the work on that."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Pritchard: "So in other words, there... it still might be a possibility that the purchase credit would be rolled into the MMAPA?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Pritchard: "You indicated we ran out of time, are there other ideas in the joint committee report that you're still considering?"

Madigan: "Speaking for myself, I would consider everything in the report."

Pritchard: "Well, we had a number of areas where there was consensus, a lot of disagreement on some of these areas of... of enhancements and ways of incentivizing business, but there was agreement on some other areas and I'm hopeful that come fall we might be able to address some of those. I also would... would bring up the fact that in that report we had a number of recommendations dealing with our overall business climate that allows our businesses to compete against companies outside our boundaries who are selling inside our state, and also allowed us to attract expansion and growth in many of those businesses. Is it your intent that we also look at that general climate recommendation and perhaps see how we can address that issue?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Pritchard: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we oftentime talk about the gimmies, the way that we're looking at loopholes. Actually, what we're trying to do is incentivize job creation. And when we look at 7.9 percent unemployment in our state, I think we have a long way to go in terms of helping business employ our citizens. I would ask for your support on this particular

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

measure, and further recommendations that have been made on enhancing our business climate."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

"I agree with the comments of the Speaker and with Bradlev: spokesperson Harris. In my mind, this is a fair deal for the big corporations. And this is a great deal for the smaller corporations that haven't had these benefits available to them in the past. It also provides opportunities in areas of the state that maybe didn't get considered before because of the changes that we've made. And so, not only have we opened up this program to more businesses, but we've opened up this program to more areas of the state. And I think that's important to remember for those of us who serve in underserved areas and in areas that need economic development. And so, David Harris is right. He's exactly right. This gets us out of the business of picking winners and losers. It expands a vital program to a greater group of businesses and a greater area of communities for the entire State of Illinois. I commend Speaker Madigan; I commend all of those who worked so hard on this issue in the joint committees. And I would strongly urge and recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I just wanted to know whether or not... where the tax disclosure statements will be filed if they're something that can be FOIA'd or if they're completely public to anybody who wants to see them or is this something DCEO will keep close at hand?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Madigan: "First of all, the taxpayer would be required to consent to the filing with DCEO who would put it on their website. So it would be generally publically available after the taxpayer consents."

Ives: "Okay. And does that tax disclosure apply to those currently
 receiving a special EDGE credit or not?"

Madigan: "The answer is no."

Ives: "Okay. And then this basically opens special EDGE to any corporation with these… actually more minimum standards to receive that same credit if they want to freely choose to do everything under this program, correct?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And to the Bill. First of all, I want to thank the Speaker for his Leadership on this. This is something that we've worked together for a long time on. And the previous speakers, Representative Harris and Representative Pritchard and Representative Bradley had worked very hard, we had the... the joint committee and we had many hours of testimony on this as well. I had... the Speaker cites it that we've run out of time for this Session on it. And I... I see this as a start 'cause I know that we're going to have more revisions, like as one of the other speakers had mentioned. But understand, these changes here really are monumental and... and these changes deserve your support. For the first time, smaller employee... employers will actually have the opportunity to get an EDGE credit. Before, very few employers could get them because of the million dollar capital

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

requirement. With that capital requirement being taken away, this will allow the small employers, those that are real... really the economic engine in Illinois, to avail themselves to these same credits that they've never had the opportunity to use. Before it seemed that the small employers were always the ones who were subsidizing the big guys, many of which didn't even pay taxes which we had seen in these special EDGE credit deals. And this does... Mr. Harris was right, this does effectively put... making it very difficult for the special EDGE to happen, which is the proper public policy. It doesn't make it impossible, but it makes it very difficult. But perhaps the most important issue that's being changed now by the Speaker's Bill is that no longer will Illinois subsidize the firing of Illinois' workers. I found that particularly distasteful in previous EDGE deals, where employers would be able to claim retention of employees while at the same time actually reducing head count and we would subsidize the termination of taxpaying Illinoisans. I found it morally reprehensible and a terrible, terrible economic policy for the State of Illinois. This Bill effectively terminates those... that provision. So I think this is an excellent start. I appreciate the Speaker's Leadership on this and I look forward to coming back to the Veto Session with some of the other suggestions that our joint committee brought forward. But I'd ask all of you to support this very important piece of legislation."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, earlier this year you put forth a plan that I totally supported that cut the corporate income tax rate in half. We have 7.9 percent unemployment in this state. What happened to the plan to cut the corporate income tax in half? That's something that actually creates some jobs in this state."
- Speaker Madigan: "Our plan and our effort was to take that together with other changes to the Tax Code and that's where we simply ran out of time. As far as I'm concerned, that's still on the table but as part of a broad based Bill so that when we do that change we'll be in a position to say, we've done some meaningful significant change here that will put us in a position where our Tax Code is actually helping the situation, not hurting it."
- McSweeney: "And... and Mr. Speaker, respectfully, we're not getting out of the business of picking winners and losers. This program continues. Wouldn't we be better off just cutting the corporate income tax in half and eliminating the EDGE Program so we can get out of this business once and for all?"
- Madigan: "Mr. McSweeney, I don't want to go that far. And I would refer you to Mr. Pollet who's the current director of the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, who to me has made a pretty good case that there is utility in the EDGE credit. You may philosophically disagree with him... philosophically disagree with me, but Mr. Pollet is a very qualified director. And he cites the costs, which I don't have at hand right now and he compares that to total expenditures and he comes to a judgment that it's better to have it than not have it. And this is where you and I may

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

have a fundamental disagreement, but... but I would just reference Mr. Pollet because he's a very good witness."

McSweeney: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Speaker Madigan to close."

Madigan: "I'd like to thank everybody for this very meaningful debate and ask for an 'aye' vote."

'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Osmond, Tracy. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1004, Representative Monique Davis. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2846, Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3364, Mr. Reboletti. Out of the record. Senate Bill 3423, Mr. Thapedi. Please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3423, a Bill for an Act concerning business. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Thapedi."

Thapedi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 3423 is an initiative of the lending industry and is also supported by the Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation. After the great recession, the Obama administration initiated a series of legislative measures including the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The purpose of Dodd-Frank was in part to protect consumers from abusive financial practices in the service industry. Most relevant to this Bill, Title 10 of Dodd-Frank created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

One of the rules established by the Bureau sets forth the rules and regulations and requirements that mortgage lenders and servicers must follow to obtain property hazard insurance for a homeowner that either, 1) doesn't have insurance, or 2) has inadequate liability insurance coverage on their home. This is actually called force-placed insurance. Illinois enacted similar laws in the Collateral Protection Act of 1996. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, there's some confusion as to the rules that a lender and/or servicer must follow when obtaining force-placed insurance on a property. In my legal opinion, the Dodd-Frank rules provide far more preemptive protections for consumers. For example, Dodd-Frank requires that the lender or servicer provide two separate notices. One 45 days before the force-placed insurance may be purchased. Then if the force-placed insurance is to be renewed by the lender or servicer, Dodd-Frank requires that a new notice must be given before it is in fact renewed. Among other things, Illinois law only requires that notice be given within 30 days after it has been obtained by the lender or servicer. Senate Bill 3423 removes the uncertainty and the confusion between the state rules and the Dodd-Frank rules. It also makes clear that the lender in service or compliance with Dodd-Frank equals compliance with Illinois law. I'm happy to answer any questions on this important issue."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Davis. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2694, Mr. Drury. Please read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading and please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2694, a Bill for an Act concerning posting of information on an Internet site. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Drury, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury on the Amendment."

Drury: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to adopt Floor Amendment 1 and debate it 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 2694, a Bill for an Act concerning posting of information on an Internet site. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the revenge porn Bill; the House previously passed this out. I just ask for your 'aye' vote on it, again."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Cabello, Mussman. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, on Senate Bills-Second Reading, there appears Senate Bill 1740, Mr. Turner. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 1740, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Second Reading of this Senate Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, there appears House Bill 1154. Leader... Out of the record. House Bill 4417, Mr. Hoffman, on the Order of Concurrence. Please proceed, Sir."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr... thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Amendment #2."

Speaker Lang: "And any idea what it does, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Speaker Lang: "Okay."

Hoffman: "No. It... it... it is a simple Bill. What it says is that the probation officers who have to go through the training in order to carry a weapon have... the Illinois Law Enforcement Training Standards Board must provide the training."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Osmond. Please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4417. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

passed. House Bill 1463, Representative Golar. Please proceed, Representative. Representative Golar."

Golar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 1463."

Speaker Lang: "Give us a brief description of the Amendment, please, Representative."

"Yes, Sir. First of all, this Bill was passed out of the House last year and the Sponsor in the Senate has been working very hard to get an agreement. This is an agreed Bill. Senate Amendment #1 would limit the closures to only those premises where the liquor control commissioner has evidence of either sales or possession with intent to sell controlled substances of marijuana, the sale or possession with intent to sell firearms, homicide, criminal sexual assault or criminal sexual abuse, aggravated assault, aggravated battery. It would also provide a safe harbor for those retailers who report criminal activity to local officials. Lastly, the Bill allows distributors in coordination with the Liquor Control Commission and police department to remove any product from the closed retailer for which they have not received payment. Senate Amendment #2 is a... is a Bill that's amended and an agreement between the city, ABDI and WSDI. It allows the city liquor commissioner to inform the State Liquor Commission of any license premises where criminal activity is alleged. If the state commissioner receives such information, the Commission must post the information. This is an initiative of the mayor of the City of Chicago and of course the commissioner of the Liquor License Commission. I'll be happy to take any questions."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Acevedo. Please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1463. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Chair recognizes Leader Mautino. Gentleman does not wish to speak. House Bill 3199, Representative Cassidy. Please proceed."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I wish to concur in Senate Committee Amendment 1 to House Bill 3199. This is a Bill that we thoroughly debated in April that addresses the... the need to make clear that when schools are polling places they can either utilize an outside exit or choose to close or have an in-service day in order to not take IDs. We have had some issues in areas where... where schools are restricting access to polling places by taking IDs. As I said, it was thoroughly debated in... in April. But the Bill over in the Senate was used for another purpose so we're putting the language on this Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sandack: "Representative Cassidy, help me out. What was... what'd the Senate do? Did they gut and replace it?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Sandack: "And what does the Bill do now that you're concurring to?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Cassidy: "So, what you are concurring to this... this is the language that we debated in April now on a new Bill. And... as a gut and replace."

Sandack: "All right."

Cassidy: "So the... the schools as polling places language is on this Bill now."

Sandack: "Okay. And as a refresher, 'cause we did thoroughly debate it, this takes away local control though from the schools to limit access or require identification in order to get into the schools, if I remember correctly?"

Cassidy: "No, it does not. It simply makes clear that polling places are not places that can be restricted... have access restricted based on ID."

Sandack: "But some of the polling places..."

Cassidy: "And it provides some guidance..."

Sandack: "...are schools though, right?"

Cassidy: "...to schools... and it provides some guidance to schools on other ways to address it."

Sandack: "That's it... quidance."

Cassidy: "It is not a mandate."

Sandack: "Not a mandate but it was... it's guidance to schools, which they needn't adhere to, correct? They can continue to require identification to get into schools for security purposes, as they deem appropriate?"

Cassidy: "Under election law, they may not. Under the Election Code you may not prohibit access, utilizing an ID. Because schools have raised concerns, this provides guidance on how they can adhere to both issues. That you can utilize... most schools have been able to utilize outside entrances. Schools

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

have a great deal of freedom in scheduling in-service days and... and teacher... teacher record days. That is another good way to do it if they cannot comply with an outside entrance."

Sandack: "How is that not a mandate then?"

Cassidy: "We are not mandating that they close."

Sandack: "Ah, we're not mandating... mandating that they close, but we are mandating that they stay open and not prohibit..."

Cassidy: "They are already mandated to prevent... to not allow... to not prevent access if someone doesn't have an ID on Election Day."

Sandack: "Right. And... but in every other day when it's not Election Day the schools obviously are free to utilize their own security purposes?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Sandack: "So for one day of the year or whenever an election occurs, there... they... they must not utilize their security purposes and you're requiring identification?"

Cassidy: "This gives them options on how they can comply with Election Code and maintain their security."

Sandack: "Excellent soft history. Thank you. To the Bill. As a reminder to mostly my side and to folks that... that are concerned about local control, we did... the Representative is quite right, we did have a vigorous debate and many people were concerned about what this does to schools and their ability to maintain their own security. I would, again, urge those that voted 'no' last time to vote 'no' again. And encourage those who really talk about, when it's convenient, local control to be mindful that this is ultimately an issue of local control. Vote 'no'."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, why do we require schools to modify their schedule for the convenience of an election?"

Cassidy: "We are not requiring schools to modify their schedule.

Schools are... schools are often utilized as polling places."

Pritchard: "But they aren't used as polling places when they don't meet... meet the accessibility requirements, are they?"

Cassidy: "Do..."

Pritchard: "And we don't..."

Cassidy: "...you mean the ADA?"

Pritchard: "...yes."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Pritchard: "They have to meet ADA?"

Cassidy: "Yes, they do have to meet ADA."

Pritchard: "And if they don't, then we don't use that building, correct?"

Cassidy: "Correct."

Pritchard: "So why can't we if there is a problem with accessibility for the voter that we pick another location?"

Cassidy: "In many circumstances, a school is the only ADA compliant building available, large enough to accommodate a polling place."

Pritchard: "It just seems, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we're asking the local district to modify their schedule unnecessarily so that we can make this a secure situation. I... I think we've passed all kinds of laws that limit access to school buildings for... for example, people that are charged with sexual abuses.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Now we're opening up the school building and requiring it to close for the school purposes. I... I just think this is really stepping over our local control."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want the House Democrats Franks: to understand our analysis is not up to date. This still shows that it's a Riley Bill. Mr. Sandack had described what it does, so for those of you who are looking at the analysis it isn't correct. I'd ask you to look at the Amendment. And if you pull up the Senate Floor Amendment #1, it's short, you'll be able to see what this Bill says. And what this Bill says is it encourages schools to close or to hold a Teacher's Institute Day on that day with students not in attendance. So what this Bill is encouraging is that schools close instead of having kids at school. I ... I've seen our test scores and I would hope that our kids would be in school more, not less. I wouldn't do anything that would encourage schools to close. We've had... I have a Bill that says, and we never had a chance to even have this Bill heard, but I think it makes eminently much more sense than this Bill. What our... my Bill says is if a school cannot comply with its own safety protocols that it should be allowed to opt out of being a polling place. Because on... every day that one goes to a school to visit or you have your kid at school, you have to show your ID, you have to oftentimes go through a locked vestibule and then you would enter into the premises. You'd have to sign in, put on your little visitor badge because... we do this because we are trying to protect our children. Yet for some reason on Election Day all safety protocols are thrown out the window and I can tell

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

you in some areas I've seen people go in to vote and they walk right into the media center of a middle school. No checks, no balances, no... nothing. So, I don't understand why on every day we would require safety protocols, but on Election Day we throw it out. So what's the solution? Close the schools. That's ridiculous. What we ought to talk about is the ability for elected school boards and locals to make it self-determination on whether they can actually keep their children safe. And if they think that they cannot follow their own safety protocols they ought to have the ability to tell the Election Board, I am so sorry we cannot be a polling place this year because we can't follow our own safety protocol. Perhaps you can move it someplace else, perhaps you can give us some money so we can build a vestibule or whatever it might take to keep our children safe. Because oftentimes they don't have the ability with segregation to put it in a separate place for the voters. Now I would think this would probably affect less than 10 percent of the schools. But to encourage schools to close it just the dumbest idea I could think of. If anything, we should change Election Day and have it on a weekend if you want more people to show up. But to ask our schools to close makes no sense whatsoever. I think our children's safety is paramount. I think if we want to drive up voter totals we should change the date to a weekend or perhaps have two days of voting. Heck, in India they do it for 6 weeks 'cause they have so many people show up. They have 80 percent turnout. I could tell you at our last election in March in McHenry County we had almost 17 percent turnout. Almost. Well, I get really excited about a 17 percent turnout.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

It's terrible. So, now what's... what's the solution? Let's have 17 percent turnout and we're going to close our schools. This is ridiculous. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. For those... I remember this debate last time and it was all of the discussion about how, well, just go find another polling place. Just go somewhere else, there's got to be somewhere else. I'm going to stand... I'm going to wait here a few minutes while each and every one of you call your clerk. And I want you to ask how many polling places they're able to find other than a school because you're not going to be able to find very many. The clerks know that we have to have the schools as polling places in order to be able to conduct elections. The other alternative which I don't think would sell very well here is to make larger precincts or to fight to make the polling places much further apart so people have to drive a longer distance in order to be able to vote rather than going to their local school. I get it that they're... I'm don't... I'm not for making our schools unsafe. But we have to find a balance between safety and the ... and the ability to be able to vote and to provide people a polling place that is convenient. As... as Representative... as a former speaker said, you know, we want people to vote, making them drive further is not... is not the solution for that. This is a really straightforward proposal that simply says that... that doesn't mandate schools to close or to hold an Institute Day, it says you just might want to think about it. It doesn't ask them to do anything. And so, I think that this is the ... the ... an important approach

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

for making sure that our elections are easily accessible for people so we do have more than 17 percent turnout. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "Representative Cassidy, did this Bill... was this Bill
initially HB5755?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

Ives: "And is... and why is it now HB3199?"

Cassidy: "Because it was amended in the Senate."

Ives: "And is... what is HB5755 now?"

Cassidy: "I suppose we'll get to that when we get to that point in the Calendar."

Ives: "But HB5755 now became a different Bill. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "I believe so. But we're debating this Bill now."

Ives: "Oh, I understand. I just think it's completely... I think we
need to point something out..."

Cassidy: "We've been doing Concurrences all day."

Ives: "Oh, that's fine. I think we need to point something out to the public here. It's just very, very difficult for any individual to really track these Bills when you start with a shell Bill and you move Bills around and you add Amendments and you gut and replace and I'm just pointing this out. This Bill started out as 5755, now 5755 is a completely different Bill and now this Bill becomes 3199. And I think it makes it very difficult for the public to understand how things go on. It's just like concealed carry last year, which started out as HB182, a signage law on ATMs and then becomes concealed

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

carry. I think we need to look at how we're doing this thing... doing this in the future and stick to the Bills. And could you ask... I have one more question of you. Why is... why did HB5755 suddenly appear without going through the regular Bill process?"

Cassidy: "The identical language has already gone through committee."

Ives: "It didn't go through the normal committee process when we had to file Bills in time and then also have it come out of the House with a Third Reading deadline. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "It... it did."

Ives: "It didn't... HB5755 as it currently stands, didn't meet the Third Reading deadline that we all had, correct?"

Cassidy: "That's a completely different issue."

Ives: "No, the issue here..."

Cassidy: "It did make the Third Reading deadline."

Ives: "...is that we just like to make up the rules and add items into the language and not... not confer... not actually adhere to the policies in place with Bills and having them go through a full committee process and having them go through the normal time frame of debate and looking it at. Because later on today we'll probably be looking at HB5755 which started out as this Bill but is now a completely different idea. I find it ridiculous and so does the public."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Fortner."

Fortner: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. One of the previous speakers issued a challenge to call our clerks and try to identify what we could do to replace schools as polling places. Well, in my particular case, I believe I can answer

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

to that challenge. Because last summer the local school district determined that they were unable to comply with their safety protocols and would have to be forced with the option of either closing or doing something else because they wouldn't be able to comply to make their schools available on Election Day as a polling place. I actually did reach out to the Election Commission and offered a number of suggestions; we actually looked around in the area. And in part, because of actions of this Body to make it easier through electronic means to consolidate polling places from multiple... single polling places per precinct to one that served multiple precincts, as well as by the number of voters who are taking advantage of early voting to come on earlier dates and not burden the polling place on Election Day per se, we're actually... we were able to identify sufficient polling places to accommodate, at least in my township, all of those things. So I did do that. And we were able to find a way to keep the schools on their calendar providing education to the children. I can't say that that would be true in everyone's jurisdiction, but at least where I was we were able to do that. I don't think this legislation's wise. I'm going to be voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, in your experience have you ever had an educator or a... an administrator say to you, what I really need from Springfield is yet another mandate to help my school move forward?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Cassidy: "This is not a mandate."

Hays: "Well... but I believe you are suggesting that a school would need to either accommodate letting at least some individuals who the court system has suggested should not be near children, not at school, not at a park, not anywhere into the school at least on one day and relax the safety requirements. A... a previous speaker suggested that, you know, there's some compromise maybe in the middle. And on many, many issues and we've witnessed that over the last weeks, good people, wellintentioned people to come together, there was a meeting in the middle, you agree on what you can and you make it the best Bill to go forward. But I'm not sure there's ever a compromise... ever when it relates to the safety of children. I'm not sure in any precinct in this state you're going to get much agreement from... to the notion that somebody who is a sexual predator, one day a year it's okay for them to show up at your school and you've got to let them in with ID or not. That's not okay. There's no middle ground. This is, in fact absurd, vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack, did you speak in debate, Sir?"

Sandack: "I... I did, but my name was used in that debate later on by the Gentleman from McHenry."

Speaker Lang: "Well then, proceed."

Sandack: "Thank you. To the Bill. When I asked the Sponsor whether this was a mandate or not and she's been consistent that it's not a mandate, but I look at the text of the Bill and it reads, if the County Board or Board of Election Commissioner chooses a school to be a polling place, then the school district must make the school available for use as a polling

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

place. And then the language says, which the Sponsor has been about, talks very candid about accommodations. accommodations, however, as the Gentleman from McHenry said, are limited to be generous. Close or make it a Teacher Institution Day... an Institute Day where the students aren't in school and the students aren't learning. We're making this polling place for a day superior to the school in its seminal purpose, which is to educate and teach. We can do better. This is not good use of a school, requiring that it limit its security practices for a day. And as my previous... my friend and previous speaker just said, security trumps in this instance. So I'm going to, again, appeal to everyone to vote 'no' on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, what is it that you're trying to do with this Bill? Everybody's talking about closing schools. I have polling places in my district and I have a lot of schools and we don't close our schools. Accommodations mean that they could have a section of the school to be able to run a polling place. I mean, if I was supposed to close all my schools for Election Day, I don't think that would be feasible. Is that what you're trying to do to the schools?"

Cassidy: "No, not at all. And let me be clear, the... the mandate that a school be used as a polling place is existing law. This does not mandate that schools be used as polling places that is existing law that we have worked under for years. What this does is acknowledge that distinction that sometimes there is a... a challenge in addressing school security. This

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

does not mandate additional closure days. This suggests that a school could utilize one of the days that they would be already closed as a... as an Institute Day or as a closure day on that Tuesday for Election Day. This balances the... the need to keep our students safe and recognizes the... the primary importance of... of our democracy and access to the polling place and preventing people from being kept away from the polling place, the fundamental basic right to participate in your democracy."

Arroyo: "Representative Cassidy, thank you for the clarification because I've been hearing a lot of people talking about closing the schools. We don't close none of our schools and we have a lot of polling places in the City of Chicago. I was pretty sure in knowing that you wouldn't want... that that's not what you want. And if you're calling the Bill, I stand in support of this Bill because I have the same thing in my district. And I would urge all the colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Wheeler."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Wheeler: "I stand in firm support of this as well. I did what Representative Nekritz asked me to do and I called my clerk, the Clerk of McHenry County. So I hope that all Representatives from McHenry County are listening. There are 150 polling places in McHenry County, 50 of them... approximately 50 of them are schools. She wouldn't know what she would do in this bedroom community of McHenry County if she didn't have the public buildings of schools to use. I

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

asked her, would it... is... would it be an issue... or has it been an issue as far as school safety? And she said, a couple of schools have questioned it and have been able to make accommodations. Some of them do use the day as an in-service day. So to the... to the Sponsor I ask you, isn't it state statute how many school days there are in a year?"

Cassidy: "Yes, it is."

Wheeler: "Would this Bill change that at all or reduce the number of school days?"

Cassidy: "Not in any way. This merely suggests that one of those days could be utilized in this fashion. One of those closure days could be utilized in this fashion."

Wheeler: "All right. To the Bill. I have five children and I would love for there to be more school days, as a matter of fact, a longer school year would be a great idea. However, their safety is of most important to me. And if the school needs to take one of those in-service days on Election Day, then it is their choice to do so. So thank you for bringing this forward."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "Representative, I have a couple of quick questions for you. Number one, I know we've had some problems where schools on a regular daily basis always ask for IDs when they come in. And when it's Election Day we had schools that were doing this, correct?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Willis: "If they... there are people that are on the no trespassing list for schools for a variety of reasons, they may be not safe to the community, they may have caused problems in the school. If that is the case and one of those in the previous practice came up on that list, were they denied the right to vote?"
- Cassidy: "There is a... there's a procedure under existing law for sexual predators to... who... who are not permitted in schools.

 I... if you're talking about a school having its own list, I don't know the answer to that."
- Willis: "Okay. So... but this will protect us from that type of thing so we won't have to worry about this?"

Cassidy: "Right."

Willis: "Because IDs are no longer going to be... hopefully no longer will be checked because we're giving full access to that?"

Cassidy: "Right."

Willis: "I mean, so your intent of course is not at all to disrupt the educational system of our students, it's to allow free access to our democracy that we have set up, correct?"

Cassidy: "Absolutely."

Willis: "I... I commend you for this Bill. I will continue to vote 'yes' and support this and I urge the rest of the Body to do so. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

- Bost: "Sorry, I wanted to wait until after but we need to excuse Representative Osmond for the rest of the day please."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect that, Sir. Representative Cassidy to close."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Cassidy: "I thank you for the retread debate. It was great. Once again, this is about fundamental democracy. This is about access to our polling places, access to our elections. This balances that need for school safety with the importance of our... of the integrity of our elections. I urge all of you who voted 'yes' before to do so again. 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? Moylan, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3199. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Soto."
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. I just want to change my vote on Senate Bill 852; it's Representative McAuliffe's Bill. It was my intention to vote 'yes' on the Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "The record will reflect your intention. Page 16 of the Calendar, there appears House Bill 5331, Mr. Zalewski. Please proceed, Sir."
- Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House..."
- Speaker Lang: "Please... please wait one moment, Mr. Zalewski. All right. Please proceed now."
- Zalewski: "Okay. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5331. It's a trailer Bill to the ridesharing legislation. We know that the opponents to the original Bill are supporters of this legislation as it eases the burden of the original Bill. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sandack: "Could you explain that a little bit?"

Zalewski: "So, Ron, it... we made a few changes to the Bill. We lowered the insurance requirement. We changed the way in which the hours are measured, the threshold hours for who's a part-time driver and who's a full-time driver. We... we dealt with the Home Rule... we dealt with the Home Rule powers in a different way and we added a grace period for chauffer licensing."

Sandack: "With these changes, Representative, are the... the providers Uber, Lyft, Sidecar, are they in agreement with these changes or do they still oppose?"

Zalewski: "They... they would... it's fair... I think it's fair to say they oppose the original Bill..."

Sandack: "Right."

Zalewski: "...but they would support our passage of this legislation."

Sandack: "I'm sorry? Pardon me?"

Zalewski: "I think it's fair to say they oppose the underlying Bill, but they would support our enactment of this legislation."

Sandack: "Okay. And last question, Mike. I know the City of Chicago, I think they just passed an ordinance. Is this consistent with that ordinance or do we have conflict here?"

Zalewski: "I would say that this... this legislation is... will be the bottom line legislation on ridesharing to the extent that it... there are times when our jurisdiction will be concurrent

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

with the City of Chicago's jurisdiction. But for the most part, this... this will be the ridesharing law in Illinois."

Sandack: "Thank you. Appreciate it."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Kay. Please take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting 'yes', 10 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 5331. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5622, Mr. Turner. Please proceed."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 5622. House Bill 5622 is the Employment Payroll Card. The Bill passed the Senate unanimously following an agreement between the Attorney General's Office and financial institutions. The big sticking point was... were the declined transactions. And the Bill now allows employees to receive two declined transactions at no cost during each month and allows financial institutions to charge fees for any subsequent declined transactions. But these fees are limited to the costs to process those declined transactions. I'd ask for the Body's support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hays, Kay, Tryon. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 98 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 1 voting

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

'present'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 5622. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5512, Representative Nekritz. Please proceed."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments, I think it's 2... 1 and... 1 and 2..."

Speaker Lang: "Two and three, Representative."

Nekritz: "...it's 2 and 3? Okay. That's fine. Okay. I... I move to concur in the Senate Amendments 2 and 3. The underlying legislation dealt with an extension of the statute of limitations when the... when an injured party developed a disability. The... the changes make it clear that there is... that... that if the disability lasts longer than 10 years that the statute is not extended beyond those 10 years. And I also want to just mention that the term 'adjudication' as set forth in page 2, line 10 of Senate Amendment 2 means adjudication of disability pursuant to Article 11a of the Probate Act of 1975. I ask for your support."

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Harris. Please take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 5512. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Turner in the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "House Bill 5735, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Hi. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 3, please."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "A little bit about the Amendments, please."
Williams: "Okay. Yes. They simply add a couple of small changes,
adds the number of union members to the task force to 2 and
provides that the Attorney General will be the appointing
authority for nongovernmental entities on the Home Builders
Task Force."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady moves that the House concur with Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 5735. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 73 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House will concur with Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 5735. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5342, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Senate Amendment adds a Bill that we passed in a... on a different Bill number. As... as this Bill is now it... it changes and makes more clear the audit requirements in a more objective way for both credit unions and banks. I know of no major opposition and both of these Bills passed the chamber, I think, unanimously. I would ask your support on the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Amendments #1 to House Bill 5342. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Reboletti, Wheeler. Mr. Clerk, please take the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House will concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5342. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 5674, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you... thank you... Mr. Speaker, could we move the people in my row away from me? It must be the last day of Session. So the Senate Amendment to this Bill deals with zoning and medical marijuana in the City of Chicago. When we... when we passed House Bill 1 we put a requirement in the Bill that required that dispensaries be more than a thousand feet from a day care center, a school or a residential zone, and that a cultivation center be more than 2500 feet from those places. As it turns out, for the City of Chicago there are no places you could put a cultivation center under those rules. So... and so, what this Bill would say is that the City of Chicago can create their own zoning. Now, there's simpler... they're still going to create zoning that reflects common sense. They're still not going to put these facilities near a school or a day care center. But let's remember what these facilities are, these are facilities that won't have big signs. You can't do window shopping, you can't even get into the facilities. And so, all this does is allow the City of Chicago to create some commonsense rules. I would also indicate for legislative intent that the request is that unincorporated areas still be zoned in accordance with what is in the original House Bill 1 and that if this Bill were to become law, we would expect the state agencies to create appropriate rules to deal with

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

unincorporated areas. I would ask your support on the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bellock."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Bellock: "So with doing this, does this allow the city to put one of these cultivation centers anywhere, across from a school, next to a school?"

Lang: "It would allow the City of Chicago to use their own zoning ordinances just as they do with any other business, Representative."

Bellock: "Well, yes, but this is a cultivation center for marijuana. So this will allow the City of Chicago to put one of these centers anywhere they want to, across from a school, across from a church, correct?"

Lang: "Well, let's understand that when House Bill 1 passed it called for there being one cultivation center in each State Police District."

Bellock: "Right."

Lang: "The City of Chicago is its own State Police District. It's an encompassed State Police District. And if this Bill were to not pass, the City of Chicago would not be able to have a cultivation center. Now for those who oppose marijuana I would say, don't think you're going to cut down on the amount of marijuana it'll just go elsewhere somehow. The product will be purchased somewhere else. But this is good economic development for the City of Chicago. Everything sold at these cultivation centers requires a 7 percent tax to be paid. And

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

so, this will create jobs in the City of Chicago. When we passed this Bill, the City of Chicago came to us and said, look, it's a great Bill, but we can't... there are no places that are 2500 feet from a residential zone in the City of Chicago. So there would be no site in the City of Chicago. So, just simply because you oppose the original marijuana... Medical Marijuana Bill would not be a reason to oppose this legislation."

Bellock: "No, I know that, Representative and I respect you on that account. I'm just thinking, you know, that Chicago is a large, large city and I think it's about 15 miles wide and about 25 miles long. And it just seems to me that this would not be needed, that it... they should be able to find a cultivation center. But I just wanted to ask, too, is it the same with a dispensary?"

Lang: "It... well, the dispensary rules are a thousand feet. And yes, they're having difficulty with dispensaries as well. But let me go back to your premise about cultivation centers. If I were to hold up a map of the City of Chicago and I would black out everywhere that's less than 2500 feet from a residential zone, there would be nothing left in the city, 2500 feet is a half a mile. You can imagine in the rural areas of Illinois that's easy to do. But in the City of Chicago, not so easy to do."

Bellock: "Thank you very much, Representative. I appreciate your answers."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "Just for clarification purposes, you just said that 2500 feet is a half a mile?"
- Lang: "Twenty-five hundred feet is close to half a mile."
- Davis, W.: "Is close to half a mile. So, there's no half a mile in the City of Chicago, not in any of the industrial areas of the City of Chicago that are not... that... I mean, there's no half a mile in those areas?"
- Lang: "I can... I can only answer your question by telling you that the City of Chicago brought this Bill to Senator Raoul and when... when he passed this through the Senate, he indicated that there were no sites in the City of Chicago that were workable under the law we passed."
- Davis, W.: "So if this Bill were to pass and they're allowed to amend their zoning ordinances, then it's possible that... I think as the previous speaker said, there's a possibility that a center, either distribution or cultivation, while it may not be across the street from a school could be in a proximity to a school?"
- Lang: "Representative, I guess that's true. But understand that the City of Chicago has a rigorous zoning process. It depends on... the aldermen in the City of Chicago have to get elected like we do and I can't imagine that they're going to put a marijuana facility of any kind, legal or illegal, across the street from a school or a day care center."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Lang: "If they do, they do that at their own political risk. But let's also remember that the City of Chicago zoning deals with every business in the City of Chicago. Gun shops or whatever... if there are gun shops in the city or what you

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

might... whatever you might think of. Every business and some have some inherit dangers or risks has zoning. And so, since... and let me also point out that under House Bill 1 every community has the right to zone marijuana any way they want. The only restriction we're talking about here is the 2500 foot rule and the thousand foot rule."

- Davis, W.: "But what... we don't know exactly what the City of Chicago may come up with. And the reason I'm asking it that way is because, again, I know there are some fairly large industrial areas in the City of Chicago. So versus giving them permission to change their zoning then why don't we change the Bill that would make it so that they... in other words, let's figure out in the Bill or in the language that... that was proposed a way to amend the language that would make it so it could fit within these industrial areas?"
- Lang: "So, this is the Bill that came out the Senate,
 Representative and I suggested to the city and to Senator
 Raoul that I would move it in this manner. And so I would
 request your 'aye' vote, Sir."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. And fair enough for you. I'm not sure if I can support it. And the reason being is because, in my opinion, the City of Chicago kind of gets everything. So here we are giving them... and I... and I can appreciate that in all fairness the business development, but you know that dispensary that the city wants could be in the City of Chica... excuse me, could be in the south suburbs. That cultivation center that they want could be in the south suburbs. So I'm... I feel... I feel like, in essence, I'm giving them permission or would be

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

giving them permission to take business out of my area solely for their purpose."

Lang: "Well Sir, may I respond to that?"

Davis, W.: "Please."

Lang: "So, this wouldn't affect the south suburbs in any way.

Under the rules that were created by the department, there will be 13 cultivation centers in the City of Chicago and under the Bill there would be 1 cultivation center in the City of Chicago. If those aren't issued, they aren't going anywhere else. They're set up for the City of Chicago. There is a map created where there's an opportunity for those that want to do a dispensary in the south suburbs to do that. A map set up so that those that want to do a cultivation center in the south suburbs can do that. But it's not like you'll get an extra one if the city is denied this right. There won't be any extra ones."

Davis, W.: "So the south suburbs would only be entitled to one?"

Lang: "Well, I'd have to see the map the department created. So whatever State Police District the south suburbs are in and if all... if all the south suburbs are in the same State Police District, that's correct. But if there's a line that goes through them so you're in two or three different State Police Districts, you could get up to 2 or 3. So there's one cultivation center for every State Police District and there are 60 dispensaries spread around the state. And I'd have to look at a map to tell you how many are scheduled for the south suburbs."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Then my... my last question then would be, when you... you said distributed by State Police Districts, can you

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

tell me with some level of certainty that the south suburbs is in a separate Police District than the City of Chicago?"

Lang: "The... so, the City of Chicago is its own. That's the point of this Bill."

Davis, W.: "Right."

Lang: "And all of the rest of Cook County is in one State Police District."

Davis, W.: "Is in... so they're separate from the City of Chicago?"

Lang: "Correct."

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

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative DeLuca."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Leader will yield."

DeLuca: "Leader Yang... Lang, I think this Bill passed out of committee on Tuesday? Leader Yang?"

Lang: "Whatever."

DeLuca: "This Bill passed out of committee on Tuesday. Is that right?"

Lang: "It's been a long week, Sir. I'll take your word for it that it was Tuesday. It was definitely this week."

DeLuca: "Okay. And then this morning in committee there was a Bill that was a little more expansive than this version. Is that correct?"

Lang: "Yes. That Bill failed in committee."

DeLuca: "And during testimony it was mentioned that the reason why we were bringing forth this second Bill, which was heard this morning, was because the previous Bill had flaws in the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

drafting but we were never explained what those flaws in the drafting were. Could you tell us now?"

Lang: "Sure. So I stated for legislative intent what... what I hope will fix that. So in the... in this legislation that came from the Senate, drafted by whoever, the... it was... it's unclear as to what happens with the unincorporated areas and someone could read it to think that there's no zoning requirements, no 2500-foot rule in the unincorporated areas. So, let me say again on the record here that that is not the intent of the Bill. And we expect that even in the unincorporated areas there will be 2500-foot rule and a thousand foot rule and that we expect the department, the various agencies, to create the appropriate rules to... to deal with that."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you. And is the City of Chicago saying that based on the restrictions in the law that there is no location that exists or have they already identified a location and that location does not conform with the restrictions?"

Lang: "To my knowledge, very few if any communities in Illinois have actually zeroed in on location, so they all have to deal with zoning. To my knowledge, the City of Chicago has not even had a hearing or a discussion on a site. And I'm not sure what entrepreneurs that want to do a cultivation center in the City of Chicago have even gone to city hall to ask that question. The way this was described to me, that there... is that there are no or let's say, 'cause I don't want someone to bring out a map and show me a location, no or very limited locations in the City of Chicago where a cultivation center could be sited under the law we've passed."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

DeLuca: "Okay. And the final question is, there was testimony in committee that Chicago is not its own district, that it's actually more expansive than that. Can we have some clarification on that what it actually is? Is it the City of Chicago or is it Cook County? Is it... is it more than just the City of Chicago alone?"

Lang: "As for a cultivation center, the City of Chicago is its own district because the City of Chicago is a State Police District and they're entitled to one. So that... so this Bill deals with one State Police District and its inability to be able to have a cultivation center due to the restrictions that we passed in House Bill 1."

DeLuca: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Golar."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Golar: "Representative Lang, according to the zoning requirements there are some in... in here that you speak of, isn't it true that if you were putting in a cultivation center and you wanted it in a certain area and zoning of that area would have a been a residential it would have to go before zoning and have a hearing with the residents within 250 feet of that location? That's what the normal zoning requirements are."

Lang: "Are you referring to the City of Chicago..."

Golar: "Yes."

Lang: "...zoning requirements? I'm not familiar with all of them, but if you tell me that's correct..."

Golar: "That's the normal."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Lang: "So... so, if the City of Chicago under their own existing zoning requirements..."

Golar: "Yes."

Lang: "...have a... has a rule that all of the locals have to be invited to the zoning hearing if you're closer than a certain footage to residences then I suppose that we can presume that the City of Chicago would follow that."

Golar: "But only the... the footage but also looking at if that area is residential and now it would be in a business zone because of what they will be doing there, that would change it to a business?"

Lang: "I don't presume that the City of Chicago has any interest in putting a cultivation center in a residential district. The issue here is how far they can be from a residential district and there does not appear to be any or very, very limited locations in the City of Chicago that are more than 2500 feet from a residential zone because the population of Chicago is so dense."

Golar: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative David Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just... a couple of questions of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Harris, D.: "Representative... Representative, this... the City of Chicago as a single State Police District is entitled to only one cultivation center. Is that correct?"

Lang: "Correct, Sir."

Harris, D.: "And you think that within the entire geographic boundary of the City of Chicago there is... there would not be

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

a single location that is more than 2500 feet away from a school or a day care center or group home... group day care center?"

Lang: "I think it might be unfair to say none as in actually zero locations. But the locations are so limited as to limit the city which is a very large city to so few locations that they've asked for this relief. The relief isn't because of day care centers or schools, the relief is because the... the law currently requires that no cultivation center be closer than 2500 feet to a residential zone. It doesn't mean a house; it means the edge of a residential zone. So you can see that because of the density of the city and how spread out the people are in the City of Chicago that it would be very difficult to find a... a site for a cultivation center, which would be a half mile or more from the closest residential zone."

Harris, D.: "Well, I'm not sure I agree with that because the...
the current law as I read it says that 2500 feet of the
property line of a preexisting public or private preschool or
elementary or secondary school, group day care home, part day
care child facility or an area zoned for residential use or..."

Lang: "Or an area zoned for residential."

Harris, D.: "So, this cultivation center, if this law were to go into effect, a cultivation center in the City of Chicago could conceivably be located right across the street from a school?"

Lang: "So you might be reading from the section of the law regarding dispensaries. It's slightly different for cultivation centers."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Harris, D.: "Well, the... what I'm looking at it says, any municipality with a population of fewer than 500 thousand a registered cultivation center, that's what we're... that's what I'm asking about here is a cultivation center, cannot be located within 2500 feet of the property line of a preexisting public et cetera, et cetera, et cetera or an area zoned for residential use. So..."

Lang: "So, it has to be more than 2,500 feet from the edge of any..."

Harris, D.: "Right. So, if we..."

Lang: "...zone... any area of the City of Chicago zoned for residential use. So that's a very..."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Lang: "...expansive area."

Harris, D.: "Okay. All right. And I come back and I say, given the fact that this... this large City of Chicago that has a fairly large land mass is only eligible for one, it seems to me that there ought to be a location or multiple locations that might be suitable. And granted it might be in... might not be in the optimum location but nonetheless, there's going to be a lot of traffic in and out since there's only one cultivation center and that cultivation center is supplying multiple dispensing organizations. There's going to be a lot traffic in and out. So, lowering the... the distance requirement seems to me to be a move in the wrong direction."

Lang: "Well, Representative, I don't agree with your assertion there's going to be a lot of traffic in and out. There's going to be 60 dispensaries in the State of Illinois. So there's not going to be more than 60 people coming there, but since

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

there's going to be 21 cultivation centers, these dispensaries are going to be going probably to places that are closest to them."

Harris, D.: "Okay."

Lang: "So there aren't going to be a lot of cars going in and out of these facilities."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Maybe... maybe not. I just... I do come back and... and question the fact that we couldn't find a location and I'm keying in on the cultivation centers. But I... and a cultivation center would seem to me would have to be a fairly large org... operation because you're growing these plants, unlike a dispensary which could be relatively small. But..."

Lang: "Which is exactly why, in the end, these things will end up in industrial sites... areas away from the residences. But they just can't find very many that are more than a half mile away."

Harris, D.: "Thank you for your answers very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Has the City of Chicago signed on to this Bill?"

Lang: "This is the City of Chicago's proposal."

Ives: "Who in the City of Chicago brought this Bill to you, what agency?"

Lang: "You'd have to ask Senator Raoul that. I got... we got this on Concurrence."

Ives: "I was just looking at proponents and the City of Chicago often signs on and lists themselves as a proponent of a legislation, they're not listed. Is there any reason why?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Lang: "I can... I can't begin to tell you. It's their proposal."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... I have some grave concerns..."

Lang: "Grave?"

Reboletti: "...about the program as a matter of fact. And it's my understanding in the bare bones budget that was recently passed out of this chamber that this program is no longer funded. Is that... is that correct? It was zeroed out."

Lang: "Well, the budget we passed put zero in the line items that the Department of Agriculture wished to have to roll this program out. But it is our belief that they can find the money to make this program work."

Reboletti: "And... and so, wouldn't it... you... you believe they can get money from somewhere else then to put the program in motion?"

Lang: "Well, they have... they have a substantial budget, Sir. So they'll... they'll have to do priorities to determine how to pay for their share of this program."

Reboletti: "And what would happen if... if this Bill doesn't pass?

Is there... will the City of Chicago not have a... a facility?"

Lang: "My understanding is that if this Bill doesn't pass there's likely to be no cultivation center in the City of Chicago."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Fortner."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Fortner: "I was listening to some of the earlier questions trying to identify the State Police District since I understand from the original Act, as approved, there is one per State Police District. Is that correct?"

Lang: "That's correct, Sir."

Fortner: "I went to the State Police website during the debate here and at least according to that website it seems to identify that State Police District Chicago encompasses the entire county of Cook."

Lang: "All right. So, it does get a little confusing but here we go. So at one time these... that Cook County and the City of Chicago were referred to as districts 3 and 4, separate districts. Okay, so far?"

Fortner: "I'm following you."

Lang: "Then they consolidated them together into something called C."

Fortner: "Which is what I'm seeing on their map."

Lang: "But under the administrative rules, they reverted back to two separate districts. So the administrative rules that call for one in each State Police District, in fact, split them off back into their original form."

Fortner: "But these are the rules... these are rules adopted pursuant to HB1? When you say the administrative rules?"

Lang: "The agency rules, Sir."

Fortner: "These are the State Police agency rules. I'm trying to figure out which agency's rules we're talking about here?"

Lang: "We're referring to the Department of Agriculture and medical marijuana rules."

Fortner: "The ones that would apply to HB1 then?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Lang: "Correct."

Fortner: "Because I'm looking at the Act as adopted and it very specifically says, not issue more than one registration per each Illinois State Police District boundary as specified on the date of January 1, 2013. Maybe I'm confused, but that doesn't sound like that's amendable to change by administrative rule?"

Lang: "Sir the... the Bill also said we would have 22 cultivation centers based on the number of State Police Districts. But in fact, one of the State Police Districts is the Tollway system. So, we didn't think you'd want a cultivation center at the Oasis on 294, so we split them off administratively."

Fortner: "Okay. I'm... I... to me... I understand what you're saying about the administrative rule. I just... It... it doesn't seem to me to comport with here... The language seems very clear in the Act in that regard."

Lang: "So this is something you would want to take up with JCAR, Sir."

Fortner: "I have someone sitting next to me, I guess I could do that."

Lang: "Well, I'm also on JCAR, come see me about it."

Fortner: "Well, you're a little… you're a little further away than the…"

Lang: "Okay."

Fortner: "...the Gentleman at my right. I guess... to the Bill. I...
this seems like a... an unusual carveout. I understand the
response to the question. I'm not sure this is the right way
to proceed. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman will yield."

Flowers: "Representative Lang, I'm very curious about this Bill.

Will there be... a cultivating center on the south side of the

City of Chicago?"

Lang: "I don't think anybody knows where it will go, Representative. But there won't be one if this Bill doesn't pass."

Flowers: "I understand. But is there a possibility? What... what are the guidelines? What are the rules? Because there's lots of land on the south side."

Lang: "Every community makes their own decision about the applicants and then the Department of Agriculture, in the case of the cultivation centers, will determine who gets the licenses, nobody else."

Flowers: "Okay. Because I found that interesting because we have an agricultural school on the south side and there's a lot of land around there. So but you said, every center... every community, how many communities are going to have a..."

Lang: "Cultivation center?"

Flowers: "...a cultivation center?"

Lang: "There will only be 21 of these in the State of Illinois."

Flowers: "Only 21, so there will not be 21 in the City of Chicago?"

Lang: "No, there will be..."

Flowers: "So, how many will be..."

Lang: "...one in the City of Chicago if this Bill passes."

Flowers: "...there will only be one?"

Lang: "But if this Bill does not pass there won't be any."

Flowers: "What about distribution centers?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Lang: "I'm sorry?"

Flowers: "Will there be a distribution center on the south side?"

Lang: "The dispensaries? There's going to be 60 of those. And the City of Chicago, by rule, will be given 13 of those 60."

Flowers: "By rule, there'll be 13..."

Lang: "Thirteen of the 60 total will go to the City of Chicago."

Flowers: "Will one of... will some of those be on the city... on the south side?"

Lang: "That will be decided by the Department of Professional Regulation."

Flowers: "Is... what are the criterias for their decisions?"

Lang: "The statute that we passed that you voted for has a long... has... has some basic criteria but it also permits the department to create a scoring system by rule. And those rules are now pending and will be at JCAR shortly. The rules will be on the department website which you could read and make public comment if you wish to."

Flowers: "And as far as minority participation, Representative, how many minorities will be able to purchase or will be able to participate in the purchasing of a distribution center as well as a... a cultivating center?"

Lang: "So, it's an excellent question. There are no quotas or goals, but here's what we do have. The rules that came out of the Department of Financial and Professional Regulation and the Department of Agriculture very specifically put a high premium and a higher score and a higher weight to an application that has female-owned business and/or minority-owned business. So, those who can... can show that... that they

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

have minority-owned businesses will get more points in the application process."

Flowers: "Representative, I want to say that I really support your legislation, but for a multi... for biblical reasons, quite frankly, because in the Bible it speak of medical marijuana and all the great things it can do to heal the body. And so, I do believe in that because I also was a Sponsor of similar legislation years ago. But I need to also know... I want to know and make sure that minorities are able to purchase... are able to participate not just be incarcerated for the use of marijuana. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Lang to close."

Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate the debate. I understand the concerns of many, but as... as the author of House Bill 1 and as a person who represents part of the City of Chicago, it's important to me that the city be able to use the cultivation center that's been awarded to it in House Bill 1. They say they have no place to put anything unless it's in the middle of O'Hare. I don't think that's a very good place for a cultivation center. And so, I would ask your support on my Motion."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves that the House concur Amendment #1 to House Bill 5674. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cross. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 40 voting 'yes', 66 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', the House does not concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5674. And

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

this Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority... Please take... All right. House Bill 5755, Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 5755. The Amendment places a nonbinding advisory question on the November 4, 2014 ballot asking voters, shall any health insurance plan in Illinois that provides prescription drug coverage be required to include prescription birth control as part of that coverage? I ask for your support."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sandack: "Representative, what's the current state of the law in Illinois with respect to coverage for contraceptions?"

Cassidy: "We do require coverage, but it does allow for very high...
high copays and deductibles under Federal Law, which is being
challenged. Women are actually able to access affordable
birth control."

Sandack: "Wait... wait a minute. I just asked about the state of the State Law. What's the State Law currently?"

Cassidy: "State Law does require coverage."

Sandack: "And the... that's unequivocal, isn't it?"

Cassidy: "There are certain exemptions."

Sandack: "What are the exceptions? Since you mentioned that."

Cassidy: "It is a... it's a broadly written exception for conscience or religious reasons."

Sandack: "Where do you see that, Representative?"

Cassidy: "It is in the Code."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sandack: "I have that Code in front of me as well. It's 215 ILCS 5/35 Section 4 and it talks about coverage for contraceptives. I don't see a exception... a broad exception. Can you point that to me?"

Cassidy: "Just a moment."

Sandack: "Thank you."

Cassidy: "745, Section 70 of the Illinois Statute which offers the conscience clause."

Sandack: "745? Are you under 215 ILCS?"

Cassidy: "No."

Sandack: "Oh."

Cassidy: "It's separate, 745 ILCS."

Sandack: "And what does that say, Representative?"

Cassidy: "Just a moment. Protects the right of conscience of all persons including health care payers who refuse to obtain, receive or accept or who are engaged in the delivery of, arrangement for or payment of health care services and medical care that is contrary to their conscience."

Sandack: "Representative, that speaks to deliver... people who deliver services. It does not speak to insurance or coverage.

That is a totally inapplicable..."

Cassidy: "Payment of health care services."

Sandack: "That is not insurance, Representative."

Cassidy: "Insurance is payment of healthcare services."

Sandack: "How long has the current law been in effect, Representative?"

Cassidy: "Since 2004."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sandack: "Correct. And are you aware of any court challenges presently before the court on the… propriety of the provision that 215 ILCS with re…"

Cassidy: "There are... there are no current challenges to the Illinois law."

Sandack: "There is?"

Cassidy: "There are no current challenges..."

Sandack: "Right."

Cassidy: "...to the Illinois law."

Sandack: "Now you also mentioned Federal Law, which also provides for coverage for contraceptives, does it not?"

Cassidy: "Yes, it does."

Sandack: "So essentially, this nonbinding question that you advance is a triplicate, is it not?"

Cassidy: "No, it is not. There are questions about the Federal Law which does provide more accessible coverage for... for folks who... who utilize these... these medications. And that law is currently being challenged with a decision coming shortly. This ballot initiative will give us clarity as to what the people of the State of Illinois truly want and need with regard to whether men and women should have equal access to medical care and medi... medicines that they require."

Sandack: "That's a... and that's a nice stump speech, but the fact is the law in Illinois, if you even accept that the Federal Law is convoluted or could be challenged... any law could be challenged, but the state of the law as we are... stand here today is this already is in effect in Illinois and it has been since 2004. And of course the Federal Law also provides such guarantees and coverage. So my question again is, your

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- nonbinding question, what purpose could it possibly suit with respect to the state of the law in Illinois right now?"
- Cassidy: "As I mentioned, Illinois law does allow for what can be completely prohibitive costs to... to patients. This nonbinding referendum will give us clarity as to the importance of these medications to our constituents. And allow us to... to understand how better to serve them, if we need to strengthen our law, if we need to... to make it more accessible."
- Sandack: "Well, this gets... it's clear right now. I think what you're doing is adding another question, and... and you know, on the ballot and... and to that item. How many... assuming this is passed and makes it to the November ballot, how many questions will be on... referenda questions will be on the next ballot?"
- Cassidy: "This is the first question I've presented so I honestly don't know."
- Sandack: "Well, let's walk through them together. It's the first one you've presented, absolutely. But as you know, you voted on some already, too, right?"
- Cassidy: "I have."
- Sandack: "Right. You voted on the victims' rights question, correct?"
- Cassidy: "Yes."
- Sandack: "Marcy's Law. You... you voted on voting rights question, correct?"
- Cassidy: "Yes. Those are Constitutional Amendments though, these are different."
- Sandack: "Well, but they're really questions on the ballot, right?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Cassidy: "There'll also be candidates on the ballot."

Sandack: "There will be candidates on the ballot."

Cassidy: "The ballot will have a lot of things on it. That's what ballots are."

Sandack: "Let's stay to my question, if you wouldn't mind and you can editorialize and expand when you get to close. Minimum wage, you voted on that, yes?"

Cassidy: "It has not passed both Houses."

Sandack: "But it... if it does, assume it will."

Cassidy: "I make no assumptions."

Sandack: "Is the law as it currently exists in Illinois clear or
 not clear, Representative?"

Cassidy: "As I said, there is a difference between the Federal Law and the State Law. The level of coverage available to our constituents is different under both laws and I'd like... I'd like to see this question answered to get clarity. So that women who cannot afford coverage, who could... who cannot afford these medications, if we as a state need to make our law better, we can."

Sandack: "Mr. Speaker, to... to the nonbinding question. Let's be clear, Ladies and Gentlemen, exactly what this is. This is yet another misuse of public questions to gin up the vote come November. There is absolutely no legitimate question what the state of the law is right now. You vote 'yes' on this all you're doing is piling on the electric to gin up a bass. Let's not be disingenuous. The law is clear. The law in the State of Illinois is crystal clear and it has been since 2004. Once more, the Federal Law makes this also a nonissue, but instead what we're doing again is picking at the fray,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

looking at opportunities to gin up the bass come November. It is disingenuous. It's disheartening. It's absolutely the wrong use of the process here. Vote on this, make sure you know you're a game player. You're not using the process right. This is a bad vote. It's bad process. Don't do it. Vote 'no'." Speaker Turner: "Representative Mayfield."

Mayfield: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. I stand in strong support of this piece of ... into this Resolution that's going on to the ballot. However, I would much prefer that it was a Bill. I am sick and tired of these prescription companies deciding what's best for women. The fact that you are denying prescription drugs to women that have a substantial impact on their lives, birth control pills are used for more than just... Excuse me? Birth control pills are used for more than just unwanted pregnancies. They're used for women who have menstrual issues... Yes, you heard that, menstrual issues. They help to regulate periods. They have a bona fide health benefit and yet, there are individuals out here, mainly men, who feel that they know what's best for women. Now I would like to see this turned into a Bill. The fact that it's an advisory question on the ballot, I hope that every woman in the State of Illinois votes 'yes' for this. Because we have been denied one time too many. Do you realize that these same prescription drug companies that are saying no to women on prescription contraceptives are saying yes to men on Viagra? Now you tell me what's the benefit of that? I urge a strong 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Ives: "Considering the 2003 and the… considering that the Affordable Care Act requires private health insurance plans to cover contraception's free of charge, who is this Bill targeting? Who are you targeting here? Which insurance companies are targeted?"
- Cassidy: "I'm not insure... targeting any insurance companies. I am seeking to get a clearer understanding of the value of these... these important medications to the people we serve."
- Ives: "Earlier this year the United States Supreme Court exempted the Little Sisters of the Poor from complying with the ACA's mandate on birth control coverage due to their First Amendment's free exercise of religion rights. Do you disagree with that ruling?"
- Cassidy: "What is your question again, I'm sorry?"
- Ives: "Do you disagree with the Supreme Court's ruling that the Little Sisters of the Poor should not have to provide free birth control or birth control coverage? Do you disagree with that ruling from the Supreme Court?"
- Cassidy: "I believe that insurance companies should cover birth control."
- Ives: "Do you agree or disagree with the Supreme's Court ruling that they made..."
- Cassidy: "I am not familiar with the Little Sisters of the Poor case. I will tell you that I believe that insurance companies should cover birth control. I believe that..."
- Ives: "Do you..."
- Cassidy: "...everyone should have equal access to medication."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Ives: "It's the law in Illinois to cover birth control. Do you believe religious institutions should not have to cover birth control, yes or no..."

Cassidy: "There is already a broad..."

Ives: "...through their insurance carrier?"

Cassidy: "...there is already a broad exemption for the... for conscience clause. I believe that men and women should have equal access to medication and that... that poor and rich should have equal access to medication. And that's what this advisory referendum is about."

Ives: "Are... are you targeting insurance companies of..."

Cassidy: "I am asking a question to the voters."

Cassidy: "I'm not targeting anyone."

Ives: "...them?"

Cassidy: "No, I'm not targeting anyone. I am... I am targeting the people of the State of Illinois and getting their input on the importance of these medications to the people we serve."

Ives: "Well, we'll talk about that in a minute. Does this Bill
include coverage of Plan B or the so-called morning after
pill?"

Cassidy: "I read the language of the advisory referendum and it simply says, shall any health insurance plan in Illinois that provides prescription drug coverage be required to include prescription birth control as part of that coverage. That is the… that is the simple language of the referendum."

Ives: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. This... this referendum is extremely broad, it would absolutely violate religious

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

protections that are in place. Things that the Supreme Court of the United States have upheld. And if we're going to ask referendum questions on... on all sort of policies how about this one, should or should not public employees all be converted to a 401K plan to save money? That's a good referendum question to put on the ballot. Should or should not this state go right to work? That's a good question to put on the ballot. Instead, we continue to double down on social policies, things that are meaningless, just to gin up the vote. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reis."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Reis: "Representative, you've made clear what the referendum language is. In your opinion, if this were to pass and... and follow-up legislation were to be introduced would it require religious organizations to provide this as well?"

Cassidy: "We're simply not at this point... at that point. I... I don't have an opinion on that..."

Reis: "Is that your intention?"

Cassidy: "...until I see the results of the referendum."

Reis: "Is that your intention?"

Cassidy: "My intention is to get information from the voters of the State of Illinois about how strongly they feel about access to birth control."

Reis: "But we have those exemptions now and if the people come back and say, all insurance policies must include this, you're saying that religious organizations and business owners who have right of conscience are going to have to carry it as

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

well. And we want to beat up on the insurance companies here, it's the individual companies that decide the makeup of their policies in a lot of instances, as long as they're within the realm of the law. You're saying that all companies, all religious organizations, anybody with a right of conscience would have to have this coverage in their policies."

Cassidy: "Let me... let me read you the... the advisory question once again and you can tell me where in there that... that exists. Shall any health insurance plan in Illinois that provides prescription drug coverage be required to include prescription birth control as part of that coverage. There is nothing in there about the right of conscience. Nothing."

Reis: "That's right. And that's what's troub..."

Cassidy: "It is simply asking if the... if people believe that that coverage should be available. Period. I'm not targeting anyone. I'm not going after anyone. I would like to hear from the people that we serve how strongly they feel about access to health care."

Reis: "To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen. I find it interesting that Representative that's very passionate about bullying presents Bills like this that absolutely bullies people with religious conscience and makes them do something that goes against their faith. That's not right. And... and it's not just this Bill. It's other Bills that's been presented. So if you really look at the makeup of the Bill we're... we're bullying people that don't want to provide this type of coverage to their employees. And lastly and more importantly, the level to which we are trying to manipulate elections in this state is almost criminal. We're going to have an election Bill come

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

out here that'd make a buzzard puke. And we see it every year. We got referendum after referendum after referendum trying to manipulate elections. That should be more important to all of us no matter what Party we're from, what part of the state we're from, that this is going on in this state. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Tracy."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Tracy: "Representative Cassidy, for purposes of legislative intent I... I know you've read the language of the Bill but it says, any insurance plan. And... and as we know most insurance plans are run by corporations whether it be not-for-profit or for-profit corporations. Is it your intent to include Medicare Part D insurance?"

Cassidy: "That's an interesting point. Medicare Part D would apply to someone who would not likely be on birth control since that is for seniors."

Tracy: "Well, not necessarily. I mean, that is an insurance plan..."

Cassidy: "But if they currently provide... if they currently provide prescription drug coverage they are currently covered under Illinois law."

Tracy: "Okay, well that's a good thing. So..."

Cassidy: "That said, Medicare Part D would not necessarily be the..."

Tracy: "...now Medicare Part D insurance... well... and first of all,

I mean, you're asking a person who's voting, every voter of
Illinois if they think a corporation should have to provide
something?"

Cassidy: "Is that a question?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Tracy: "Right. I mean... I mean, is it... is that your legislative intent? You're just saying to the... to the voter, do you think..."
- Cassidy: "I am asking voters if they believe health insurance plans that cover prescription drug coverage... that offer prescription drug coverage should also include prescription birth control as part of that coverage. That... that is the plain and simple question before the people that I trust to tell us their opinion."
- Tracy: "Right. And so, in effect, aren't you asking a voter to give you your input as to whether or not they think we should legislate something that makes a corporation provide something?"
- Cassidy: "I am asking the voter's opinion as to whether health insurance companies should provide this coverage."

Tracy: "And it's a nonbinding referendum?"

Cassidy: "Yes."

- Tracy: "So, you're just trying to take the pulse of every voter in Illinois what... what they feel like that day?"
- Cassidy: "Just as we ask them who they want to represent them that day, we're also asking their opinion that day, yes."
- Tracy: "Okay. Well, to the Bill. You know, I think... this is another... it's another opportunity for us to provide news fodder for our whole state as the joke of this nation that obviously the Legislature doesn't know their own laws. Because we already have a law in this state that pretty much provides just what we're asking. Not only that, we have the Affordable Health Care, Federal Law, that likewise provides it. So, I think it's great that we give game... or not game but

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

celebrity comedians an opportunity to poke fun at Illinois once more. That we want to ask the voters on every type of situation when, in fact, what we should be doing is getting our fiscal house in order, giving people job opportunities instead of trying to mislead the public, mislead our voters as to what they already have. It's just incredible to me."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

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

Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."

Reboletti: "If you could ask the Clerk what's the status of House Bill 6237?"

Speaker Turner: "Can we wait 'til we finish this legislation right here?"

Reboletti: "No. We... it's actually part and parcel of this, Representative... Leader. And let me ask some questions of the Sponsor first while the Clerk is checking the status of that. Representative, so with this question we know that the State of Illinois law is that it's already covered. That's fair to say, right? All the state plans cover this. Is that correct?"

Cassidy: "What did you ask?"

Reboletti: "Do the state plans... does the people in the State of Illinois are they... are the women already covered by this? Yes or no? What's it say in the law?"

Cassidy: "If... if they have prescription drug coverage in their insurance plan, yes."

Reboletti: "And so, this will then reaffirm our statute. Now what if... what if this failed, Representative? If this failed would you be prepared to file the Bill to not do that, to take away the prescription drug option?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Cassidy: "We are not at that point. Once again, as I have said..."

 Reboletti: "Do we have... do we have your commitment,

 Representative?"
- Cassidy: "...I am asking this question of the voters. And I'd like to get their opinion. It's a very simple and clear question."
- Reboletti: "And if they're... and if... oh, it is. And if there's... if it came out the way you didn't want it to, would you be the one that would file the Bill to repeal the coverage?"
- Cassidy: "I want to get the answer to the question. The ballot...

 the question gets on the ballot, we will take the answer that

 comes."
- Reboletti: "Do you have the status, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Turner: "Yes, Representative Reboletti. That Bill is in Rules."
- Reboletti: "Oh that Bill's in Rules, Mr. Speaker? Shocking. I'm amazed. And to... to this ridiculous piece of legislation that we're going to waste our time on today. Shall the law of the state be the same as it was yesterday as it has been for 10 years? Really? That's what we're bothering with in the last day of Session? Then the gentle Lady from Rogers Park doesn't know if she'll honor what the people of the state will say. What if they say the complete opposite? Who will file that Bill over there? Ah, the silence is deafening. And even better yet, we don't want everybody to weigh in... well, of course Representative Zalewski would be for that. House Bill 6237 is in the Rules Committee, which asks a more cogent and important question, shall the income tax stay at 5 percent? That's not important enough. We want to really know if the state of Federal Law and State Law should stay the same. And then if

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

the Constitution is changed because the Supreme Court finds this unconstitutional maybe we can have a Constitutional Convention and we'll be the beacon of the nation and start the drive to turn it back. Maybe the wolf pack lobbyists could come back on that one. This is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that we're wasting time on asking advisory questions on something that's been settled law here for a decade. And if this passes, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a verification."

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti has requested a verification. Representative Cassidy to close."
- Cassidy: "Very simple. If you believe that... that women should have equal access to medical coverage, vote 'yes' to this very, very clear question. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Again, Representative Reboletti has requested a verification. Would ask all staff to retire to the rear of the chamber and Members vote their own switch. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5755?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 62 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5755. Mr. Clerk, please read the affirmative votes."
- Clerk Hollman: "A poll of those voting in the affirmative:

 Representative Acevedo; Representative Andrade;

 Representative Arroyo; Representative Berrios;

 Representative Burke, D.; Representative Burke, K.;

 Representative Cassidy; Representative Chapa LaVia;

 Representative Conroy; Representative Crespo; Representative

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Representative Currie; Representative D'Amico; Cross; Davis, M.; Representative Representative Davis, Representative DeLuca; Representative Drury; Representative Representative Feigenholtz; Representative Fine; Representative Flowers; Representative Representative Gabel; Representative Golar; Representative Harris, G.; Representative Hatcher; Representative Hernandez; Representative Hoffman; Representative Hurley; Representative Jackson; Representative Jakobsson; Representative Jefferson; Representative Representative Kifowit; Representative Lang; Representative Lilly; Representative Manley; Representative Martwick; Representative Mayfield; Representative McAsey; Mitchell, C.; Representative Representative Moeller; Representative Moylan; Representative Mussman; Representative Nekritz; Representative Riley; Representative Rita; Representative Scherer; Representative Sente; Representative Sims; Representative Smiddy; Representative Soto; Representative Tabares; Representative Thapedi; Representative Turner; Representative Walsh; Representative Welch; Representative Williams; Representative Willis; Representative Yingling; Representative Zalewski, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti, would you like to persist with your Motion?"

Reboletti: "I do. I'm going to start with Acevedo. Andrade.

Berrios. Burke. Burke. Chapa LaVia. Crespo. Cross. Currie.

Representative Callahan. D'Amico. Monique Davis. Will Davis.

Representative DeLuca. Mr. Speaker, I... I won't continue on

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

with the way this process has been running and how ridiculous this piece of legislation is. So I will withdraw my verification at this time."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. Representative Reboletti withdraws his verify... Motion for verification. The House... on a count of 62 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 to House Bill 5755. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sandack, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Sandack: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sandack: "We're still conducting the people's business and while it may be fun to sing along and add some jocularness to this process it's actually pretty damn embarrassing. We just passed a piece of legislation to say, is the state of the law still the same? Is the state of the law still the same? And when... when my colleague Representative Reboletti asked the Sponsor would she carry the piece of legislation that connotes the people's will if by chance the nonbinding question doesn't pass, nothing but silence, crickets. You know, it's good to have some fun and joke around a little bit, but that exercise, the sing-along thing, was rank embarrassing. It was embarrassing. This process deserves better than that, folks, way better."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Phelps: "Back by popular demand, please help my main guy back to the floor my Page for the day, Seiger Dunston."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative Acevedo, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Acevedo: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Acevedo: "Mr. Speaker, you know what's embarrassing when my good friend Mr. Reboletti chops up my name so bad. From now on, just call me Eddie, please."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Mr. Speaker, a point please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Davis, W.: "We just heard the Gentleman from the other side talk about what was embarrassing, seeing Members sing along. Okay, you're right. Maybe... maybe that was a little bit over the top. But if we're trying to finish our business, going through a verification where a Member from your side decides to read every name that the Clerk just read instead of proceeding with the verification, how is that any different than the Members singing along? It's up to the Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Members, we'd like to move on. We have other business to conduct today if possible. Thank you. On page 16 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 4811, Representative Sosnowski."

Sosnowski: "I'd move for Concurrence on Senate Amendment 1 and #2."

Speaker Turner: "A bit about the Amendments, Sir."

Sosnowski: "This was before us before... I believe this passed unanimously, in regards to small units of government with

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

budgets under \$850 thousand. We passed it out requiring audit. This would give flexibility for those small units to file a financial report that has been signed off and approved on by their particular board. I ask for support of this."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4811?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 4811. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill... House Bill 5546, Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This is a trailer Bill to Senate Bill 7. And there's a lot of language that I've add... have to add for legislative intent. So let me start, it's pretty lengthy, so at your... please bear with me. House Bill 5546, Senate Amendment #1, 2 and I move to concur with both. They... it does quite a few different things. The recall rights for RIF group 2 teachers with one 'needs improvement'. Number 2, it recall rights with the... until February 1 if the school term followed their RIF or for 6 months from the beginning of the school term following the RIF, if union and districts agree. Three, effective date of the law would be July 1, 2014. So that's why this is so important we pass this today, to get this to the Governor's desk and get it on the books. So recall rights would apply this calendar year to ensure teachers RIF in spring 2014 would

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

be recalled rights for fall and winter. Four, together stakeholders would jointly request that PEAC and ISBE study and create a quidance (a) summative evaluation rating, rubrics minimums and different rubrics for next... some have made evaluations after a teacher receives 'needs improvement' or (b) making it clear that after it 'needs improvement' or not to be many remediation plans. This was our intent when PERA passed awhile back. Five, language and noth... and noting containing in the Bill... nothing in the Bill would repeal, suspend, invalidate or nullify a final decisions in case currently pending Illinois court involved interpretations of Senate Bill 7. Six, housekeeping amend statute to make it clear and only one summative evaluation a year can be used for a RIF group. And if there are more than one, it is the last substantive before creation of RIF list, which would... can be used. This would clearly set a statute at ISBE's guidance. Also, there are a couple of questions that came up that I also wanted to put into... and I'll do it with my... I mean, I'll say it using myself. The question, under House Bill 5546, you are granting recall rights for 6 months to teachers who have been laid off based on a 'needs improvement' evaluation and a 'satisfactory', 'proficient' or 'excellent' evaluation. Is it your intent that a teacher can receive a 'needs improvement' rating... I need this for legislative intent, Representative... receives a 'needs improvement' rating at any other point in their career and still be granted a recall rights? The answer is yes. If subsequent 'needs improvement' is also considered with a 'satisfactory', 'proficient' or 'excellent' evaluation given shared concerns

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of the parties about teachers earning multiple 'needs improvement' ratings over the year. As a component of the negotiation, stakeholders have agreed to send a joint letter to the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, which is PEAC for those, you know you hear PEAC, that's what it stands for, the Performance Evaluation Advisory Council, to request the council to study and issue guidance and address multiple needs, improvement ratings, to establish minimum criteria for teachers receiving overall 'unsatisfactory' and 'needs improvement' rating and how Professional Development Plans issued after a teacher receives a 'needs improvement' or a not intended to be like a remediation plan issued by a teacher receiving an 'unsatisfactory' rating but a targeted plan for improvement based on the 'needs improvement' rating. Second question in legislative intent is, what is the expected outcome of this study? (A) among things we expect are, first, we encourage PEAC to review and revise the rubrics on how summative ratings are arrived at. There have been some instances where a teacher receive just one 'needs improvement' rating in on a subcategory resulting overall summative rating of 'needs improvement'. Second, we need PEAC to specifically give directions on dealing with educators who receive one or more 'needs improvement' ratings. Our intent not for educators to perpetually receive 'needs improvement' rating. Upon receiving a 'needs improvement' rating, the next summative rating should involve more stringent criteria than was applied during the rating process than needs to... leads to the 'needs improvement' rating. And the next question and it's the last question for intent is,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

if PEAC does not... what if PEAC reviews of the rubrics does not result in quidance approved by the stakeholders who participate in the Senate Bill 7 negotiations by the end of the 2014-2015 school year? The answer to that, if PEAC does not issue guidance in regards to the rubrics that is provided by Senate Bill 7 stakeholders then it is the intention of me as a Sponsor and the Sponsor in the Senate, Senator Lightford, to convene those stakeholders, develop legislation to address legislative... legislatively these issues and the recall rights of teachers with multiple 'needs improvement' over a period of time, and other issues which were part of the discussion which led to this Bill. I... I'm... thank you for the time and the indulgence to read this into the record, but this was a very hefty piece of listening for us last year. And I appreciate all the hard work that all the groups have done on the evaluations. I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative moves for the adoption of Amend...
and on that, we have Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just... I do know that this was a highly negotiated process through a lot of stakeholders at the table. I think everybody's on board. I do just have one question for the Representative, if she will yield? I do have one concern which I think can be mitigated as they go on, but PEAC is an advisory council. And did we fund PEAC this year? We did not."

Chapa LaVia: "No, we didn't fund it this year."

Pihos: "Okay. So I'm sure between Senator Lightford and yourself and the other people that negotiated this Bill, they can find

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

the appropriate place to put that advisement in because that is a concern that I have."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I'd move that we concur and please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5546?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 101 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting' present', the House concurs with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 5546. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4561, Representative D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At least I wasn't driving a car though. I... I move to concur with Amendment 1 on House Bill 4561."

Speaker Turner: "A few words about the Amendment, Representative." D'Amico: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Turner: "A few words about the Amendment."

D'Amico: "Yeah. Basically, what it does is it allows the FBI to do a background check on providers for adult driver's education."

Speaker Turner: "Did you mean Amendment #2, Representative D'Amico?"

D'Amico: "The Amendment 2."

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

Mayfield: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Mayfield: "Representative, I'm sorry. I'm reading this analysis here, I just have a question. Now these are online instructors who have absolutely no contact other than on the computer with their students, correct?"

D'Amico: "Correct."

Mayfield: "Are they... are the students minors or are they adults?"

D'Amico: "Well, it's going to be for stud... for first time drivers from the ages 18-21."

Mayfield: "So, adults?"

D'Amico: "And that... that is... that if... that has already passed.

This is just the Concurrence. We had to clarify some state statute that would allow the FBI to do the background check."

Mayfield: "Okay. I don't see any remediation here if there's an error in their background? Normally, what's happening with the brick and mortar is that..."

D'Amico: "Well, that..."

Mayfield: "...there's an appeal process and I don't see that here.

So that if an individual, you know, due to identity theft or
fraud can actually go in and say, hey, this is not me. There's
a remediation process; your Bill does not have that for these
online individuals."

D'Amico: "Well, if... if..."

Mayfield: "So I'm just concerned that we're not having parity."

D'Amico: "Well, right. And if... if they're found to have any convictions or criminal offense, they're not going to let them perform the duties."

Mayfield: "That's not what I'm asking."

D'Amico: "Oh."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Mayfield: "It's not about the performance. My issue is if there's something listed in their background that is not accurate what is their remedy to get it corrected so they do not lose the position?"

D'Amico: "I'm sure it's an appeals process, an expungement."

Mayfield: "But it's not in your Bill."

D'Amico: "That's just a normal process that they would go through."

Mayfield: "It's not in your Bill. You know, so you're making an assumption that is not there. If you're going to put in law that, you know, what... what it is you're actually outlining this into law. So this is new, there should be an appeals process here as well."

D'Amico: "Well, in order to get the contract you have to pass the FBI background check, you have to pass the State Police check which is just... That's... that's what's there right now. We're just trying to clarify this. We just needed to redo this again just so the FBI can do this."

Mayfield: "Okay. I must be misreading something in the analysis.

Let me look at the Bill. Thank you."

D'Amico: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative D'Amico to close."

D'Amico: "Appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 4561?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting' present', the House concurs

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

with Amendment #2 to House Bill 4561. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3662, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3662. It basically clarifies that students that live in a safe passage zone would qualify for the transportation reimbursement that the state provides. And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Lady's Motion to Concur. And this is a Bill that I spoke against last time and I was wrong and I apologized after. And I'm glad that we have a chance to concur because she's one hundred percent right on this Bill. And I encourage everybody to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pihos."

Pihos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Please note that this program has not been funded since 20... fiscal year 2009. And I think everybody should consider the fact that we should not continue to make promises when we don't have funding to see them through. So I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Flowers to close."

Flowers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The law is still on the books, the program exists. If the money's not there, not to worry about it. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3662?' All in favor vote 'aye';

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 73 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 0 voting' present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3662. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Sullivan, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you excuse Representative Schmitz for the rest of the day, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Davidsmeyer: "I just wanted to mention that I have a friend here,

David Albers, who has joined us on Republican staff for... to
be an intern this summer. And I just want to recognize him
and welcome him to Springfield."

Speaker Turner: "Welcome. Thank you, Representative. House Bill 3754, Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Be nice. Thank you, Speaker. You look great. Okay. So this was my original Bill that I sent over there to the Senate that would eliminate the Charter School Commission for the state and it looks like it got negotiated to... I don't know. But I'll take any questions."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Franks."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Franks: "This is an interesting Bill, don't you think? We've been friends for quite a while, our family are friends. And I remember one time when my car broke down and I pulled my... my whole front bumper came off of my car, remember that day? And you and Susana got some duct tape and some other things and put my... bungee cords and put my car back together. So this is... this isn't personal when I'm... when I may be asking you a few questions on... It's exactly... it's just business, just business."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Leader Lang."

Franks: "So this deals with the Charter Commission, but I thought that when you were trying to deal with this before, a core issue was local control. So, does this Bill, in your opinion, solve that problem of local control?"

Chapa LaVia: "Absolutely not. In fact, a Bill that I handed over to Leader Pihos would have solved our issue with local control. But no, it doesn't... it doesn't."

Franks: "And this sort of puts extra work on ISBE's plate and...
and they're... you're asking them to do the work of locally
elected school officials. Isn't that what this Bill would
do?"

Chapa LaVia: "Yes, it would."

Franks: "All right. And it also says that there's supposed to be a report in two years regarding the appeal board and they're going to give that report to the General Assembly regarding whether this will work. But who's going to be responsible for deciding what a good authorizer looks like? Is that going to be the board? Is it going to be the ISBA? Is it going to be the General Assembly? Who's it going to be?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Chapa LaVia: "Not local control, if that's what you're getting at."

Franks: "All right. So no one knows that the best practices are you're telling me and we're taking away local control, correct?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. So as I said, this isn't personal. And I had said something previously when Representative Cassidy was talking about a Bill and I apologize, I said it was a dumb Bill. I apologize for that. But there may be a worse Bill out there, Representative, but I haven't found it yet. So, I'm going to ... I'm hoping there might be a worse Bill. But on this one here, this may be... this may be the worst Bill that I've seen all year. And I know it's not yours, it's simply a Concurrence. But I think this Bill is worthy of special recognition, one that doesn't happen very often. But I do believe that this Bill should be commemorated in a special way that should be placed on a trophy for... for perseverance for generations to come. I think there ought to be a hat, I think there ought to be some confetti. I think we ought to throw a party a little later. But this Bill is so bad that I'd even ask you to vote against it, Representative. And I want you to think about that. So thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Thank you. I will."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. To the Bill. Theatre notwithstanding, it was a bad Bill the first time around and it's now worse. Ostensibly it was advanced for local control, that's been stripped away. So the very purpose that the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sponsor utilized in the initial Bill has been stripped away. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, what was the reason that this Bill was first drafted?"

Chapa LaVia: "Wow. It seems like forever ago. I think it started with either an incident in Chicago where the Charter School Commission overrode their... their school board's decision not to have a charter in a certain area. Or it was the 18 school districts that did not want a virtual charter and they had to pay a lot of money out of their bottom line to defend not having a charter 'cause the local control didn't want it. So, I think it was... it was last year."

Pritchard: "So there were several incidences that arose where the Commission would have made a determination contrary to local control?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct."

Pritchard: "And was there also the concern that the Commission hadn't set forth firm guidelines as to how they would approve or disapprove of an application?"

Chapa LaVia: "Correct. And... and now that you're on that, that... that... in that avenue, I remember them coming up with their own bylaws, not talking to us about putting together how they reauthorize charters. And I don't know if you got a call and asked how to do that, but they decided to do it all together. And... and so, you know, it's interesting but, yes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Pritchard: "So, there's also concern that as this Bill as it now stands would transfer the responsibility back to the State Board of Education, that there isn't enough staffing or funding to operate this?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Absolutely. They are extremely underfunded and understaffed with ISBE."
- Pritchard: "And as the state charter now stands, there is a separate funding source, correct?"
- Chapa LaVia: "There is, but we don't know too much about the money or where it came from and certain things."
- Pritchard: "So perhaps we ought to change that rather than totally change the landscape?"
- Chapa LaVia: "Possibly. I mean, you'd have a better idea. I'm willing to listen to you, Leader Pritchard."
- Pritchard: "Well, let's certainly work on that this summer. And let this idea kind of rest and see where we go from here.

 Thank you."

Chapa LaVia: "Is that rest in peace?"

Pritchard: "I'm certain."

Chapa LaVia: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia to close."

Chapa LaVia: "Listen, it's not what I expected to do. And it's definitely probably one of the... the worst pieces of legislation I've ever carried. So I'm not even going to vote for this. So what I'd like, you know, for those of you who love me, vote with me and vote... and vote this down. 'Cause it is a terrible, terrible piece of legislation in the way it looks. So I will be voting... I will follow Leader Yang and be voting 'no'. Thank you."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1... concur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 3754?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 4 voting 'yes', 100 voting 'no', 0 voting' present', the House does not concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3754. And this Motion fails. Mr. Lang. Representative Hays, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Hays: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Hays: "Representative Chapa LaVia, in the... in the interest of bipartisanship I would offer to accompany you to the Senate to present the trophy to the Senators that negotiated that crappy Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted for the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 336."

Speaker Turner: "On page 10 of the Calendar, under the Order of Senate Bills on Second Reading, we have Senate Bill 727, Representative Cassidy. Mr. Clerk. Can you please move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading?"

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take this Bill out of the record. Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you. Please excuse Representative Kelly Burke for the remainder of the afternoon."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Senate Bill 2728, Representative Jakobsson. Representative Conroy on Floor Amendment #2."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Oh, excuse me... excuse me, Representative. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2728, a Bill for an Act concerning education. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Conroy, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. This Amendment simply extends the...
 the deadline for the Civics Task Force from May 31 until
 December 31, 2014."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Conroy moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2728. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 2728, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson. Excuse me.

 Representative Conroy."
- Conroy: "Thank you, Speaker. I move for the passing of this Bill, as amended."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2728 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 2728, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar, we have House Bill 3937, Representative Chapa LaVia."
- Chapa LaVia: "Thank you, Speaker. I'll be brief on this one. It's agreed upon. We sent over some language that we would change the commission's idea that... the commission's idea of the finding that the virtual reality charter schools... it was... we're going to hold it 'til '17. Now, we're going to move it to '16. I move to its Concurrence. Everybody's fine with it, everybody at all. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments #1 & 2 to House Bill 3937? All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 85 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendments #1 & 2 to House Bill 3937. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 of the Calendar, under the Order

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of Resolutions, we have House Resolution 782, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speak... Thanks, Jack. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have House Resolution 782 and I know there's been a lot of talk about this Resolution. This is a Resolution. All this is is simply asking the United States EPA to give the states flexibility to create their own regulations at their own speed. By no means is this another initiative from an outside group. By no means is this against President Obama. This is a Resolution. That's it. This came from organized labor and I don't... I don't have... I've got time, but, I'll spare you how many unions are for this but almost all of them. So, I don't think we should have a cookie cutter approach to this. Forty-seven percent of our power comes from coal, 47 percent comes from nuclear, 6 percent comes from renewables and gas. I'm for all types. All I'm saying is let the state have some flexibility because coal means too much to our state. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to request a Roll

Call vote."

Speaker Turner: "A Roll Call vote has been requested.

Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Just a couple of points. The... this is in direct contradiction to President Obama's climate change initiative; the rules for which are due to be released in the next week. And this is trying to preempt that effort to get a handle on climate change and to... and I think that... and then to let the states do what the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

states are going to be doing under the proposed rules which is to implement this. And I think that it's, you know, and, again, as I said last... couple days ago, in the President's home state to be taking on one of his initiatives in such a direct way, I think, does not look well for Illinois and for ... or for the President. And as to whether or not this is an initiative of an outside group, I would tell you that I was looking on the American Legislative Exchange Council website yesterday, which is a place I don't often visit, in fact, it's the first time I've been to ALEC's website, but ALEC specifically passed a Resolution to say that they oppose any regulation where states are not allowed to play their proper roles, whatever that is, in making the significant policy judgments that are required in adopting any such regulation referring exactly to the President's climate change regulations. That's ex... what ALEC opposes here and whether this is an ALEC initiative or not specifically, but what ALEC put forward in that Resolution is exactly what are we are doing in this Resolution today and what the Sponsor is proposing. So, if it isn't specifically drafted by ALEC, it is exactly in line with ALEC's suggested Resolutions. And I would strongly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. You know, as soon as Monday, the U.S. EPA will unveil this plan. Now, understand how this Resolution just... all it asks is that we, the states... we, the states, have the ability to have some input to allow ourselves the opportunity for flexible fuel. Folks, here in the State of Illinois, about 42 percent of our

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

power, if not more, is with fossil fuel. Now, I was around, not in the Legislature, when the Clean Air Act was originally passed and I watched coal mines close down all over southern Illinois and people be put out of work and the employment rate rise. We, all of us on this floor, believe in clean and green energy, but right now we're still at that point that these are up and coming fuels and up and coming ways to provide energy. We had a Resolution yesterday on our nuclear plants and the concern that we have there. It is important that we have a federal rule, but it... that rule also should still allow for the sovereignty of the states to understand their own needs, to understand that we know what our power grid situation is, we know where our power comes from and why we use that particular power. And as we move forward and still work on those green plants, we must maintain affordable and reliable energy; ones that can provide us with base load. Folks, if the Federal Government continues to come through the EPA and then all a the sudden these rules are implemented and we have to start shutting down plant after plant after plant without first having the opportunity to build those other resources to keep our grid alive, we are really going to have some explaining to do to our constituents. The Resolution is just simply that; asking them to consider allowing us to have the opportunity that we should have here in the state to make those decisions on our own. I stand in strong support of the Gentleman's Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Body. Something that I think that's extremely important to realize about this

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Resolution, it was filed on February 4, 2014. This Bill was not heard. We had a Motion to Discharge on the floor. I want to make it very clear to everyone here, from a time manner, this has absolutely nothing to do with what's going on with President Obama and the EPA next week. This was filed February the 4, 2014. I want to make that extremely clear. Secondly, this Resolution has the full support of the AFL-CIO. Again, the full support of the AFL-CIO. I want you to be aware of that. As Representative Phelps has said, coal and gas account for about 50 percent of the power source for our state. If you look at renewables, they account for around 6 percent. We're all for renewables. Frankly, you can't just replace coal. It's not feasible right now. This encourages the EPA to let the State of Illinois have a little bit of flexibility in developing our own greenhouse gas policy. We're different than other states. It's extremely important to realize. We're for, when I say we, myself and Representative Phelps and I believe most people downstate, we're for all forms of energy; coal, nuclear and the renewables. Again, this was filed February 4, 2014. I ask for your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "To the Resolution. Just a quick point in case you didn't have the opportunity to read the last few Resolutions dealing with power. The nuclear Resolution that we didn't take a record Roll Call vote on actually encourages the utilization of and the stringent use of clean power and clean sources and urges us to draw on clean energy sources and incorporates nuclear as one of those, so-called, clean sources. So, whatever you feel about nuclear power, it is low

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

on carbon emissions. So, that was the purpose of that Resolution. This is in direct conflict to that. Just so you know, if you're voting... supported the other one whether it's a Roll Call or not and you support this one, you're kind of saying two different things. You may want to think on how you explain the inconsistency there. This actually urges us to adopt less stringent standards for the clean energy sources and the carbon emissions. So, before you take a vote on this, take a look at what you voted on before, what you're supporting before and what you weighed in on that because they are inconsistent. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Beiser."

Beiser: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. I think people that are speaking on this definitely feel very strongly on their opinion one way or the other, but I want to just say that Dynegy, which is in my district and employs over 1200 people, has been recognizing the fact that they have a responsibility to the environment as they continue to provide cost effective electricity to our area. They have... their CEO has stated that for the record. They recognize they owe it to the environment while also supplying our electrical needs but, they also have spent over \$2 billion in recent years to upgrade its coal power plant and so it does have a more positive impact on the environment. They will continue to do that. They have stated that for the record. So, they acknowledge that the environment is important to all of us, all of us, but they acknowledge that as they move forward and these technologies improve they will continue to invest in that and put it into their power plants. So, I would urge an

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

'aye' vote on this Resolution because we do recognize the importance of the environment as it relates to the coal industry. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed with your inquiry."

Sullivan: "How many votes will this take or... because, in my opinion at least, it's not a revenue Resolution that it's just more yeses than noes. Is that correct?"

Speaker Turner: "That's correct, Sir."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Secondarily to that, in the event that this Resolution does not receive the required 'yes' votes, I would like to verify the 'no' votes."

Speaker Turner: "We have your request."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Sullivan: "Representative, you're going to have some people come up and talk about the committee process. In this committee, according to the last time we discussed this Bill, you were given the opportunity for a subject matter only hearing. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Were you ever at any point given the right to have a vote within that committee?"

Phelps: "No, I was not."

Sullivan: "Okay. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Resolution. That's kind of why we're here today. This is a very important Resolution. Many of you, as I said before, are going to go

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

home to see dramatic increases in electrical costs, actually I think starting this weekend, starting tomorrow. And so, when your constituents start asking you, what have you done to curtail the price of electricity, you can say, hey, I voted to keep coal... coal plants functioning in the State of Illinois to add to our electrical power or you can say, I voted to have stricter rules on coal plants driving coal plants out of the state, driving jobs out of the state. And I ask you, is that what you want to do when you get home this weekend? I don't think that's what you want to do. I hope that's not what you want to do. We have many coal reserves here. We need to tap into that coal to create jobs, one, but more importantly, these restrictions that are coming are going to drive these coal plants out. We have a coal plant up near me that is on the verge of going out of business because they can't afford to keep the plant alive under the restrictions we have and under the coming restrictions. So, please, I urge you, for your constituents, for the southern Illinois brethren that we have here today, please vote for this Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Cavaletto."

Cavaletto: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Resolution. Coal from Champaign to Cairo, 220 years of work in the ground. Jobs... jobs that will pay taxes and taxes will grow this state. And it's a shame that, Southern Illinois, I was born around coal mines and breathed the air for all my life. I'm still here but. I don't know for how much longer, but I'm still here, now. But coal mines are not as bad as people think they are and I worked in a coal mine myself, 800 feet in the ground

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

for a couple summers. So, I think that there's really a misnomer on the fact that coal, it can be clean and it is clean and has been. And I urge an 'aye' vote in support of this Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I am for southern Illinois. I am for jobs. I am for coal."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "What he said."

Speaker Turner: "Representative..."

Mautino: "But from central Illinois. No, I also have the... the Hennepin plant and coal has been a large part of the economy throughout my area, throughout central and southern Illinois.

And I just stand in support of the Gentleman's Resolution."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Christian Mitchell."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Mitchell, C.: "Brandon, yes, dad seriously, quick question. On page 4, I'm looking at lines, I think, three through seven. You've got... it says in here the EPA should issue guidelines and approve state established performance standards that are based on reductions of carbon dioxide achievable by measures undertaken at fossil fuel power plants. My question is, is what you're saying here that there ought to be some allowance for scrubbers and for clean coal or that the entirety of the standards should be based on reductions that can be achieved at coal power plants specifically?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Phelps: "Yeah and Representative Mitchell, here's the problem on this too. Some of these power plants are so old they can't be retrofitted."

Mitchell, C.: "Right."

Phelps: "So, that's what's going to cause these places to shut down and the jobs are going to go away. And Representative Mitchell, here's the truth of all this. The ones that are going to lose if that happens are the poorest of the poor that we all represent because the electricity rates are going to go through the roof."

Mitchell, C.: "Absolutely, I understand. What I'm asking is, you're not saying all EPA standards should be based entirely on keeping old coal fire plants open, but there should be consideration for those particular plants?"

Phelps: "Absolutely. And see, that's exactly why I'm trying to do this because we just want the state to have the time to meet President Obama's policies. That's all."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Davis, W.: "Representative, I'm trying to make sure I understand this and I'm reading some of the background. I've heard Members talk about, you know, the use of coal. The coal plants in Illinois, do they use Illinois coal?"

Phelps: "Not all of them, Representative. But if it was up to me,

I'd run a Bill right now where they had to, but not all of
them. You're exactly right."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Davis, W.: "But the reason they can't use Illinois coal because it's higher in sulphur, correct?"
- Phelps: "And that's why you have Prairie State that can burn Illinois coal because the technology has advanced and it changes all the time."
- Davis, W.: "So, is kind of one of the..."
- Phelps: "Representative, I hate to interrupt, but that's the cleanest power plant in the country, I believe."
- Davis, W.: "What's the cleanest power, I'm sorry?"
- Phelps: "The cleanest coal power plant is in southern Illinois."
- Davis, W.: "The cleanest one. Now, is that a fairly new one?"
- Phelps: "Yes. That's the technology that we're all trying to do."
- Davis, M.: "Okay. So, it was built with the appropriate scrubbers to use Illinois coal?"
- Phelps: "The answer is yes."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. I just want to make sure I understand that. So, is part of the intent of what you're suggesting here is that instead of the plants that you mentioned that would close because they can't be retrofitted that we figure out how to still be able to keep them viable?"
- Phelps: "That and just to give the U.S. EPA... just let the states have a flexibility, just not a cookie-cutter approach across the... every state because each state has, you know, different dynamics according to their power."
- Davis, M.: "So... but those plants that cannot be retrofitted, they obviously can't burn Illinois coal which means that that coal will have to be brought in from other places."

Phelps: "And it is now."

Davis, W.: "As it is now."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Phelps: "Sure."
- Davis, W.: "So, because they're old and can't be retrofitted we're actually subsidizing the economy of other states then?"
- Phelps: "Well, but still though, Representative, you could look at it that way, absolutely, but look at the jobs and the revenue that brings in. I mean, I've got the statistics right here. 450 thousand jobs, \$51 billion in GDP. And I can give you more, but I don't want to bore you."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. And I can appreciate that, but if we're unable to retrofit those plants now, the coal that those plants burn is it cleaner than Illinois coal?"
- Phelps: "Yeah. It's lower in sulphur, but Representative, that's why I'm doing the Resolution. Just give us the flexibility to go over that and put that in the conversation and the debate because we do have old power plants."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Well, there's obviously been some dialogue about your Resolution and the time... timing of it referenced to whatever the President is going to say or talk about in probably less than a week. So, is it that some people feel that this should wait until we hear what the President has to say and then we can talk about a Resolution like yours so that it fits more in line into what the President's suggesting?"
- Phelps: "No. Because, like I said, I filed this in February and... let me say this too, Representative..."
- Davis, W.: "Please."
- Phelps: "...and I don't want anybody to think that I have a grudge or upset about the process. I get it. I... the chairman of that committee, I highly, highly respect and love her. And I know

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

this is a difference of opinion. I'm just trying to look out for a huge player in our state. Forty-seven percent of our power comes from coal. We can't ignore that."

Davis, W.: "And I wouldn't suggest you do. I can appreciate the fact that I believe you're really trying to represent your district and some of the other districts in southern Illinois as was mentioned by other individuals, but I guess I just want to be, you know, clear because, again, if you're saying that this Resolution is talking about you having the flexibility, you know, and I wouldn't disagree with that. Again, that's just some have suggested and I don't know anything when you talk about the process and some have mentioned the legislative process, how it's impacted you. I'm not on those committees. So, I wouldn't know the answer to those questions, but just in reference to the fact that we're going to get a statement made from the President of the United States who's from this state at some point in a number of days and I'm just wondering is it possible to consider something along the line of what you want to do, but after we hear exactly what the President would like to do or see. 'Cause I think I'm with you on the fact that if we have these plants here in Illinois, you know, they're no obsolete and they can still operate, you know, then why not keep them operating? Why not keep the jobs and the revenue and the taxes and all the things that we have a tendency to, you know, kind of go back and forth on. I'm wholeheartedly with you. I'm just... timing becomes a challenge for me because we're about to get some, I think, some pertinent information from the President as it relates to this, so that's all I was

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

wondering. I'm not suggesting that you pull it out of the record or you know, if you want to go ahead and move forward with it, please feel free to do so, but I'm just curious about that more, Representative."

Phelps: "No and I appreciate it and you know what, Representative, in all due respect, I've known you for a long time. We probably wouldn't have this discussion if I'd been able to call it in February 'cause I'd already been over with and I know it's the last day, but we just want to be part of the conversation and that's why I'm doing it. And, Representative, that's why I'm doing a Resolution and not a Bill."

Davis, M.: "Fair enough. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Rosenthal."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Rosenthal: "Right now, Representative Phelps, we have some of the most abundant coal resources in the country. Is that not right?"

Phelps: "Yeah and if I can be... if I can find my notes. I've got so many."

Rosenthal: "Yeah."

Phelps: "We've got over 100 million, I believe, tons of coal still in the ground."

Rosenthal: "And as Representative Davis said, right now we're bringing in coal from out of state because we haven't been allowed to use some of the technology to burn clean coal and we need to continue to do that, but on the other side of that

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

we need to use the resources here in Illinois and what this
Resolution would do is continue to press for that, right?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Rosenthal: "I would like to make sure we get this quote from the Chicago Tribune. It says that the U.S. EPA Director Lisa Bonnett, 'We're pretty consistent with what you're hearing from other states that you cannot have a one size fits all approach, but a fleet of tools instead to use to cut emissions'. So, what we need to do, 782, here in Illinois, the U.S. EPA calls for that fleet of tools that we need. So, even the U.S. EPA recognizes that this Resolution is what we need here in Illinois. So, I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm concerned about what would happen if some of these rules were pretty regressive. If all of our plants in Illinois were forced to shut down or retool, what would happen with the ability for us to provide electricity for our constituents and for our businesses?"

Phelps: "I don't know if we could handle it. But I'll guarantee you one thing, Representative, and I think you'll agree with me each and every one of us is going to have a whole heck of a lot of phone calls because everybody's power they're not going to be able to afford at all."

Reboletti: "And it wasn't your intention to come up against a deadline of the last day in Session to have this Resolution heard. You wanted this information to Congress much sooner so

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

that they could take this into their contemplation as they were forming the rules."

Phelps: "The answer is yes."

Reboletti: "To the Resolution. You know, we talk a lot about jobs and putting people back to work. You know, we've seen the rulemaking process for fracking and how slow that has been to create jobs and create more energy, cheaper energy for all of us and it's unfortunate that that's been so slow-walked. And I can only imagine how slow and regressive the Federal Government could be and I think it's time that the State of Illinois weigh in, we put people back to work. I urge the support of this Resolution and wish to be added as a cosponsor."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Representative, didn't you help negotiate the fracking
Bill?"

Phelps: "Yeah, a little bit. I wasn't in every meeting, Representative, to be honest."

Ives: "Wasn't that fracking Bill something that was respected by
 all elements: labor, the Sierra Club, everybody was on board
 with that fracking Bill?"

Phelps: "Representative Bradley and Reis and Representative Bost did a heck of a job to bring everybody to a hundred percent agreement."

Ives: "And didn't we have some of the most... the strictest environmental protections out of any other fracking law in the nation with that Bill?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Phelps: "The strongest in the country."

Ives: "So, would you suspect that if we were to write our own rules on coal that we'd also have some of the strongest regulation in the country on that?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Ives: "I would expect the same and I will tell you this, within the next few years, coal is expected to be the primary, the number one... let me read here. It'll be the single largest source of energy used globally, surpassing oil. So, we either want to get on board with this... we either want to have our coal be part of that... that generation of economic activity or we don't. It's a very simple question here. But when you look at the advantages in Illinois you've got three: agriculture, the transportation network and energy. We should be leading on this issue. We are the energy generator of the Midwest. There's no reason that we shouldn't use our resources to the fullest extent possible to bring 550 thousand unemployed people in Illinois back to work here in this state. Energy has been called the master resource. As long as we can continue to produce good energy at a cheap price we can then, if we would actually look at some good business reform, bring back manufacturing to Illinois. We should all be on this Resolution. Being on this Resolution means that you support energy and you support good jobs. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hays."

Hays: "Representative, I think this is one hell of a good idea.

I think it's so good we ought to a nonbinding referendum on the ballot."

Phelps: "I would probably cosponsor with you, Sir."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Hays: "Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Anthony."

Anthony: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Leader Bost."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the clearing up some things that were said. Representative, this is not speaking against the President in any way. This is just talking to the EPA, the federal EPA, and explaining to them our concerns. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "You're absolutely right, Representative Bost."

Bost: "And can you explain just a little bit, I don't think the people on this floor understand, that under the existing EPA rules and those things that are called credits and how those work. Can you kind of go into a little bit of..."

Phelps: "That's probably... you probably know more than me. All I'm trying to do, Representative, is just have us in the conversation."

Bost: "Okay. Well, let me... let me explain the credits. What happens is, is each company is given so many credits of amount of carbons and... that they can burn and use. And what you have is, is they have... some of their older plants might produce more. Some of their green plants whether it's wind or whether it is solar obviously don't produce any, so they have to try to balance out. So, what the danger is and what the EPA is proposing is those companies that are in situations where they don't have many credits left and they're trying to do the upgrade as they can afford and to keep the grid online. Now, all of a sudden, they're going to be forced into a whole different set of credits and those credits will be lost. And

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

therefore, not that the power plant is so terrible, but the power plant then must be shut down because it doesn't meet the requirements to keep them under the line that's required. And what you do is, is you get a rolling system through our grid with a lack of power. That lack of power is going to do one of two things. Well, it's going to do one for sure and that's going to drive your price of energy up. But the other thing that could possibly happen is that, either in the depth of sum... or in the heat of summer when the air conditioners are running and everything else you're going to get rolling brownouts because you can't have enough power on the grid to cover what you have to do. Folks, this is not ... this is a very important issue. We need to send this message. It isn't against the President. It is telling the federal EPA, allow our state EPA to help implement these rules locally so that we can affect our power grid the way we know that we can keep it online, keep our rates affordable, keep people working. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Lang in the Chair. Representative Sente is recognized."

Sente: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Day after day we all receive e-mails on what is wrong with Illinois. One of the areas where Illinois is currently a leader is in the area of environmental responsibility and green energy. I'll repeat that, green energy and I, for one, would like to remain such a leader in this area. I urge a strong 'no' vote on this Resolution and I'd like to ask for a verification of the 'yes' votes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Lang: "The request is acknowledged along with the previous request for a Roll Call vote. The Chair recognizes Mr. Thapedi."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Thapedi: "Mr. Phelps, I believe that initially this Resolution was in the Environment Committee. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "That is correct."

Thapedi: "And you sit on that committee, do you not?"

Phelps: "I do."

Thapedi: "Do you recall that I was also in the Environmental Committee with a similar Resolution, not similar to this, but which also addressed carbon emissions. Do you recall that?"

Phelps: "I absolutely do recall that."

Thapedi: "Do you recall that the proposal that I had focused in on those plants that emitted more than one million metric tons of carbon and anthropogenic compounds per year and put a cap on that amount and anything in excess of that amount there would be a certain amount of money that would be paid by that company to the Environmental Protection Agency but would not be a trade component. Do you recall that?"

Phelps: "I absolutely do and you're right on."

Thapedi: "And what happened with my proposal?"

Phelps: "If I remember right, Representative, you were given the ability to do subject matter as well, but I don't think the chair was going to call your Bill or Resolution whichever one it was."

Thapedi: "So, essentially then that we've had two alternate proposals on addressing the issue of carbon and especially

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

with respect to looking at how the federal EPA would be addressing it and there was no committee action, no discussion whatsoever. This is the first time we've ever had any discussion on carbon this year. Is that accurate?"

Phelps: "That is accurate."

Thapedi: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much for this very important Resolution and I want to talk to the previous speaker a while ago. I'm for green energy as well, you know, but... just coal means so much to our state. So, please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "There's been a Roll Call vote requested. There's also been a request by Mr. Sullivan to verify the 'no' votes and a request by Representative Sente to verify the 'yes' votes. Those in favor of the Bill will vote 'yes'... Excuse me. 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? Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Representative Sente, do you wish to persist in your verification? She withdraws her verification. Mr. Sullivan withdraws his verification. 66 'yes', 36 'no', 2 'present' and the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 1180, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 1181, offered by Representative Phelps. House Resolution 1182, offered by Representative Bradley. House Resolution 1183,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

offered by Representative Welch. House Resolution 1184, offered by Representative McAuliffe. House Resolution 1186, offered by Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 1187, offered by Representative Yingling. House Resolution 1190, offered by Representative Osmond and House Resolution 1191, offered by Representative Welch."

- 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. Mr. Clerk, the Adjournment Resolution."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Joint Resolution #104, offered by Representative Currie.
 - RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NINETY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, May 30, 2014, it stands adjourned until Friday, November 07, 2014, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 19, 2014, or until the call of the Speaker; and when the Senate adjourns on Saturday, May 31, 2014, it stands adjourned until Friday, November 07, 2014, in perfunctory session; and when it adjourns on that day, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, November 19, 2014, or until the call of the President.
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Page 17 of the Calendar, House Resolution 825, Representative Hatcher. Please proceed. Out of the record.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Page 18, House Resolution 934, Mr. McSweeney. Out of the record. House Resolution 1073, Mr. Bradley. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements."
- Clerk Hollman: "The following committees will be meeting immediately. Revenue & Finance is meeting in 122 immediately. Higher Education is meeting in Room 114 immediately. And Judiciary is meeting in Room 118 immediately."
- Speaker Lang: "Members, the House will be in recess for 30 minutes while these committees meet, 30 minutes and then we'll be back to the floor. Mr. Clerk, Committee Report."
- "Committee Reports. Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2453. Representative Jakobsson, Chairperson from the Committee on Higher Education reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is the Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3961. Representative Nekritz, Chairperson from the committee on the Judiciary reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is House Resolution 1188. Representative Bradley, Chairperson from the Committee on Revenue & Finance reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 333. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 1189, offered by Representative Gabel, is referred to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost is recognized."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Tracy is excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. The House will be in order. Ladies and Gentlemen, moving to page 10 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 336. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 336, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Turner, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner on the Amendment."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment will become the Bill. It's an agreed Amendment and it includes all the language and changes that we discussed in committee. I'd just like to debate it on Third."
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 336, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 336 is an initiative of the Illinois Housing Development Authority and we've had a chance to work on this Bill with interested parties and come to this Amendment. The initiative will give local governments a tool to return vacant homes to productivity by giving them the authority to provide a limited

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

property tax assessment freeze on residential improvements. So, I just wanted to go through a few things that I included in House Amendment #2. First, I want to make it clear this will only truly... this is for only truly distressed areas. House Amendment #2 includes a new target area definition that's used by the U.S. Treasury for community development financial institutions. Two prongs of the definition are that unemployment rate has to be 1.5 times higher than the national average and at least 30 percent of the residents have incomes below the poverty level. Another point; only truly distressed homes will get the benefit. House Amendment #2 requires that the home have been vacant for six months prior to acquisition giving the market time to work on its own and only providing the incentive when it does not. It also caps the purchase price of the improvements and land that the Federal Housing Administration loan limits for that county. Three, the freeze is now transferable only where investor purchasers sell to owner-occupants. Owner-occupants would not be able to transfer the freeze upon sale. This is to further promote community stability by incenting long-term home ownership. Homes receiving the benefit will be a good addition to the community. All homes will be required to pass an inspection for compliance with local building Codes in order to receive the benefit. We've had subject matter around this issue. We took into consideration the concerns of the committee. I'd like to thank Chairman Bradley as well as Spokesperson David Harris and all the Members of the committee, for that matter, for their help on this issue. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Representative, and I understood the... what describes an impoverished area that qualifies under this. But could you describe one more time so..."

Turner: "What qualify..."

Bost: "The house has to be abandoned?"

Turner: "Well, yeah. This is... this is an effort to deal with, you know... did you have something else? I'm sorry, Representative. Okay."

Bost: "No. Did the house have to be abandoned? That's what I was going to..."

Turner: "So... Right. The definition of the distressed area, again, is the new target area definition which is used by the U.S. Treasury for community development and financial institutions. Two prongs of that definition; it must be... the must be in a... have an employment rate of... the neighborhood... the area must have an unemployment rate of 1.5 times higher than the national average and at least 30 percent of the residents in that area have to have incomes below the poverty level. Is that your question?"

Bost: "When they... when they receive... when they receive this credit then what was the percentage of... is it a percentage basis? Is that what the..."

Turner: "Yeah, great question, Representative. I didn't get to that in my description and the formula for it, the calculation of the benefit is limited to the amount of the increase in the assessed value over the period of the freeze. The

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

difference in assessed value on the improvements will be reduced to 10 percent for 7 years and will gradually step up to 100 percent in year 10. Homeowners can apply for the freeze until 2019, so that's for 5 years."

Bost: "Okay. That's what I needed to know. Thank you."

Turner: "Yeah. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I want to praise Leader Turner for bringing this bipartisan piece of legislation to the floor. We all talk about fixing the problems of the State of Illinois and especially in areas that are distressed. This legislation will encourage economic development. It's a great piece of legislation. And I strongly support this legislation and urge everybody to vote 'yes'. And again, thank you, Leader Turner, for the great work you've done on this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Ives: "I was just reading this Bill. Is this somewhat like a TIF for personal property? Would you describe it that way?"

Turner: "No, Representative, it's not like a... it's not a TIF."

Ives: "Well, it seems to have some of those elements in the... if you... you know, TIFs began as something that you do to help property that was, in most cases, it was supposed to be contaminated, so it helped spur development on property that generally wouldn't get developed otherwise. That's kind of the intent of this Bill. Is that correct?"

Turner: "So, TIFs take money away and give them to local governments for economic development and there's no scamming

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of money away in this situation. This initiative will give local governments a tool to return vacant homes to productivity by giving them the authority to provide a limited property tax assessment freeze on residential improvements, major improvements."

Ives: "Well, that's what a TIF does. It provides a property tax assessment freeze so, essentially, you're paying that extra... the money to yourself by having it frozen at a base level."

Turner: "I would say the difference is there's no creation of a pool of dollars for economic development under this piece of legislation though as it is with a TIF."

Ives: "No, instead you're just freezing the property tax level as the improvement grows. Now, currently, I thought we already have in our Property Tax Code that if you improve your property you usually get a four-year abatement of 25 thousand off a EAV. Is that... So, why is this different or why is this needed if you still can have that as part of the Code?"

Turner: "Representative, in spite of that benefit, there's a huge need to deal with vacant homes and local municipalities and this is a tool that will help deal with that issue."

Ives: "So, is this only... this is only for S corps, LLCs? It's not
 for an individual property owner?"

Turner: "No, that's not the case."

Ives: "Okay. If it's such a good idea why are we limiting the amount of credit that's given out each year?"

Turner: "There's actually not an overall cap here."

Ives: "So, there's... I see that FY14 has 10 million and then... Okay, that's the underlying Bill. All right. So, there is no cap,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- so how much do you think we can expect to have capped in potential property taxes coming out of this?"
- Turner: "I'm not sure I understand your question, Representative."
- Ives: "Well, how much is this going to cost local governments that they won't be receiving in tax payments?"
- Turner: "Well, it's not going to cost them anything 'cause this would just be lowering it from any increase in the value."
- Ives: "Sure, over time property is going to increase in value, but they would've received some benefit as the property value improves and now they're not going to receive that benefit.

 Is that correct?"
- Turner: "Well, they will receive some benefit if there was any investment in the property, but the problem is there's no investment in the property. We're trying to incentivize homeowners to invest."
- Ives: "Okay. And the last thing is, how are you going to actually...
 what's the methodology for determining the poverty count in
 a particular area to understand what qualifies and what
 doesn't?"
- Turner: "So, only truly distressed homes will get the benefit.

 House Amendment 2 requires that the home have been vacant for six months prior to acquisition giving the market time to work on its own and only providing incentive when it does not. It also caps the purchase price of the improvements and the land that the Federal Housing Administration loan limits for that county."
- Ives: "Okay. I thought I heard something like 30 percent of the people in that area have to be below the poverty level. Is that correct?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Turner: "Yeah. That was one of the prongs under the definition that we're using for the target area. Yes and that... what you're referring is at least 30 percent of the residents have incomes below the poverty level."

Ives: "I'm just wondering what's the methodology for determining
 that? How are you going to do that?"

Turner: "It's a federal designation."

Ives: "Will it change every year? Will it change every two years?

Does it change with a census count? How do you guys... how do
we know that it's actually serving the population it should?"

Turner: "We're going to double-check on the frequency of the changing. We can get back to you on that."

Ives: "Okay. I'm just a bit concerned because I've seen how projects that are meant and designated for one purpose end up dovetailing into other things like the entire center of Chicago becoming a distressed zone where you have hundreds of TIFs. I certainly wouldn't want that to happen with this program and it'd be important to understand the underlying methodology of determining what is distressed or what is not and what is vacant and what is not. It could be vacant for a number of reasons. It could just not have a selling price that is not commensurate with the market. So, that's my biggest concern here is the underlying methodology of determining if this benefit's going to be misconstrued to property areas that should not be receiving this type of tax credit."

Turner: "I don't think that'd be the case, Representative, but your concern is noted and we'll keep that in mind."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Ives: "Okay, thank you. I'd like maybe some additional... maybe we need trailer legislation on this or something because I think it's pretty subjective, but thank you."

Turner: "Yeah, thank you, Representative and to that point. We have had discussions with county assessors, downstate county assessors and others in terms of the implementation of this and we've made the commitment to continue to work out any sort of kinks that may arise through the process and if we have to come with trailer legislation, we'll do that, but thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I compliment Leader Turner. This is a great idea. It's going to affect all the state. I support this. Vote 'aye'." Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sosnowski."

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

Sosnowski: "Just a brief question. Would this apply to all

counties throughout the State of Illinois?"

Turner: "Yes, Sir, it will."

Sosnowski: "And I appreciate that and also appreciate the work of the Illinois Housing Development Authority. When it came to committee, that was something that was discussed and I appreciate your willingness to work on that and expand that. I think with the limitations on unemployment and also on the poverty level, it's a very positive program that will help those communities that have blight and will hopefully get some of these properties back on the tax roll. So, I appreciate your efforts. Thank you so much for sponsoring this."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Turner: "Thank you for your input."

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

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, can you walk me through the process of how this would occur? And I don't mean to belabor or make the evening longer. So, where, first of all... I know that there's eligibility here... requirements. What are those eligibility requirements? There's an unemployment component and something else involved."

Turner: "Right. Okay. So, eligibility requirements. This is for a distressed area. The definition of distressed is, again, we're using the new target area definition which is used by the U.S. Treasurer's Office... Treasury for Community Development and Financial Institutions. The two prongs of that definition are unemployment rate of 1.5 times higher than the national average and at least 30 percent of the residents in that area have incomes below the poverty level. Now, that's how we determine a distressed area. The distressed homes that this will apply to they have to have been vacant for six months prior to acquisition giving the market time to work on its own and providing incentive when it does not. And it also caps the purchase price of the improvements and land at the Federal Housing Administration's loan limits for that county."

Reboletti: "And where would you anticipate the neighborhoods and communities where this would apply? I know, obviously, it's not going to be only Chicago, but do you have a general idea

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- of where this may apply? Is there a map with some kind of graph that would show us?"
- Turner: "Sure. And you know, I can get you more information, Representative, about your particular area, but this will affect the entire state and there are many distressed communities across the entire state from downstate Illinois to neighborhoods in Chicago and the collar counties and, you know, west of Rockford. It's statewide and there are many areas that will benefit from this, but I can get you specific information about yours."
- Reboletti: "And I appreciate that and Leader, with respect to, I think, following up on Representative Ives' line of questioning, is once the property has been purchased and rehabbed does it always have to be owner occupied or can it be leased out or does it always have to be leased out? What is the ultimate goal?"
- Turner: "Okay. So, under this Amendment, the freeze is now transferable only where investor purchasers sell to owner occupants. Owner occupants would not be able to transfer the freeze upon sale."
- Reboletti: "So, the desire isn't to have some corporate group come in, buy a bunch of places and then turn them around and then make a profit and leave. That's not... we're trying to help people own a home. Could that happen though?"
- Turner: "Representative, they would be eligible, but they would have to come in and make significant improvements into the home. We're trying to promote stability in these neighborhoods and have occupied homes."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Reboletti: "And I appreciate those answers, Leader, and I look forward to supporting this and please add me as a cosponsor."

Turner: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Willis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Willis: "I have a couple of quick questions. So, the goal of this, if I'm reading right, is really doing community renewal so that we are not walking and seeing empty homes anymore and we find homes that we can turn around. Am I correct?"

Turner: "That's correct, Representative."

Willis: "Okay. To the Bill. This is something that I'm in strong support, in fact, I just put in a slip to add me as a cosponsor. We have had some similar but not quite as extensive programs put throughout in my... some of my neighborhoods. I know Bellwood and Maywood have had part of a community renewal grant project that was done through Proviso Mental Health where we, basically, these independent groups came in and they flipped homes and to get people back into the houses, to be able to help them stay. It helps the community. It does nothing good to have an empty home in a community and if this is the way we can get those empty homes back filled with families that are productive citizens, this is a wonderful idea. And I urge the entire body to vote 'aye' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Yeah. Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. I just want commend, Art. This is how the process is supposed to work. We've been working on this all Session and also

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Chairman Bradley deserves kudos on this because here we're trying to make this statewide and it happened today because of his efforts as well as Art Turner's. And this is a Bill that I think will really help rejuvenate areas that need it most. And it affects every one of us because when all of us... when these areas lift up it helps us all. It increases property values. People have more money in their pockets. This is the type of legislation that the state desperately needs and it really was a team effort. And Art, I want to thank you for your leadership and John Bradley as well. Thank you and I encourage everyone to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Turner to close."

Turner: "I'd just like to close by thanking everyone again. This is something that we've been working on for a very long time with the Illinois Housing Development Authority and Char Flickinger, all of the Members of the Revenue & Finance Committee and the overwhelming bipartisan support that we've received around this initiative. I'm really grateful and 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? Chapa LaVia, Flowers, Wheeler. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Martwick is recognized."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just on the last Bill could the record reflect that I meant to vote 'present'?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Speaker Lang: "Record will reflect you intention, Sir. On page 8 of the Calendar, Senate Bills-Third Reading, there appears Senate Bill 333, Greg Harris. Leader Currie's handling this. Leader Cur... Please put this on the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk and read the Bill."
- Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 333, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. This Bill was read a second time, previously.

 Amendment 1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie on the Amendment."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Can we move the Amendment, put the Bill on Third and then describe what it does?"
- Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Amendment will say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. 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 333, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you very much. A couple of years ago we passed language permitting the Cook County Assessor's Office to go after people who claimed extra exemptions on their property tax bills, senior exemptions, double homestead, triple homestead exemptions and so forth. This language is cleanup language in order to make that program work more effectively. For example, providing that the state would have a lien if people didn't pay up as they were supposed to. I know of no

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

opposition. And I'd be grateful for your support for the Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you. A parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your inquiry."

Franks: "Was the House Floor Amendment #2 adopted just now?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes, Sir."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you. I think that I'll... will the Majority Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "This... this now will apply statewide for folks who have erroneous exemptions, as I recall?"

Currie: "This is only for Cook County. As to my knowledge, Cook County is the only county that has implemented the opportunity to... to go after... I mean, there may be other opportunities, but a few years ago we worked with the Cook County Assessor on specifically language making it easier for them to go after people who were claiming exemptions to which they were not entitled."

Franks: "Correct. And I think we talked about doing this statewide, but because Cook County hadn't..."

Currie: "We do... we do and we should work on that over the summer because the problem with just taking this Bill and making it statewide is that the procedures in the Cook County office are different from those in other county assessing programs and the assessment officials statewide have offered to work with us to get legislation that would make this work for your county, too."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Franks: "I appreciate that. And I rise in strong support and we'll work over the summer and get something for the rest of the state hopefully in Veto. So, thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I apologize. I've been gone for most of the day, so I didn't see this come through."

Currie: "And we missed you, Representative.

Sullivan: "Thank you, thank you."

Currie: "I just want you to know that."

Sullivan: "But I did have a lot of fun with my daughter this morning, so. We've had extensive negotiations on the underlying Bill that have gone through many machinations and we finally settled on the correct rates, the correct years, correct interest and penalties and so forth. Your Bill, from my brief reading, is really about defining the types of moneys coming forth and who... and the person that's in charge of it and where the money goes and how it's prorated to pe... to taxing bodies. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That's exactly right. It's a technical Bill..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Currie: "...making the whole operation work more smoothly, more efficiently."

Sullivan: "So, we're not changing the underlying penalties, interest, years or what could be erroneously assessed?"

Currie: "Not a bit."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sullivan: "And that's why the realtors and so far they're not in opposition and everyone's in favor?"

Currie: "Correct."

Sullivan: "I just wanted to get that on the record. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Bill will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Riley, Stewart. Please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Moffitt."

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

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Moffitt: "...if we're kind of in-between things right now? A time or two during the Session I mentioned Retrofit Caucus and a little contest and really appreciate working Representative Chapa LaVia on this and then we had two caucus leaders in the Senate. And we had a weight loss contest. We had 68 people enter that. And apparently, all 68 did not make the progress they had hoped to because just 13 weighed back in, in our effort for smaller government. And of those that weighed back in, the biggest weight loss goes to Joan Daley who's on staff here with the House staff. Her son's on the House Republican staff. The second biggest weight loss loser was Senator Oberweis, which I don't know if he has diet ice cream or what the deal is, but he was the second biggest loser. And then we kept track of steps during the month of

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

April and for the month of April the winner of that was Representative Willis who walked 256,042 steps for the most steps. Each of those three will be getting a gift certificate from a sporting goods store and want to thank everyone that participated and some comments from Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Yes. Since, Representative Willis won that distinguished award, I have a trophy for her too. It's a bonus. No, seriously, I want to thank everybody for... who participated in that. I think a lot of people are now conscious of how much they put in their bodies and to understand that you're all, each and every one of you, very important to a lot of people in the State of Illinois. And you got to try to keep yourself healthy, Representative W2 over there with the snacks. So, thank you and thank you to our illustrious chairman Representative Muffin because he kept us going when we didn't want to do that. So, thank you and thank you, everyone and look forward to doing this next year again. Thank you, everybody."

Moffitt: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Good work. The Chair recognizes Mr. Evans."

Evans: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Evans: "Ladies and Gentlemen, you look at the rear of the gallery, my mother, Sharon Davis came down to Springfield to visit me.

Can we get a round of applause for my mom, Sharon Davis? Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you for being here with us. Page 12 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 3044. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rita, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 for Senate Bill 3044 is agreed legislation between the realtors and the appraisers and coming to agreement on who can appraise and who can't and setting the guidelines. It's something they've been working for many, many years and we've finally come to an agreement. So, ask to adopt the..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, do you wish to speak on the Amendment, Sir?"

Reboletti: "Go ahead."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves to adopt the Amendment. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. 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 3044, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Rita."

Rita: "Again, Senate Bill 3044, as amended, puts an agreement between the realtors and the appraisers on how appraisals would be done. And also, does some cleanup language that the Department of Professional Regulation needed for this Act."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti. Gentleman does not wish to speak.

Those in favor of the Bill vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

wish? Have some sense of urgency, Members. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Mitchell. Please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members, on Supplemental Calendar #3, under the Order of Resolutions, there appears House Resolution 1188, Christian Mitchell. Mr. Mitchell, please proceed."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As many of you know, we are beginning the summer season which in the City of Chicago and other urban centers is a very difficult time. We are seeing our entire generations of young men and women being wiped out by gun violence. Now, to be clear, the Resolution and the task force that we are considering here today is to focus specifically on the menace of illegal gun trafficking, specifically illegal gun owners not law-abiding citizens. The goal is not to go after folks who may have formerly had guns that would have been illegal before concealed carry but to focus specifically on illegal gun trafficking. Now, the effort of this task force, as I understand, there have been task force in the past on gun running that is really to deal with coordination and aggregation of both information and resources. The Illinois State Police, the City of Chicago, the United States District Attorney for the Northern District, Department of Justice, the effort here is to bring everyone together to figure out along the possible paths where guns are coming in before they get to gangs on our streets, how we can stop those weapons from ultimately hitting our streets, to determine kind of the holes in our legal framework in so far as there are any,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

though I think I and others suspect it's mostly an issue of enforcement as it relates to gun running, straw purchasing and other related offenses. And finally, to determine, as we think about efforts other than policing and security, what are kind of best practices from around the country in similar situated cities and states to make sure that we can deal with violence in the most comprehensive manner. I look forward to questions. I do want to start off by thanking both Representative Thapedi who I know did something similar previously as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have agreed to be helpful. I welcome your questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Evans."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this Evans: Resolution. Ladies and Gentlemen, this summer, like every summer of my life, I will attend a funeral for a young African American on the south side of Chicago. And this process started when I was in the fifth grade, 10 years old, when I watched the first individual shot outside of my elementary school and it's been an ongoing process. The violence in Chicago is not a new issue and it's not one that's not going to be solved by this Resolution or any particular law, but it is my belief that this is a part of that larger process. We need issues with parenting, with education and I think we're doing our part here to address that. I ask you to support legislation because those who are illegally matriculating guns into the City of Chicago need to be addressed by all of us. This is not a problem of the City of Chicago, but this is all our problem when folks choose to

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

take guns from other states and from other parts of the state and they end up on the south side and west side of Chicago to cause the issues that we have. So, I ask you to support this legislation and let's stop this matter. Let's stop the violence in the City of Chicago. Let's stop the matriculation of illegal guns. This Resolution, from my understanding, it was mentioned by Representative Mitchell is not an attack on legal gun owners. We love and respect the Second Amendment right. There's legal gun owners in my community and your community, we want those legal gun owners to have their right to have a gun. That's why I voted for conceal and carry. But we want to attack those individuals who are bad for our state and bad for this nation. I ask you to support this legislation. Thank you, Representative Mitchell."

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? Brady, Cabello, Harris, Tryon. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no'. And the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Concurrence, page 15 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 2494, Leader Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a proposal that was initiated by Senator Cullerton. It would provide for the licensure of retail establishments that sell tobacco. They'd pay a \$75 annual fee. The point would be to give money to the Department of Revenue to beef up enforcement of the tobacco laws. Many people are illegally selling to minors, many are illegally selling to people who are not minors and in fact, embezzling is a major issue and the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

legitimate retails are being undercut by those who would game the system. The Illinois Retail Merchants Association which as you know represents the very retailers that are the good ones and are the heart of this Bill, do not object to the Bill. They think this is a good idea. And I would very much welcome your questions and I certainly would appreciate your support for the Senate President's highest priority of this spring Session."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Leader yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Sandack: "Leader, adding this fee, this license fee, what will that do to deter illegal cigarette sales, black market sales, et cetera?"

Currie: "It will provide money to the Department of Revenue for enforcement. Illinois is one of a handful of states that do not license legitimate retail tobacco merchants. I think only 10 or 11. And in the other states, the evidence is clear that having enforcement tools makes the big difference in the level of the smuggling. That... that, Representative, is why the Retail Merchants are not opposed to this Bill because they recognize that their legitimate sellers are undercut by embezzlement."

Sandack: "Well, we have some of the highest cigarette taxes in the country right now. Isn't there potentially a revenue source for enforcement?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Currie: "I bet most of those taxes are imposed at the local level or even at the state level. They do not go to enforcement. They beef up the city's general revenue budget and so forth."
- Sandack: "All right. To the Bill. The irony is palpable here.

 We've raised cigarette taxes so high that we've created a

 black market. Now, we need to raise the fee to attack the

 black market. This is an interesting dynamic to be sure. Be

 careful what you ask for, it just may come true."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a question of the Sponsor, please?"
- Speaker Lang: "Please proceed."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, I realize that the Illinois Retail Merchants represents a lot of dealers that sell tobacco. What about the gas stations? They're not members of IRMA normally, are they?"
- Currie: "I have not heard from any of them, Representative, so at... to me, I have heard from no opp... no opponents of the Bill."
- Harris, D.: "So, there could be..."
- Currie: "And again, I think the gas station people are just as much at risk if they're buying the tax stamps and they're operating legitimately, they, too, are at risk from smuggling operations. If they were opposed, let me tell you, I would certainly have heard from them."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you very much."
- 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? Rita.

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Please take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no'. And the House concurs with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2494. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Turner in the Chair. On page 10 of the Calendar, we have Senate Bill 727, Representative Dan Burke. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. This Bill was read a second time on a previous day.

No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 which is a correction to a drafting error. This, again, has to do with a liquor exemption, a distance shorter than the hundred feet. Be happy to answer any questions. Ask for the Body's favorable consideration."

Speaker Turner: "On the Amendment, we have Representative Sullivan. Would you wait 'til the Third Reading?"

Sullivan: "Now."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, when we were in committee the other day we had a num... numerous Bills that we moved from the committee with the anticipation of them being shelled with an Amendment and those Amendments were coming back to committee."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Burke, D.: "Representative, this is not one of those matters that were shelled. This is something that we did discuss. I had announced to the committee the locations and the names of the businesses that were affected by this. So, this is not one that you referenced."
- Sullivan: "Well, the point being that it was one of them. You might have discussed it before, but we talked about this. And that's fine. I'm not opposed to your Bill. But the process is one where we talked about this. And so, how about this, of the rest of the ones that we talked about, if they're going to be used, at least come talk to me in the backroom so we can just work it out ahead of time. That's all I ask."

Burke, D.: "I... I was just as..."

Sullivan: "It's the last day. I get how it works, but..."

Burke, D.: "I was just as surprised as you were, Representative."

Sullivan: "I get it. I get it. But I got to, you know, as the chairman of the... or the spokesman of the group, I got to voice my displeasure of the process here a little bit. I get we're going to, you know, I'm going to vote for this. But we have about six more of these and if they pop up on something, my office is right out back. We can have a little discussion.

Burke, D.: "Got it."

Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 727. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

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

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Clerk Hollman: "Senate Bill 727, a Bill for an Act concerning liquor. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you just heard, this is a matter having to do with a liquor exemption in the City of Chicago, Pete's Fresh Market, a location that is commonly described as a food dessert in the west side of Chicago. And this is crucial for the… the business's survival. And I would ask for the Body's favorable consideration."

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Ives: "Just looking at the list here, other than the grocery store you just desci... you just... did you just say that it's in the food dessert and that's why you're appro... asking for an exception?"

Burke, D.: "This one in particular."

Ives: "And how about the rest of them? Were they located there already and schools moved in nearby or would... So, were they there first?"

Burke, D.: "There... there are varying circumstances. And what you just articulated is in case... in fact the case with another one that had been a Dominic's store and now converted to another owner. Previously they did have a liquor license and were grandfathered. The church, I believe, came after the Dominic's store and now with the new owner, they are subjected to the zoning restrictions. So, they would be included in the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

list that our Executive Committee had considered the other day."

Ives: "Okay. What about the Roosevelt Collection?"

Burke, D.: "Representative, these matters were passed out of the Executive Committee with no discussion and..."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Burke, D.: "Sure, sure."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And ask for a favorable consideration."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 727 pass?'
All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Members, please record yourselves. Representative Will Davis. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On a count of 60 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', Senate Bill 727, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Will Davis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davis, W.: "A point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Davis, W.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, everyone in the Body received a letter from me a little earlier in the year inviting you to be a judge for the Cook County 4-H Fair which will be held on Saturday, June 28, 20... of this year at Toyota Park in Bridgeview, Illinois. Please, if you have not signed up to be a judge, please, they will welcome your participation in the event. I think it'll be a fantastic opportunity for you to connect with a myriad of young people from all over the State

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of Illinois who will be bringing a variety of projects to the state... to this event. And they would welcome your participation as judges. So, if you'd like to have the information again, please let me know. I'll make sure that you get it. Otherwise, if you are able to do so, please sign up to be a judge. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. On page 15 of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 3961, Leader Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, we recently passed the Smoke-Free Campus Act and we passed an exemption to it that allows people who are driving through a campus to smoke. This simply says if they park their car... their own car that isn't owned by the university, they can smoke in their car. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is... With a late light, we have Representative DeLuca."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

DeLuca: "Leader Lang, was there... or Leader Yang. I want to make sure I pronounce it correctly. Was there any..."

Lang: "Thank... thank you, Mr. DeLuca."

DeLuca: "...conversation about addressing the golf courses in regards to allowing smoking at golf courses on campus property?"

Lang: "Sir, this is what came out of the Senate. I don't know what conversations they had."

DeLuca: "So, there was no conversation even though it was brought up in debate when it was in the House. As far as you know,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

there was no conversation regarding that. You made no effort to include that exemption?"

Lang: "Sir, this came out of the Senate, landed on my desk. They stripped one of my Bills, put this Amendment on it. Seems like a very innocuous issue."

DeLuca: "Okay."

Lang: "Let people smoke in their own car."

DeLuca: "Okay. Thank you."

Lang: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3961?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 103 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3961. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Brown, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Brown: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 of House Bill 2930, on page 15 of your Calendar. Let's roll it."

Speaker Turner: "The Motion is denied. We're not on that Order right now, Representative. Would you like to file a Motion to Nonconcur?"

Brown: "No, but I believe that Motion requires a voice vote."

Speaker Turner: "No, it doesn't, Representative. Representative Zalewski, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Zalewski: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "Please state your inquiry."

Zalewski: "Has... has the Chair been able to check on my request to show the Hawks game on the screens beginning at 8:00? It looks like it's going to be a long night."

Speaker Turner: "You've got the ap on your phone, right,
Representative?"

Zalewski: "Yes, Sir. Can I stream it right to the screen? I could do that."

Speaker Turner: "If you know how..."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Speaker Turner: "...go right ahead. Representative Sullivan, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Sullivan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, to answer Mr. Zalewski, I would just inform him that I do have a TV in the backroom. We're just asking for a simple donation to cover the cable cost. So, if you'd like to come watch the game, you must... you certainly could."

Speaker Turner: "Problem solved. Mr. Clerk, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 2453. On the Supplemental Calendar #2, we have House Bill 2453. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "This is the Bill that would... First of all, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2453. This is the Bill that would save the 9-1-1 system. There's a few major points that I'd like to point out quickly. Number 1) it would require the 9-1-1 districts to submit audited financial reports by October 1, 2014 and annual financial reports beginning in 2016. This has been a major cause of concern for people throughout the state in terms of proper

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

reporting and audit oversight. Secondly, it would begin a Statewide 9-1-1 Administrator within the State Police to develop and implement a uniform statewide network. Thirdly, it would keep the 9-1-1 surcharge downstate as is, but it would shift needed funds from the carriers to the districts that are struggling to survive. There would be a portion that would go to every district under the current formula and then additional money that would be given to the struggling districts. This is vital to keep 9-1-1 service throughout the State of Illinois to all its citizens. Number... and that would be for one year. Number 4) it would also create a sunset for one year of a 390 fee for the City of Chicago and up to nine percent on prepaid TracFones. It removes the cap on monthly reimbursements for the carriers. It extends the Services Advisory Board at 7 additional members, 1 from each caucus, the director of the State Police, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police and the Illinois Sheriff's Association would be given spots and the Wireless Emergency Telephone Safety Act would sunset from July 1, 2014 to July 1, 2015. This is necessary to keep 9-1-1 service in the State of Illinois. It's designed to begin a process to come up with a long-term solution to the 9-1-1 system. Passed... an identical Bill passed out of committee this morning, unanimously, 52 votes for this in the Senate about an hour, hour and a half ago. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Motion to Concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 961."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Moffitt: "Representative, thank you for the work that you've done in continuing to make this happen. I just want to emphasize some points. And I rise in strong, strong support of this. First of all, we do a lot of important things down here. Some of them have urgency, some of them are long-range planning. Keep in mind, if we do nothing, the current Act sunsets July 1, this year, 2014. July 1, right after we leave here. For counties, 9-1-1 call centers that have lots of reserves and there's fewer of them all the time that have any reserves, that means their doors would close. They couldn't continue to operate unless some emergency funds came from some other local source and that's very difficult. So, if you want to keep your 9-1-1 systems in operation, we need to pass this or the very Act, the revenue goes away. This will extend it until July 1, 2015, very critical. Representative, you mentioned this Advisory Board, the 9-1-1 Services Board, it's currently, I believe, 11 members and that would add... was it 7 more members to get some diversity there."

Bradley: "Correct."

Moffitt: "One of the seats will go to the Illinois Sheriff's Association."

Bradley: "Correct."

Moffitt: "So that elected officials will be represented on there."

Bradley: "Correct."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Moffitt: "I think that's important. The Police Chiefs will be represented."

Bradley: "Correct."

Moffitt: "Looking to the future, and we want to pass this, I think I want to make sure that the fire service is represented and perhaps they've... they've... and we want to make sure that happens. The main thing now is to extend it, but you agree, don't you, that we want to make sure the fire service..."

Bradley: "Yes."

Moffitt: "...has direct representation on this?"

Bradley: "Yes. And I want to compliment you for your lifelong work on this issue. And I would hope that you would be part of this process and that would ensure that the fire departments would be included."

Moffitt: "Well, thank you. And we are not raising any fee with this for downstate. We're not... we're not raising it anywhere. Now, there's an empowerment given to the City of Chicago... the City Council..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Moffitt: "...but we are not raising it downstate. In counties under a hundred thousand, there's even additional funds to keep them solvent that the Commerce Commission would decide how that was funded, but immediately the reimbursement will go from 57 and a quarter cents to 65 cents. So, 7 and three quarter cent increase per... per subscriber for downstate. So, it's critical that we... we pass this because we're up against a deadline. It's very important because it increases funding. It's important to keep in mind it does not raise a fee and even the empowerment given to the City of Chicago, they still

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

can only go no higher than what any other county or municipality in the state has raised it, is my understanding. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "That is correct."

Moffitt: "I think if there are more questions I know you'll be ready to answer them, but I would just say to the ... to the Bill. I hope that none of you ever need 9-1-1 services. But the reality is that you, your family or friends acquaintance at some time will need help and the faster the response with the best trained staff and best possible equipment, is the best opportunity, the best chance for a satisfactory or positive outcome. And that response gets there with a good 9-1-1 system. And as all of you or your family or your friends or acquaintance travel the State of Illinois, the response that they're going to get is going to depend on that local 9-1-1 service and the emergency responders in that area. You might have plenty of funds back home, but as you travel the state, you're depending on what's there. I'll just close my comments, again, asking your support for this to keep 9-1-1 funding going. But there's a quote over here on the... the Fallen Firefighters Memorial that kind of sums up the importance of emergency response. It says, since the beginning of time, men and women have never engaged in a more noble purpose than that of protecting, prolonging and rescuing the lives of their fellow human beings. Attributed to Peter Hoffman. That's what we're doing, trying to protect, save and rescue lives right here. This is your opportunity, but this is critical that it be done today. Again, Representative Bradley, thank you for your efforts and

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

everyone involved to get us to this point. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. My communities, my... my cities and county and METCAD director have been asking me a long time, you know, what about the 9-1-1 Bill. And I would keep asking the Representative and he would assure me something would happen. When I first saw this and saw the additional amounts that Chicago would get and then the distribution that's going across the counties in populations of a hundred thousand or less, well, that kind of leaves us out. But I talked to my mayor, I talked to the METCAD director and they're saying yes. This is good because even though it looks as though it might not benefit us right now, the long-term effects of this are very good. So, I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Hammond: "Representative Bradley, first and foremost, I want to thank you for your work on this legislation and all of the other folks that worked so hard on this. It... it has been a long time coming, but what a great thing that we're doing, we're finally doing it. I do have just a couple of points for clarification, if I may, Representative. There have been questions on how some of the 9-1-1 funds have been used and whether they had been used for approved purposes or not. As I understand it, that is clarified in your legislation. Is that correct?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Bradley: "Correct. One of the main goals here is to get the information from the districts that we've been lacking. And so, the continued support from the state through the fees is conditioned upon cooperation with the reporting."

Hammond: "And in addition to that, if I understand correctly, Representative, is it also going to be a requirement that there will be an audit..."

Bradley: "Correct."

Hammond: "...annual audits of the funding?"

Bradley: "Correct. When I say reporting, I'm including audits..."

Hammond: "Okay."

Bradley: "...in that terminology."

Hammond: "Okay. Thank you, Representative, really appreciate it."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Pritchard."

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

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know one of these provisions in here is that the Advisory Board is continued for another year.

Do you have any sense whether they're going to be able to reach some agreement on the many issues about 9-1-1 and the reduction of funding due to the conversion to cell phones over landlines?"

Bradley: "Yes. I think they've done a great job up to this point and we're going to be involved in it, our caucuses and I am confident we'll get the right people to go in with the folks that have already been working on this and get the answers with the tools we need in order to get the answers we need to solve this problem, long-term. We're solving it. We're

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

solving it short-term here, but the goal is to solve it long-term."

Pritchard: "Well, I certainly compliment you on the provisions of this Bill that deal with a little bit more oversight and focus on trying to improve the services in a lot of areas of our state where they don't have the kind of 9-1-1 service that we do in the northern part of the state where I'm from. So, I would hope that as we move forward we could expand the... the performance of 9-1-1 in all areas of our state to reap the benefits that come when emergencies strike and we need to call our emergency responders. Like the Representative from Champaign, my 9-1-1s have been very anxious over this issue. And it's an important piece of legislation that we perhaps end this part of our 98th General Session and I compliment you for your leadership."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Halbrook."

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

Speaker Turner: "The Sponsor will yield."

Halbrook: "A couple questions, on the Amendment #3 where it talks about the... the administrator to the State Police. Can you kind of describe what that person's job would be?"

Bradley: "Well, I think that's going to be a work in progress.

And so, if we're looking to do a more statewide uniform system, we'll need some designee within the State Police to help bring that to fruition with the Advisory Board, working together with the Advisory Board and their appointment on the board."

Halbrook: "You don't see that wrestling power away from the local boards to the state in anyway?"

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Bradley: "No, we're going..."

Halbrook: "That's not the intent?"

Bradley: "We're going to give this advisory council the resources they need and do it in the context of a statewide discussion and a statewide approach to try to solve a statewide problem.

And so, we'll be working with all the various groups in order to do that."

Halbrook: "Okay. A question as we expand and Representative Moffitt touched on this about adding fire to those members and I had that question to you but also EMTs or ambulance people. I mean, is that somebody that needs to be at the table or is it too late to include them in this discussion?"

Bradley: "I think that we have an ample group along with the concerns that Representative Moffitt expressed to get started on this. And we want to give this group some level of flexibility in order to arrive at the right decisions and right conclusions, give them the tools they need... give them the tools they need, let them do their job and get it figured out in the next year."

Halbrook: "Okay. The retail transaction fee that's mentioned in
 the Amendment #2 going from one and a half to 9 percent for
 communities over half a million."

Bradley: "That... that would be in the City of Chicago only."

Halbrook: "Right."

Bradley: "And it would have to do with TracFones."

Halbrook: "Okay. So, that's TracFones, onetime point of purchase..."

Bradley: "And landlines."

Halbrook: "...and landlines."

Bradley: "I'm sorry. Just TracFones."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Halbrook: "Okay. No concern that that may be reduced population numbers to cause... to pay for things down the road?"

Bradley: "I don't have that concern."

Halbrook: "Okay."

Bradley: "I'm trying to save our 9-1-1 systems downstate."

Halbrook: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bradley to close."

"I'm honored to be a part of this. I want to thank everyone for their good insight and nice comments during debate. I appreciate the bipartisan nature of this and this is the beginning of the process of ensuring 9-1-1 for the entire State of Illinois, for all the citizens of the State of Illinois, those who come to Illinois. It's the beginning of the process of a solution. I would ask for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2453?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hernandez. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 83 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2453. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mitchell, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the Journal reflect that on House Resolution 782 I intended to vote 'present'."

Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request.

Representative Martwick."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can... on the last Bill, 2453, can you please record that I intended to be a 'no' on that?"
- Speaker Turner: "The Journal will reflect your request. On Supplemental Calendar #4, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 961. Representative DeLuca."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to waive the one-hour requirement of the Supplemental Calendar #4 being on the desk."
- Speaker Turner: "On the Gentleman's Motion, are there any objections? Seeing no objections, the Motion prevails. And now, Mr. DeLuca on House Bill 961."
- DeLuca: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Floor Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 961. This changes the language from 'immediate distribution' to 'within 60 days distribution'. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "On that, we have Representative Pritchard."
 Pritchard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
 Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."
- Pritchard: "Representative, I know you've been working on this since the beginning of the year and I compliment you for at least bringing us something that's close to what we started with, but do you know what the distribution is right now in the Local Government Distributive Fund?"
- DeLuca: "I know that... I don't know exactly, but I do know that it's far less than what it was in the past."

Pritchard: "But it's far more than 60 days in some cases?"

DeLuca: "No, no. No, it's around that time now."

Pritchard: "So, then what is our Motion to..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- DeLuca: "It's between two and three months right now where it was five and six months."
- Pritchard: "Okay. So, this is an improvement over where we were and you're just trying to codify the fact that it should be staying in this two-month time period?"
- DeLuca: "That's correct. Right now, the time frame is pretty good, but we don't know what's going to happen in the future and this will protect the fund in the future."
- Pritchard: "Well, I compliment you again for working on this. It certainly helps our local governments. They depend on the state funding and wonder sometimes how funds that are supposed to be automatically transferred can go, as you said, up to five to six months. So, I urge the Body's support."

Speaker Turner: "Representative DeLuca to close."

DeLuca: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please vote 'yes'."

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves that the House concur with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 961. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 961. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention, Members. The Fall Veto Session schedule is being distributed."
- Speaker Turner: "On page 14 of the Calendar... Excuse me.

 Representative Bost."

142nd Legislative Day

- Bost: "Yes. If we could, we'd like to have Representative...

 Representative Reis to be excused for the rest of the day."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the other... under the Order of Consideration Postponed, we have House Bill 4097. Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4097 is a... with Amendment #1, it's a Bill that states if a non-violent... if a... if a person who has not co... who has committed a non-violent crime and doesn't have a criminal background that the judge can release that person on their own recognizance. We amended the Bill so that non-violent was described as a misdemeanor and we used that particular section of the law that defines a non-violent crime. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4097 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 46 voting 'yes', 59 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', House Bill 4097 fails. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolution 1192, offered by Representative Lilly."
- Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Members, we have one more Bill to consider that we're waiting to receive from the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Senate. So just please be patient, and we'll try to get you out of here as soon as possible. Representative Hays."

Hays: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Hays: "Has anybody gone over there and confirmed they're up from their nap? Just asking."

Speaker Turner: "Bill's on the way, Representative.

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

Hoffman: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Hoffman: "I see the... the publisher and editor and writer of Capitol Fax is on the floor. Mr... Mr. Rich Miller. Rich Miller is on the floor. Rich. As you recall, we had... we had an unfortunate outcome in this year's softball game. And Mr. Miller saw fit to say that I was an aging former star, Representative Hoffman. Well, I would just like to point of that he is an aging former media star."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Point of personal privilege. Going along with my friend, Jay Hoffman, I was also identified in Mr. Miller's Capitol Fax. And I take full responsibility... but I'm going to echo my friend's characterization, but I don't think he's aging. I mean, 60, 61 isn't that old, right? He looks... he looks good for his age. No, not Jay, Rich. You're not that old, are you, Jay?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Chapa LaVia."

Chapa LaVia: "Point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Chapa LaVia: "I'd like to yield my 5 minutes to Mr. Miller."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Point of personal privilege, please."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Brady: "I'd like to say Rich looks great. Course, that's coming from an undertaker."

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

Costello: "Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Sir."

Costello: "I just had a very troubling situation that occurred to me that we may be in Veto Session during the first day of deer season. Just wanted to bring that to the Body's attention."

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

Verschoore: "Point of personal privilege. I just want to say something about Rich Miller. He has exquisite taste in dogs. Because he has a dog just like mine, and they're the most beautiful thing in the world. Right, Rich?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "A little further inquiry about Rich Miller. When we formed the Retrofit Caucus he indicated he was joining. That side profile there... I didn't inquire... it's confidential who got in the weight loss contest. I'm not sure whether or not he did, but I'm pretty sure he's one of those that did not weigh back in... maybe, just a guess. But next time. We're going to do that again. And so if you didn't participate, sure would invite you to consider it next year. Thanks."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "Representative Arroyo."

Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I won't be talking about Rich Miller 'cause I don't want him to write anything about me. Thank you. Thank you, Rich. But I want to thank the Appropriations Committee. This year wasn't an easy year. When I came to the General Assembly, I used to be 5'9". Now I'm 5'5" 'cause every time I call something they keep beating me up and hitting me over the head over there. Dennis, Ron Sandack, I hope when I come back next year I'm back to 5'9". But I want to thank you guys for what you do on that side. I want to thank everybody in the General Assembly. It's a pleasure to serve under this House under Speaker Michael Madigan. It's an honor. It's a pleasure. His staff, Jessica, Heather, everybody does a wonderful job here. I wouldn't have been able to do it without you guys. Thank you very much. I'm going to miss you. And I'm going to call everybody when I come back next year. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Lilly."

Lilly: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed, Representative."

Lilly: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise just to take a moment of silence on behalf of the Booth family. They'll be laying to rest on tomorrow afternoon their son, Derrick Booth, Jr. We give and send our love, thoughts, and concern to Jehan, our very own. I would like to add all of our Members to the Resolution 1192."

Speaker Turner: "The Body will take a moment of silence. Thank you. Seeing no... Excuse me. The Sponsor... Representative Lilly moves that all Members be added to House Resolution 1192.

142nd Legislative Day

- Seeing no objection, all Members will be added as cosponsors to the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "All Members are advised to remove anything from their chamber desk that they wish to keep upon adjournment.

 Please remove any items from your desk that you wish to keep."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record could reflect that Representative Cross and Senger excused for the rest of the evening."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. The record will reflect your request. Representative Verschoore, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Verschoore: "Personal privilege. I'd just like expound a little bit on Representative Arroyo's thanking of Jessica and Heather. I'd like to also thank all the staff people for all they do. The secretaries for all they do. When we're out having dinner and stuff, they're still working. I mean I... I can't thank them enough for their dedication. Thank you."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And thank you to all the staff. Representative Arroyo, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was mentioned today. I believe I left somebody... I believe I left somebody very important here in this chamber, that a lot of people don't remember and don't give credit to. There's a person here that works a lot, and is a workaholic. And we have to pay for that, for a workaholic. I know that all you guys know who he is. His name is Tim Mapes. Tim, thank you for what you do. That's

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- been my mentor... that's been my mentor for a long time. So, I take the beating for that guy right there. Tim, thank you very much for what you do."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And thank you, Mr. Mapes. Representative Nekritz, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Nekritz: "Well, I think there was a... an omission from some of the previous Speakers on this... on congratulating and thanking staff. And so, one of our favorites who not that long ago took on a brand new family and still managed to keep the place running. So, I'd like to give a big thank you to Will Cousineau for all he does."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. And thank you, Will.

 Representative Soto, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Soto: "Thank you, Speaker. I want to do the same. I just want to acknowledge all the floor staff that are here, everybody in the whole building. Because let me tell you, you guys are the bomb. Thank you. Shout out to you guys. Thank you for everything you do."
- Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Representative Bost, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Bost: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

- Bost: "Yeah. Early this morning, when I came in I received an e-mail. And I just need to know if you could ask Mr. Mapes what time he eats dinner?"
- Clerk Bolin: "Attention Members, the Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on May 30, 2014: recommends be adopted is a Motion to Concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 105."

Speaker Turner: "On Supplemental Calendar #5, under the Order of Concurrence, we have House Bill 105. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I move we concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to this Bill. This is an election Bill. It includes many components. I will briefly describe a few of them. It has a lot to do with making sure those precinct boundaries are available earlier than they are today and the same with vote by mail applications. There are some technical changes about the paid for by campaign language. Requires a majority vote of an election authority before a subpoena is issued. Makes some changes to expand grace period voting. And even in... in precinct voting on Election Day for purposes of the... Okay. May I first move to waive the posting requirements so we can hear this right now?"

Speaker Turner: "Leader Currie moves that we waive the posting requirements... Leader Currie moves that we suspend the 1-hour waiting period for the Supplemental Calendar. Seeing no objection, it's waived. Leader Currie."

Currie: "Yeah. Yeah. And expands grace period same-day voting in certain circumstances. Happy to answer your questions. Welcome your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Turner: "Mr. Fortner."

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

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Fortner: "Technical question. First, you mentioned in your list of things that there was change to the subpoena requirements related to the Electoral Board. Is there a particular problem that motivates that? What is causing the need for the change to how we've done that?"

Currie: "We... we just want to make sure that they know what they're doing, if there's a vote of the Electoral Board, that the decision is not made by an individual hearing officer, who may well embark upon a fishing expedition."

Fortner: "The other question I have. It appears that the language for the... that appeared in House Bill 3814 related to the minimum wage referendum also appears in this. Is that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct."

Fortner: "As I understand, that Bill has passed both chambers now. Is there a reason why it reappears in this particular piece of legislation?"

Currie: "This came to me from the Senate. They didn't explain."

Fortner: "I see. Though, I noticed that there was a similar Amendment that was filed here on a Senate Bill here in the House that also had that provision. So, I don't know if you have any knowledge about why the same language also appeared here..."

Currie: "A security blanket."

Fortner: "...and also had that same provision... I'm sorry could you..."

Currie: "A security blanket."

Fortner: "A security blanket against..."

Currie: "Can't be too careful."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Fortner: "Okay."

Currie: "Insurance policy."

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Sandack."

Sandack: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Leader yield for a few questions, please?"

Speaker Turner: "Indicates that she will."

Sandack: "Thank you. Leader, you were just asked some questions from my colleague about the fact that there was an inclusion of minimum wage referendum language in this Bill. There are no other questions... initiative... ballot initiative questions in this Bill, are there?"

Currie: "Correct."

Sandack: "So the security blanket or insurance policy only works for one of the questions and is nowhere else to be found in this Bill."

Currie: "Accurate."

Sandack: "This Bill makes some, what I would call election tactics, because there's, throughout the Bill, references only to the 2014 ballot. For instance, there is a change for same-day registration. That's a new component of this Bill for the 2014 ballot only. Isn't that correct?"

Currie: "That is correct. And the rationale is that this is... this is an expansion of opportunities for people to cast the ballot in Illinois. And some of the election authorities are worried how same-day registration and voting will actually work. So what we're really doing here is kind of giving it a pilot's opportunity."

Sandack: "Yeah. It's..."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

- Currie: "Let's do this for the 2014 election. See how it works. In my view, it will work very well. It does in 11 other states. But there was some nervousness on the part of election authorities, whether they're able to meet these new requirements and the 2014 election will give us good solid information going forward."
- Sandack: "Well, I mean, it seems perfectly rational that we would use this coming election for an experiment, given all the ballot questions we have on, all of the politicking we've done. Let's figure that 2014 is a great social experiment in expanding voting rights. Right?"

Currie: "I'm for it."

- Sandack: "Me too. Forget what the... the folks that are doing... talking about the election process. Forget that they have concerns. Forget that this does a whole bunch of new things with no experience to draw upon. We're going to try it out in 2014."
- Currie: "There's a lot of experience in other places. As I say, we're trying to allay the fears of some election authorities that expanded grace period voting and so forth, might be difficult for them to manage."

Sandack: "How..."

Currie: "I think it won't be."

- Sandack: "How are you allaying fears? This thing is expanding voting in numerous ways. What are we doing... what protections are in this Bill to allay their fears?"
- Currie: "That it is for a onetime... some of the provisions: the grace period voting expansion, early voting expansion, same-

142nd Legislative Day

- day registration on Election Day. Those apply only to the 2014 election."
- Sandack: "But Leader, that's not going to allay any fears. That's laying new burdens and mandates upon the election officials. So that's not helping their fears, it's just expanding their duties in an era that just happens to be a very contested Gubernatorial Election."
- Currie: "The election authorities are comfortable with our approach."
- Sandack: "How do you know that?"
- Currie: "Because we've been working with them on this for months and months."
- Sandack: "What officials... what election officials have you been working with for months and months?"
- Currie: "The usual... the usual suspects."
- Sandack: "Like who?"
- Currie: "Well, for example, the State Board of Elections. I'm sure we've heard from David Orr. I'm sure we've heard from the Champaign County election authority."
- Sandack: "Leader, have you asked anyone from Lake County, Kendall County, DuPage County, Will County?"
- Currie: "We... we've worked with them and with their association.

 And you're call..."
- Sandack: "In the crafting of this Bill, you've worked with those county officials about..."
- Currie: "Their... their association and some individual electoral authorities as well."
- Sandack: "Right. We are, for the first time after... the social experiment of early voting's worked very well. But now we're

142nd Legislative Day

- going to do something very different. We're going to expand it, and take away the requirement of a... of an identification. Isn't that correct?"
- Currie: "If the jurisdictions have electronic poll books, but...
 there's no reason to have the photo identification. That
 provision, too, applies to the 2014 election."
- Sandack: "Yes. It's worked in the past so well, that we should now, as a matter of experimentation, for this purpose, for this coming election, strip that requirement because it's worked so well and we've heard so many complaints about abuse. Let's make it more expansive for the 2014 election. That wasn't a question. I'm sorry."
- Currie: "No. It wasn't."
- Sandack: "What was... what was the goal beyond extending, pretty rapidly and pretty aggressively, early voting?"
- Currie: "It's only a few days, Representative. I wouldn't say it was such an expansive expansion."
- Sandack: "Well, it's to... it's to three months now, right? Oh, that's absentee, pardon me..."
- Currie: "No, no, no. three months... three months..."
- Sandack: "...pardon me. I stand corrected. Absentee went from 40 days to 3 months."
- Currie: "No, no, no. The applications have to be available 90 days ahead of time. It doesn't mean you can vote 90 days ahead of time."
- Sandack: "No, but you can walk in the day of the election, be unregistered, and get registered to vote the day of."
- Currie: "In certain... in every election jurisdiction, there'll be one place where you could do it. Do you think it's a bad idea

142nd Legislative Day

- for Illinois to join the 11 other states that permit people to register and vote on Election Day?"
- Sandack: "I think it's an unmanageable idea. And I think it's fraught with problems because people move frequently. They... and by the way Leader, is an identification needed to register to vote on the day of an election."
- Currie: "They will have to have 2 forms of identification, if they choose to register and vote on Election Day."
- Sandack: "So that's the one time a requirement of an identification's required?"
- Currie: "This is if you're registering on Election Day to vote."
- Sandack: "Right."
- Currie: "You don't have to do this if you are voting early in some other jurisdiction for the 2014 fall election."
- Sandack: "Leader, we are... we're... this is a mandate obviously on all the local election officials and clerks for extended hours and for extended polling locations. Invariably, this leads to additional costs, does it not?"
- Currie: "We don't think it's going to be costly. We think that the... to the extent that it does mean a few extra dollars, we think the election authorities will be able to handle it. The expansions are very small."
- Sandack: "Who's we? And what cost do you think will be minimal that the local officials are easily... could be easily handle?"
- Currie: "Yeah. Basically, early voting. And we've been asking them to do that for many years. We're expanding by a couple of days the time period for early voting. And we, as I say, have worked with the clerks, with the election authorities and they have not said this is not manageable."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Sandack: "Okay. Thank you, Leader. I appreciate your answers. To the Bill. Mr. Speaker, it is fortuitous, I quess, an act of serendipity that after we've passed a bunch of questions, initiatives, many nonbinding, one completely duplicative, actually triplicative of existing laws. Today earlier, we passed a nonbinding question that already exists. So now, after loading up the ballot, after ginning up the base, we're going to finish off this whole process by making, for just 2014, this one little pilot plan, this social experiment that just happens to come in November. This busy election, this contentious election, which is anticipated to be close, let's now expand voting rights because we think it's the right thing to do this time. Let's make the clerks and the local government officials who have to manage this ... it won't cost too much, don't worry. We don't think it will cost you too much. We want to expand absentee. We want to expand early voting. We want to expand same-day voting so that someone who just moved in, maybe, maybe not, can vote ... register and vote the same day. Why are we doing this now? It is no coincidence this comes on the heels of a Session that is loaded up with questions, ballot questions and initiatives focused on ginning up the base. This is part and parcel of a political scheme... overt political scheme to make the 2014 election super political. And this Body has no business doing that, has no business loading up that ballot and now changing the rules only for 2014. If you look at the text of this Bill, it says for 2014 only. So I guess, we're going to amend this after whatever happens in November. Look, this disingenuous ploy. Folks, search your conscience, search your

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

hearts. Is this good process? Is this really what we want to do, make this overtly political? I suggest it's unseemly... and... you know... only someone that isn't from Illinois wouldn't think that this is what it really is. A ploy, a gimmick, to gin up the base. Once again, we've seen it in the last couple of weeks particularly; it's bad process. It's disingenuous. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Ives."

Ives: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. It's pretty apparent that the other side of the aisle is only interested in making Illinois an even bigger laughing stock than it already is. No other state would even conceive of doing election law by the year. We passed election laws that were sweeping changes last year. Now we're going to pass this. Oh by the way, on the last day of Session with it out having gone through the normal process. With it out having been really vetted in committee. With it out having us go back to our districts and find out if our clerks can handle this. No. We're just going to throw something up there and because you guys are nervous about the gubernatorial race, we're going to try and turn out the vote. So, we'll set up a voter ... in-person voting registration and ... and go ahead and vote that same day right in front of the mess hall, or whatever you guys call them at public universities, right as the kids go in for dinner, hey, before you go and grab your tray, come over here you can vote. Come over here and vote. Do you need to show ID? No ID necessary, just go ahead and vote. It doesn't matter. Or let's set it up in front of the recreation center. I'm sure we'll get quite a few people to go ahead and vote there. Let's set it up at

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Chicago State University with a less than 20 percent graduation rate. I'm sure those guys know exactly what they're doing. Let's just go ahead and set it up. This is ... this is such a charade. Nobody would conceive of this, except for your side of the aisle. On top of it, let's go ahead and give ... let's have another mandate on businesses. Let's just tell employers that you have to give your employee time off... time off to be an election judge. Another unfunded mandate on employers. No ID required anymore for early voting. Why? It seemed to be working fine in the past. Oh, let's add on minimum wage referendum language. Just to make sure that it's in... on the ballot. In-person voting at public universities. Can you have in-person voting at Wheaton College? That'd be interesting. But it's required... required in high traffic areas at university. It's so specified that you can't put it off in a separate office. Let's just go ahead, and in every single quad let's just set it up outside, snow or not at that time of the year. This is so absurd as to set up election law by the year. I... People are going to be laughing at us. This is the most unserious proposition I've ever heard of. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "Sponsor will yield."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, it's a little loud here. I know it's the last Bill of the House, but obviously very important so Leader Currie, I have a few questions before I offer my remarks. You said... we have an increased grace period voting and if you could explain to me what the change is on that?"

142nd Legislative Day

- Currie: "Yeah. We would extend grace period voting in, first of all, permanent voting locations, through the Monday before Election Day. And on Election Day itself the authorities would be required to permit voter registration and voting in one central location or in voter centers... voting centers if they have them."
- Reboletti: "And for early voting we're going to extend that out 90 days. Is that... is that correct?"
- Currie: "Early voting would be extended through the Sunday before the election. And the opening hours would be longer than they are today."
- Reboletti: "And absentee ballots, that will go from 40 days prior to 90 days?"
- Currie: "The absentee ballots don't change. The only change in the Bill is that they can request them earlier than the statutes say the can request them today."
- Reboletti: "Can... can you discuss... whose initiative was it to expand the in-person absentee voting at public universities?

 I know you talked about a lot of these different entities throughout the collar counties that wanted to work with you on the Bill. Who authored that?"
- Currie: "My understanding is that the Senate... Members of the Senate requested that, and it certainly makes sense, if you want to expand people's opportunities to participate in our democracy."
- Reboletti: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think the title of House Bill 105 should be the Leave No Democrat Vote Behind.

 And I'm surprised that maybe at the universities we could send the RAR to make sure they knock on the door of the

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

students that are registered as Democrats and get them to the dining hall to make sure they can cast their ballot before they have their dinner. Now, you can go to the voting booth, register minutes before you cast your ballot and basically have no one check your name, your ID, if those are valid, nothing. This will definitely be fraught with fraud. Obviously, we like everybody to vote that can vote. There's no doubt about that. I'm surprised that there's not a presumption that if you don't vote in the election, that your vote is cast as a Democrat ballot with a presumption that you have to overcome that, it's rebuttable that you might really vote Republican. Are you guys that scared? Really? Can't we just have a normal election like we do? But every year, we have to add all these things to try to drag Democrat voters to the polls because it's an off year election. I'm surprised it's not called the Neighborhood Voting Initiative and draw the vote out. We've had so much success with other programs like that. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. To the Bill. I presume this will be the last piece of legislation we'll take up this Legislative Session. And we'll make comments, the Speaker and I will make nice comments after... we finish our business. But, I just want to tell you folks, this is not the way we should end up our business this Session. In all the years that I've been down here, to put up an election Bill, which is going to apply to one cycle, I think is really wrong. Guys, I know many of you. You guys are very independent minded, which has no place in this building. We have people watching us all over the state,

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

all over the country all the time, but my gosh, do we really want to end up the cycle... this Session with this piece of legislation? It's the wrong thing to do. And I'll just say I'm very disappointed that we're seeing it at the... at the 11th hour, of all hours, for a Bill that will apply strictly to one cycle. It's not the way we should be doing business. I would encourage all Republicans to vote 'no'. And I'm also encouraging many of my friends on that side of the aisle, those who are independent minded, who do believe what my friend Representative Reboletti said, should... we should participate in noble elections. This doesn't do it."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan."

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

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman moves the previous question. Seeing no... all in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Leader Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please join me, Members, in making sure that all Illinois citizens have the opportunity to participate in their democracy. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Turner: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 105?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On a count of 64 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', the House concurs with Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 105. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

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

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

Speaker Turner: "Please proceed."

Golar: "Over my head. I see early registration on the same day everywhere. Over my head. I see raising the minimum wage ballot on referendums ev... everywhere. Over my head. I see early voting everywhere. Oh, there must be success in the air."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Could we have all staff retire to the rear of the chamber and give our attention to Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, when we leave here in a little bit, we'll have the annual event over at a place called Julia's Kitchen. It's the former Dublin Pub, a block south of here. For those of you that are going to stay the night, it... it's near the big white tent one block south on First Street. Bring your IDs for those that might be close to the age of 21. For the rest of us, it's been a good Session. Let's... let's have a good night. Let's have some good comradery. And let's all come together so we can enjoy the summer and move forward. Thank you very much."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative. Leader Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. It appears that some of the party is already... has been prematurely started based on some of the things I've heard over the last hour, but anyway. We've concluded our business and I just have a few brief comments I just want to make. It was this last October where I was extended the honor to serve through the election of all of our Members as The

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

House Leader. It's a moment I will never forget and it truly, truly is an honor to serve not only as the House Minority Leader of my Republican Caucus, but also to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle. And Mr. Speaker, it truly has been a pleasure working with you this Session. And we made some great progress on some very important issues. And... but we still have many serious challenges ahead of us, but rest assured that I will continue to work what I feel is right for Illinoisans and also for my Party on any given issue. And I think I've proved that this year. Well, thank you. I looked at my... at some comments that I made last October and I... just looking at some of the ... some of the comments that I made. One of them is that... I talked about the fact that the House Republican Caucus is a unified caucus. That was last October. And we are as unified right now as we were back in October. So I think my friends over here, my colleagues who have entrusted me with this position, thank you for it. You know, we don't agree on everything, but we shouldn't agree on everything. But we have ... we have held together on some of the most important issues of the day, and I want to thank every one of you for doing that. I really appreciate it. I mean it from the bottom of my heart. I also said that everybody in this building, everybody on Democrat, Republican, they need to know that my door is always open. And it was never more true two days ago when Ray Poe... Ray Poe had his chicken over in the back and there was a log jam that was created in that little hallway. What I did is that I opened my door and allowed both not only Republicans but Democrats to walk through, as my door is always open. But always, I think, all

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

of you who know me that I've always give everybody an opportunity to make their case and discuss with them any issue that they have and to see if there's any way we can help them. But the fact is, I'm glad to do that. And I'll continue to do that. You know me. You know that's the type of person... you know that's my style, and I think it's good. And I know that that's how the Speaker feels as well. I also want to thank my personal staff, the ones that I work closely with. Cheri, in the back, I know Cheri Hermes is just a wonderful person. Vicki Crawford, who does my... my press and Scott Reimers, Chief of Staff. They do a great job. They help me out so much 'cause at times I can be a handful. You don't have to nod your head in agreement. But I also want to thank on behalf of our caucus, our staff. And I cannot praise our staff more. They are the ones that work on the second floor of the Capitol. The ones that will work on the fourth floor of the Stratton Building, also the ones that are working on the second floor of the Stratton Building. I can never thank them enough for the hours upon hours they dedicate to our caucus. They are truly the best. I also want to thank the Democratic staff for their cooperation and professionalism... professionalism they display on a daily basis. So thank you, for those who are in here. Thank you for working with us. Just folks, remember that our staff members make our jobs easier and more meaningful. Our staff also makes us look better, even when we really don't deserve it. And there are plenty of times down here where that happens. But they're always there for us. And again, let's give them a round of applaud for our Republican, Democratic staff. You know, we are all here for the right

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

reasons. We want to better Illinois for our... for our families, our friends, and our neighbors. And even more so for the ones that we don't know. Those Illinoisans that we don't know. But remember we all are sons and daughters as well. And remember you're never too old to make your parents proud of you. Never too old to make your parents proud of you. Myself and Jay Hoffman went through a rough year. He lost his mother in December; I lost my mother in December. Jay's an old college friend of mine. We... we reminisce about our mothers often. I miss her dearly. As does Jay miss his mother. But I know she's still watching me, and I know Jay's mother is watching him too. I use that as a moment to remind myself that I'm never going to get too self-absorbed or never will I be too important to anyone. Keep that in mind, folks. Just remember those earliest directions that we received from our parents. Be respectful to all, be fair to all. Because if you do that, your life will be more happy... will be happier and more meaningful. On that note, I want to thank the Speaker for having an open bar for our staff House Republicans and Democrats at Boone's tonight. All of you... all you have to do is mention Speaker Madigan's name to the wait staff. It was a very kind gesture that you have extended to us, Mr. Speaker. But on that note, thank you everybody and I wish you a great summer."

Speaker Turner: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "That shall be a tough act to follow. But let me first compliment Mr. Durkin for a commendable performance in his voyage as the Minority Leader. As usual, we had a lot of difficult issues. Right at the very beginning on a very

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

contentious issue, Jim came into my office and said, 'now look, we're going to have a difficult debate tomorrow. And we're going to work with our people so that it's done appropriately. And that's exactly what happened. And that was the beginning of your first year as the Minority Leader. And so, I want to compliment you, but I want to thank you, because what's really important for all of us is the decorum and the tone that is set in this chamber. And you have gone a great distance in helping all of us accomplish that goal. As I said, and as usual, this has been a difficult Session, maybe a very difficult Session. Over the last few years nothing seems to be simple. Nothing seems to be easy. It's just one difficult, complicated issue after another. And so, let me thank all of you for your participation in the debate, the discussion and at times the resolution of those issues. You... and all of us, the Members, are what makes this institution function. That's why the people sent us here, that's what they expect, that's what they're entitled to. Day in and day out you all do your job, and you do it very, very well. So my compliments, and thank you very much. Let me thank staff, Democrat and Republican, the professional staff, the support staff for everything that you've done for all of us. I just said that we make the place function, but without them we'd be in a lot of trouble and it would be a lot more difficult. So, thank you to all of the staff. And with that, I think we're ready to adjourn, go to some places in town, or get on the highway and go home. Thank you very, very much. Have a very great summer. Godspeed. God bless all. I move that we adjourn."

142nd Legislative Day

5/30/2014

Speaker Turner: "And now, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk, Speaker Madigan moves that the House adjourn Session 'til Wednesday, November 19 at the hour of 12 noon. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House is adjourned."